

Brig. Gen. Robert E. Halls, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Geoffrey Cheadle, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Foster L. Smith, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Alfred L. Esposito, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Donald H. Ross, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. James A. Hill, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Jimmy J. Jumper, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Robert W. Maloy, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Devol Brett, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Robert E. Huyser, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Alton D. Slay, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Fred A. Helmstra, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Maurice F. Casey, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Henry L. Hogan, III, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Charles W. Carson, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Robert A. Patterson, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force, Medical.  
 Brig. Gen. Dudley E. Faver, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard R. Stewart, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Harold C. Teubner, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Paul N. Bacalis, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. David V. Miller, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Allison C. Brooks, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. William S. Chairsell, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Jones E. Bolt, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Frank M. Madsen, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. William R. MacDonald, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Albert R. Shely, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. James M. Keck, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Ernest T. Cragg, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John R. Kullman, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John B. Hudson, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John H. Buckner, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. William E. Bryan, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Earl L. Johnson, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John B. Kidd, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Joseph G. Wilson, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Rexford H. Dettre, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. George W. McLaughlin, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.

xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Roger K. Rhodarmer, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Richard M. Hoban, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John O. Moench, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Sanford K. Moats, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Robert E. Halls, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. John C. Girardo, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.  
 Brig. Gen. Jimmy J. Jumper, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force).  
 Brig. Gen. Robert W. Maloy, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force).

**IN THE NAVY**

Vice Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

**IN THE MARINE CORPS**

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

The following U.S. Marine Corps general officers for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of their respective retirements.

Lt. Gen. Henry W. Buse, Jr.  
 Lt. Gen. Lewis J. Fields.  
 Lt. Gen. Frank C. Tharin.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 5, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Andrew W. Tampling, the First Baptist Church, Sylacauga, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, we acknowledge Thee as our God. Grant that these Thy children, possessing powers to govern that have been ordained of Thee, may meet their duties and responsibilities with a constant remembrance of the great traditions wherein they stand and of the brilliant cloud of witnesses at all times surrounding them.

We pray that a sense of the eternal may color the thoughts and endeavors of all who serve here in this citadel of American life.

We bless Thee in advance for the gift of a realization of Thy presence forming our decisions and permeating our will's most inward being.

In our silence and speech and deliberate actions may Thy will be done. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13300. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes.

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

S. 3253. An act to provide that the Federal office building and U.S. courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969.

### THE GOLDEN EAGLE AND INFLATION

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

remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon-Agnew administration talks a great game of fighting inflation, but when you look at the record, it does not look so good.

The latest instance of inconsistency on the part of this administration is their backing for a proposal to extend the so-called Golden Eagle for entrance to Federal recreation areas, which Congress had voted out of existence on March 31 of this year, and not only to extend it but to raise it from \$7 to \$10 which is an increase of pretty close to 43 percent.

If this is holding the line on prices, and if that is helping the average American citizen, and if it is helping to make outdoor recreation available to all people, it is a strange way to do the job.

It seems to me the Congress during the last session made a wise decision in regard to ending this pewter buzzard in March of this year—and found at that time that the extension of it is not in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make quite certain that all American citizens can enjoy access to the national parks and Federal recreation areas which belong to the American people—a bill to prohibit the charging of entrance or admission fees for access

to any recreational lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States. The bill would not prohibit reasonable user fees for actual use of highly developed recreational facilities, such as campsites providing utilities, but it would put an end to all entrance fees collected from the people for entry and enjoyment of our parklands and reservoirs.

The bill referred to is as follows:

H.R. 15745

A bill to prohibit the charging of entrance or admission fees for access to any recreational lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and determines that every citizen of the United States has the right to enter upon those public lands and waters of the United States used and usable for recreational purposes free of any charge.

SEC. 2. No entrance or admission fee shall be collected by any officer or employee of the United States at public recreational areas located on public lands or waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of any Department, Agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 3. Any provision of law which is inconsistent with the provisions of this Act is hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, 1969, I was in my congressional district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On roll call No. 351, on the adoption of the conference report on the Tax Reform Act of 1969, I would have voted "yes."

On roll call No. 352, on the Mahon motion to agree to Senate amendment containing appropriations resolution, I would have voted "no."

#### WHO IS GETTING 8¼ PERCENT INTEREST FROM THE GOVERNMENT?

(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, on Tuesday of this week, Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy said that lower interest rates are closer than most people realize.

Last week the Treasury announced that it is offering \$6.6 billion in three issues including an 8.25 percent, 18-month note in exchange for bonds maturing February 15 and March 15.

The new offer is limited to those investors who already own the Federal bonds maturing on February 15 and March 15. If these Federal securities were offered to the general public, they would be sold at a premium or at a considerably lower rate of interest.

Since less than 10 percent of the bonds maturing this year remain in the hands of the original purchasers, the extension of refunding privilege at the highest Federal interest rates since 1859 is made to persons and institutions which ac-

quired these bonds at distressed prices, at bargain rates, and quite recently.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasury is catering to those who manipulate the Federal bond market rather than the best interests of the American people.

I am today requesting the Treasury to report on the percentage of original holders of these bonds who held them to redemption and the percentage who acquired those bonds within the last year and the last 6 months before due date.

Treasury procedures and manipulated debt management could constitute the biggest drain in the Federal Treasury and serve to propel the forces of inflation.

#### FARMERS NEED ADVANCE FEED GRAIN PAYMENTS

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill in the House of Representatives today to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain program.

This bill, which is coauthored by 14 other Members of the House, is a result of the decision announced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture late in December to eliminate advance payments under the 1970 feed grain program.

In the past, farmers have received their payments for diverting land from production of specified feed grains in two installments, one in February and the other in August. Since 1961, the February payments have helped farmers to buy seed and fertilizer and to pay for the incidental but growing expenses which farmers face each spring. Now the USDA says it will not make diversion funds available in February 1970, but that payments should be in the hands of growers by the end of July or mid-August.

We were told the reason for withholding advance payments was to avoid making any such payments in the 1970 fiscal year, which ends on June 30, 1970. Since the same money will be paid out anyway in the form of diversion payments several months later, no Federal money is being saved, while the timing of the payments could work to the serious disadvantage of many farmers. It appears to me that the USDA and the Bureau of the Budget are simply engaging in some fiscal juggling to provide the illusion of budget cutting, when in fact, costs are merely shoved into the next fiscal year.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to see how this move may be anti-inflationary because it will force many farmers into borrowing millions of dollars across the country at record-high interest rates.

In Wisconsin last year, for example, \$13 million in advance payments were made. If farmers seek money from lending institutions to buy seed, fertilizer, fuel, and other items which they were able to purchase with their advance payments, they will have to pay thousands of dollars in interest because the decision was made to

use a bookkeeping gimmick to create the illusion of real budget cutting, when in fact only a paper cut is being achieved.

No one can question the fact that our economy is in trouble, and that measures must be taken to stop inflation. That is why the Congress cut the President's budget this year by some \$5.6 billion. But an "on paper" budget reduction is a pretty weak argument for imposing a serious hardship on thousands of farmers.

The feed grain program has been reasonably successful in its attempts to strengthen farm prices and farm income through a reduction in the total supply of agricultural products. In 1969 over 9,000 farms with a base of 166,231 acres in the Seventh Congressional District participated in the feed grain program, and over \$3.9 million in diversion payments was received by Seventh District farmers.

While someone at the USDA or Bureau of the Budget has cooked up a clever way to supposedly achieve a budget cut, the result will actually add to our inflation problems because farmers will have to seek credit to buy feed and fertilizer. It will hurt a lot of farmers who are already fighting against serious economic difficulties, including a 5-percent increase in their cost of production over the past year. And the decision to eliminate advance payments may even result in some farmers dropping out of the diversion program altogether, deciding it more worthwhile to plant the acres they would otherwise convert to conservation or other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, advance payments to producers under the feed grain program do not cost the Government any extra money but they are extremely helpful to farmers who need money at planting time. I am hopeful that the Congress will give serious and swift consideration to this legislation.

The additional sponsors of this bill include:

Representative JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat of Iowa, Representative JOHN MELCHER, Democrat of Montana, Representative WILLIAM RANDALL, Democrat of Missouri, Representative TOM STEED, Democrat of Oklahoma, Representative WILLIAM HATHAWAY, Democrat of Maine, Representative MARK ANDREWS, Republican of North Dakota.

Representative SPARK MATSUNAGA, Democrat of Hawaii, Representative WALTER B. JONES, Democrat of North Carolina, Representative THOMAS FOLEY, Democrat of Washington, Representative W. R. HULL, Democrat of Missouri, Representative ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, Democrat of New York, Representative LEE HAMILTON, Democrat of Indiana, Representative DAVID HENDERSON, Democrat of North Carolina, Representative JOHN L. McMILLAN, Democrat of South Carolina.

#### THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE SOUTH

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr.

Speaker, according to news reports, a 14-year-old schoolboy in Oklahoma City has been arrested on orders of a Federal judge for failure to comply with a court order to be bused across the city. Busing incidents are occurring all over the South and in many other sections of the country. If we go back and read the civil rights bill of 1964, we see that it prohibits the busing of schoolchildren to bring about racial balance.

Alabama has operated for the last few years under the so-called freedom-of-choice system, and every school in Alabama has been integrated. What could be any fairer than a freedom-of-choice system? What is fairer than a system that permits a schoolchild to go to any school of his choice? But the bureaucrats will not stand for that. They say integration is not coming about rapidly enough, and violate the laws of the land by ordering busing.

I predict that the bureaucrats in HEW and the Federal judges are rapidly destroying the public school system of the South.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN and BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Messrs. REUSS, WIDNALL, JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, and MIZE.

#### CAB IS CARRYING ON PURGE OF SUPPLEMENTAL CARRIERS

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the CAB is carrying on a purge of some of the supplemental carriers of this country that I think are doing an outstanding job in handling the tremendous demand for air carrier service internationally.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of the people of my district that this act of the CAB in carrying on this purge does not represent their interests but does represent the interests of some of the more established airlines that do not need this protection.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include two articles, one from the Washington Post, dated January 5, entitled "IATA: Domination of Airline Fares," and the other is an article from the News and Views on Air Transportation, dated December 26, entitled "Char-

ter Flights Can Save Traveler a Lot of Money":

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1970]

IATA: DOMINATION OF AIRLINE FARES  
(Review by Ralph Nader)

(NOTE.—Nader, author of "Unsafe at Any Speed," is a noted lobbyist for the public interest and chairman of the Center for the Study of Responsive Law.)

"The Air Net: The Case Against the World Aviation Cartel," K. G. J. Pillai, (Grossman, 212 pp., \$5.95).

The most efficient consumer abuse occurs when its perpetrators institutionalize it in such a complex and authoritative manner that the victims know little of the abuse and nothing of the perpetrator. Few international air passengers have ever heard of the International Air Transport Association (IATA). Much less do they possess an elementary understanding of what Dr. Pillai calls "one of the most powerful and authoritarian private international cartels that the world has ever seen."

Yet IATA, as a private business association of international airlines, fixes rates, fares and other conditions of air travel and thereby determines who can and cannot fly by keeping prices much higher than would prevail in a competitive industry. Since the aviation industry is heavily subsidized—directly and indirectly—by taxpayers and is rightly considered by many analysts as a "world public utility," the users' stake in IATA is undeniable.

The absence of a user or consumer voice, with or without government, in IATA's deliberations and decisions caught Dr. Pillai's attention while he was studying for a graduate degree at Yale Law School. His doctoral thesis about this secret society, relying heavily on a meticulous search of the available documents and a sense of relevant logic, unravels for the first time its intricate controls and sanctions over international aviation.

In brief, the situation he depicts is as follows: IATA, with headquarters in Montreal, receives its authority to fix airline tariffs from various bilateral agreements between various governments. These agreements reserve the right of governments to suspend or reject these rates. In practice, however, the combined lobby of state-owned and private airlines has overwhelmed any attempts, including that of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to block rate hikes. Meeting in secret at various cities around the world, IATA permits no access to its rate-making machinery on behalf of shippers, passengers or governments. These meetings develop price structures that further codify restrictive practices, protect the most inefficient of airlines, amalgamate a massive number of political variables—and make all these decisions without any explanation and analysis that would allow external evaluation.

What emerges from these long, arduous IATA conferences (some extending six weeks or more at an estimated cost to the airlines of \$10,000 an hour) are the predictable results of the cartel system. These include an artificially high rate and fare ceiling that reduces the volume of passengers, the diversion of competition into wastefully deceptive promotions about alleged service and aesthetic distinctions between the airlines, the harassment of non-scheduled charter airlines which threaten the serenity of this international fare-fix, and the shortchanging of areas of the world (such as Africa) that cannot mount the lobbying force within IATA to tame the British-led European bloc that uses IATA to further Europe's domination of the tourist trade.

Already in control of this multi-billion dollar industry, IATA is becoming bullish about its future expansion. With its power spreading over the entire field of civil aviation, IATA

is moving to impose its authority over more and more of the international tourist industry. The movement of airlines into the purchase or operation of hotels and other tourist facilities is tracked by IATA. Dr. Pillai summarizes IATA's basic range: "All travel agents and tourist organizers are subject to the discipline and punishments of IATA; no airline can fly in the air without following the technical codes of IATA; and IATA determines the rights and duties of passengers for that part of their lives which they spend in an IATA plane. Its authority extends to tariffs for domestic air transport except in the United States, the Soviet Union, and most Eastern European countries. IATA has already taken steps in 1968 to form its own insurance company by 1970..."

Potentially powerful groups have hacked away verbally at IATA's collusive policies that retard the growth of economical international air transportation. The CAB has huffed and puffed mostly in vain. The Justice Department's Antitrust Division in 1965 advised the CAB to re-examine "the entire concept of IATA Conference machinery and CAB immunization of agreements and resolutions" which "are per se violations of the Sherman Act." Sen. Warren Magnuson urged likewise. All this has amounted to nothing more than mere caveats, and IATA is a past master in handling caveats.

There has never been a congressional inquiry into IATA nor an independent executive branch study of the cartel and preferable alternatives. This is a remarkable testament to the ingenious matrix of power and invulnerability that IATA has built. Some U.S. airlines for years have been displeased with IATA high-fare policies. Shippers have complained about IATA's arbitrariness. But like the regulated industry that captures the regulator, IATA, by manipulating and compromising the factors of economics, politics, national prestige, regional claims and the fear of "competitive anarchy," brings most governments to its side. The shippers and the passengers are not organized countervailing forces.

The IATA forces place the greatest premium on secrecy. Airline costs, the reasons for inefficiencies, and the politics and economics of IATA intrigue must remain secret if this cartel is to continue. Dr. Pillai's disclosures and analysis will not receive a public rebuttal from IATA.

Its strategy will be to ignore and thereby cool the possibility of a real dustup. IATA's unilateral hegemony has no room for discussing Dr. Pillai's proposals for a single international governmental authority with due process and democratic procedures for all interested parties. Similar silence will greet his alternative suggestions for directing, rather than displacing, IATA operations toward consumer justice.

What this book lacks are the "proper name" disclosures—of the backscratching, the intense powerplays, and the colossal waste—disclosures which would generate a thorough congressional-type inquiry. But Dr. Pillai has only the power of a concerned citizen, not the unused subpoena authority of a congressional committee or governmental agency. He has prepared the brief against IATA. Congress, the CAB and the White House would do well to heed his admonitions and listen to his counsel.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, Dec. 26, 1969]

CHARTER FLIGHTS CAN SAVE TRAVELER A LOT OF MONEY

(By Carlton Smith and Richard Putnam Pratt)

The overseas airlines regularly go through more contortions than a belly-dancer's apprentice in trying to work out a fare schedule that will satisfy them all. They are repeating the process right now, and no one

is sure exactly what the fares to Europe will be next summer.

One thing is just about certain, however. They won't come anywhere near the economy of the charter flight.

As of right now, one firm that handles a hefty chunk of the charter business will fly passengers from New York to London and back for \$134.37 each. From Detroit, the price is \$146.63; from Chicago, \$154.01.

It can't be too far wide of the mark to say that these charter prices are roughly half what you'd pay for a comparable seat on a standard flight.

If this dollar discrepancy leads you to think harsh thoughts about the scheduled airlines, you need to remember that scheduled planes fly on schedule, loaded or not. Vacant seats are no novelty, and these empty seats represent an unrecoverable loss that must be made up somehow. Charter flights are commonly booked solid.

Thus, if you are aiming for a trip to Europe (or any other place, for that matter), you should seriously investigate the possibility of joining a charter. It will almost certainly save you money.

Groups are the heart of the charter business. You have to belong to one to enjoy charter benefits. The law requires it and so does practicality. In effect, the group rents the plane, much as an individual would hire a taxi.

Fortunately, air travel has now become so common that charter flights are everywhere. Fraternal organizations, professional groups, sports clubs, church congregations, labor unions, alumni clubs and dozens of others occasionally, or even regularly, sponsor such flights.

There are a few rules that cover chartering. First, anybody who signs on for the flight must have been a member of the group prior to the time the flight was announced.

Second, if the flight is going overseas, participants must have been members of the chartering group for at least six months prior to the flight, or longer if the charter was promoted more than six months before its departure.

On the other hand, wives, husband and children of charter group members are eligible to go along simply on the basis of the family tie.

If the group is large enough, chartering is simple. The group rents an entire plane, puts its members aboard and says: "Paris, s'il vous plait." With today's jets, however, that means filling something like 250 seats, an impossibility for most groups.

If the group can't fill a whole plane, then the next step is to charter a piece of a plane headed in the right direction. Five groups of 50 members each, for example, can neatly fill a 250-seat plane so long as they all want to go to the same destination.

The price is the same as if they were all members of a single unit.

And that's about all there is to it. Subject to the availability of planes, charter groups can fly from any place to any other place at will, and return when they like. En route, they get all the usual amenities—food, liquor and service—and can even lay on a special menu if they like.

If you've got the yen, keep a close watch on bulletin boards and club mailings. Chances are good that somebody out there is whipping up just the kind of vacation you've been dreaming about for years.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9, I am recorded as paired for the bill. I wish to make a statement that this is incorrect. I was not for the bill as paired. I ask that my statement be included in the RECORD, my understanding

being that the pair cannot be corrected at this time.

#### LEGISLATION TO HELP CURB DUTCH ELM DISEASE

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to help curb the epidemic of Dutch elm disease sweeping the Nation's 20 million elm shade trees.

Mr. Speaker, we are losing more than 400,000 elm trees to the disease in America every year and unless preventive action is taken now, the esthetically beautiful American elm with its sweeping branches and cool shade will be extinct by the end of the century.

The replacement cost for shade trees destroyed by Dutch elm disease is \$80,000,000 annually.

My proposal would amend the Forest Pest Control Act and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to help local communities institute pest control programs to halt the epidemic and to remove quickly trees already diseased beyond salvation.

The Dutch elm disease epidemic is one of the Nation's most serious environmental problems and much too little attention has been paid in the past decade to its alarming growth.

Elm trees do not only provide our urban areas with shade and esthetic values, but they also act as the most effective insulator against urban noises.

Recent studies have shown that in those communities where elm trees had to be removed because of Dutch elm infestation, the noise level from normal big city activities have created increased problems in noise abatement.

Since its introduction into the United States about 1930, the Dutch elm beetle has become our most destructive shade tree pest.

The disease affects communities throughout the East, extends across the Midwestern States, and into two of our Western States.

In total, the disease has now appeared in 32 States and new locations are being detected almost daily.

The U.S. Forest Service estimates that Dutch elm disease will infect shade trees in all 50 States within the next 15 years because of its alarming and rapid spread.

Dutch elm disease is caused by a fungus carried by the bark beetle which has no preference over species of elm trees and affects them all, with the American elm, our most valuable native shade tree being most frequently and most severely affected.

The growing number of treeless eastern and midwestern communities—including vast areas in my own Chicago congressional district—whose streets were once arched with stately American elms, bear witness to the destructiveness of Dutch elm disease.

Certainly, no one can accurately evaluate the intangible scenic and esthetic

losses that have occurred in all of these communities.

It would also be too difficult to accurately appraise the reduced property values in communities where the American elms are gone.

While the aged elms can never really be replaced for beauty and shade value, we do know that it costs approximately \$200 to replace those taken down with much smaller and younger but already blooming trees. Using \$200 as a base figure, it can be safely estimated that the annual loss to American property owners exceeds \$80 million in replacement cost alone.

It is my hope that as America becomes more concerned with environmental health and pollution, the amendment which I offer today will rate high in the order of priorities to save the health and esthetic value of our communities.

I have placed no dollar authorization into my amendment leaving estimates for effective action by the Department of Agriculture in the battle against Dutch elm disease to the Secretary of Agriculture after he has concluded his preliminary studies.

#### NEW SOURCES OF REVENUE

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, of all the problems this great country faces the most acute is the shortage of money. There is not enough revenue coming in to the U.S. Treasury to pay for all the demands upon Government for programs—whether these be for defense, ecology, urban crises, or education.

We must not continue further deficits. Government must be operated with the revenues we have coming in or inflation will eat up the earnings of every man, woman, and child in this country.

There is only one answer to our urgent fiscal crisis. We can cut back all we want to, but with the fixed costs of Government—charges like interest on the debt, veterans compensation, defense personnel, and procurement—it is impossible to achieve fiscal balance solely by cutting back. We must find new sources of revenue.

I shall soon introduce comprehensive legislation providing for a national numbers drawing to be conducted once each month by a national commission whose members shall be men with backgrounds of proven unimpeachable integrity. This bill will provide that States that participate by permitting the sale of Federal number stamps within their borders shall share in the net revenues on a per capita basis and by a percentage of the revenue from sales within their areas. This will help the several States in their fiscal hour of need as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is infinitely preferable to a national sales tax as a source of new revenue. It will produce hundreds of millions of dollars for both the Federal Government and the several States—paid with a smile—to be used to fight crime and for the public welfare. Many

of the nations of this world have and depend upon a national lottery for substantial revenue. Why not us when we need money so badly for urgent new programs of public benefit?

No longer can it be responsibly contended that a national drawing offends public morality. There is nothing immoral about it. As a matter of fact it would not only help fight crime but would materially reduce the take of the underground from the numbers racket.

Under special order I shall outline my bill in detail as soon as drafting details have been completed. It will have features assuring integrity, fairness, and effectiveness. I commend this new fiscal alternative to the thoughtful consideration of all Members of this Congress.

#### FILM RECORDINGS WITH MAJOR ROWE

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 25th of November I made a statement in the RECORD relative to a film which had been made in the House Recording Studios. Today I should like to refer to it once again.

During the month of November a great American and an outstanding soldier, Maj. James N. "Nick" Rowe, who had been captured by the Vietcong and held prisoner longer than any American soldier had been held prisoner, appeared before the House Armed Services Committee. The committee was so impressed that many of us asked him to appear on television programs with us. He had so many requests it was decided, in the interest of time and in the interest of the Members, that one big tape would be made, almost 30 minutes in length, with an open beginning and an open closing, so that any Member of the House could use it. They could dub in the front and dub in the closing, and it would be made available to any Member, to be shown in his home district, whether to a chamber of commerce or a school group, because it would be most appropriate for almost any group.

There was absolutely nothing partisan about it. The film is available today to any Member of the House who would like to use it, on the same basis I would be able to use it; that is, just defraying a part of the cost.

Just recently in the papers I have seen statements alluding to this, saying it was a partisan effort and that the statements or Major Rowe and his appearance here were partisan in nature. I can only say, nothing is further from the truth. There is nothing partisan about it. Anyone can judge for himself. The man was a captive of the Vietcong. He describes his treatment as a prisoner. He was stating facts—not opinion. He was speaking only the truth. If his presence here embarrasses anyone, it should be only those who are sympathetic to the Vietcong and those who would put America's interest last.

#### LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE COAST GUARD TO CONTROL MOVEMENT OF VESSELS IN U.S. NAVIGABLE WATERS

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of January 21, 1970, the U.S.S. *Yancey*, dragging her anchors, crashed into the \$200 million, 17-mile Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel tearing out a 375-foot section in this vital north-south link between Virginia Beach and the Eastern Shore of Virginia.

Fortunately, there was no loss of life nor were any injuries suffered. The economic losses, however, are almost incalculable. Bridge repair cost will probably exceed \$2 million. It will be closed for public passage for at least a month—inconveniencing thousands of motorists and breaking the flow of commerce north and south.

On the Eastern Shore of Virginia, in my district, many businesses have been forced to close or reduce employment; lack of transportation of supplies and equipment is hurting farmers, merchants, and watermen; increased shipping costs are reflected in a rise in prices to the Eastern Shore consumer; and the tourist trade, a major contributor to the economy, is at a standstill. Unemployment is at an alltime high.

The Governor of Virginia has requested the President to declare the Eastern Shore an economic industry disaster area and eligible for certain Federal assistance. The area and the bridge tunnel, however, may never recover from the monetary loss or from the psychological effect.

This was the worst disaster to this bridge, but it has not been the only one. Several years ago a barge smashed into the same area of the bridge closing down the facility for over 2 weeks with calamitous economic results.

Another barge and a Navy LST have also damaged the structure.

There have been a number of near misses which could have caused considerable damage and numerous incidents of smaller vessels brushing the sides of the trestles.

Other U.S. ports with extensive port and bridge facilities have and are experiencing the same difficulties.

I am aware that no legislation can prevent all damage caused by acts of God or human failures. But I do believe we can enact laws which would minimize these disastrous occurrences.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to authorize the Coast Guard to control the movement of vessels in U.S. navigable waters.

The new legislation, for the first time, would empower the Secretary of Transportation, Coast Guard, to make and enforce rules to control the anchorage and movement of any vessel, including U.S. Navy, located in our waters.

If this legislation were enacted, it would be a very significant advance in strengthening the hand of the Coast

Guard to set operating rules for all vessels. The new legislation would resolve once and for all the presently fuzzy question of jurisdiction between the Coast Guard and the Navy in our navigable waters. As I see the bill, all maritime traffic would be subject to the Coast Guard operating rules in the same way as all aircraft, including military, are subject to the control of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Coast Guard agrees with this new legislative authority and could enforce the necessary regulations designed to promote harbor safety and to protect pier and bridge facilities in the ports of the United States.

I shall urge immediate hearings.

#### THE UNITED STATES IS A FRIEND OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, upon the 21st anniversary of the establishment of Israel, I had the privilege of making a statement and signing a resolution with my colleagues relating to our position as far as the State of Israel was concerned.

Again today I wish not only to reaffirm this resolution, but to strengthen it by advocating, first, face-to-face negotiation between the Arabs and the State of Israel, and, second, military aid to the State of Israel in the form of equipment necessary to support its efforts and to defend the safety of their people so that a lasting peace in the Middle East may be a reality instead of a dream.

Israel has proven itself a friend of the United States and I, in behalf of my friends in the Greater Cleveland area, wish the State of Israel to know that the United States can be relied upon as its friend and will always remain Israel's friend.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has taken another step toward proving that his is a responsible administration.

That step, of course, is the presentation of his proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1970-71. This is the first budget that can truly be called the President's budget and it carries that quality that is almost unique to Republican administrations—it is balanced. It is non-inflationary. It is responsible. It meets the people's needs without attempting to buy the people's votes with vast spending programs and promises that cannot be kept.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, this is not a stand-pat budget nor is it a budget that merely perpetuates old programs to a greater or lesser extent. Far from it.

This is a budget that charts new paths while abandoning old ways.

It recognizes current problems and turns away from yesterday's solutions.

And above all, it recognizes priorities—the fact that our first priority abroad is winding down the war in Vietnam honorably. The fact that our first priority at home is winding down the cost of living effectively and without a depression.

Mr. Speaker, the President's first budget is further proof that the people of the United States are getting sound, sensible leadership from the White House. It is up to the Members of Congress to support that kind of leadership as we work to put the President's budget into effect.

#### BILL TIMMONS

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

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased and proud to learn of Bill Timmons' appointment as assistant to President Nixon for congressional relations. He is not only a close friend, but one of the finest men I have known.

Bill Timmons began his Capitol Hill experience as an aid to Senator Alexander Wiley, 1961–62. In 1963 he joined my staff as administrative assistant, serving in that capacity until joining the Nixon administration in December 1968. I know of no more dedicated or capable public servant in Washington.

This is a tremendous opportunity for a young Tennessean who has proven his ability and dedication through hard work. President Nixon has recognized Bill's leadership potential, as have the Members of Congress. He will do an outstanding job.

#### NATIONAL USURY LAW

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to create a national usury law at 6 percent maximum legal interest on all credit and loan transactions within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the principal cause of high interest rates is the artificial tight money policy of the administration and the so-called fight against inflation by the Federal Reserve Board. If these authorities wished to curtail consumer spending, they need only invoke the regulation requiring higher downpayments for installment credit. As it is, they have simply inflated the cost of borrowing money so that the consumer spends as much but gets less in goods and more in interest rate receipts.

The interest rates were raised by artificial Government action and should be brought back down the same way. Only this time they should be lowered by the law rather than administrative discretion.

Artificial interest rate increases caused by direction of the Federal Government plus certain private banking interests located in the vicinity of Man-

hattan Island have ushered in America's first depression since 1929. This one so far is concentrated in the housing industry. Homebuilders cannot build because they cannot afford to borrow. Home buyers buy because they cannot afford to borrow.

And the American Government cannot afford to stand idly by and pretend nothing is wrong in the quasi-public utility of money changing.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13300, SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITIES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13300) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, DINGELL, SPRINGER, and DEVINE.

#### ENCOURAGING NEWS FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON THE FIGHT AGAINST DRUGS, CRIME, AND POLLUTION

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the fight against three of our most serious problems today—crime, drug control, and pollution—received valuable support from President Nixon this week.

On Wednesday the President issued an Executive order to all Federal agencies instructing that they act by the end of 1972 to bring under control air and water pollution caused by their facilities.

In addition, the President stated that funding for the necessary cost to bring this about be included in their future budget requests. The cost for this is estimated by the White House to be near \$360 million. The President also ordered that from now on no funds appropriated for pollution control may be transferred for other programs, a practice which has undercut control efforts in the past.

The President has promised to submit guidelines whereby the new order will be carried out and emphasized the order must be implemented no later than December 31, 1972.

Earlier in the week, the President's budget message proposed the Congress appropriate more than a quarter of a billion dollars over current spending to fight crime and narcotics traffic.

The increase would bring the Justice Department budget to \$984.5 million for the next fiscal year, and would raise to \$1.3 billion in Federal funds being used

by all Federal agencies to assist in law enforcement and crime control.

This increase is in marked contrast to reductions asked by President Nixon for other Federal departments and agencies.

The largest part of these increases in funds would be used directly by the Department of Justice to aid in law enforcement and help combat the illegal flow of narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, this is reassuring news for the people of this Nation. Crime, street violence, and drug addiction have been recognized as major American problems for some time. Just recently, it has become rapidly recognized that environmental pollution may well threaten our very existence within a generation if we do not halt it immediately. And certainly the Federal Government is acknowledged and admittedly one of the greatest single polluters of America today.

As a candidate, Mr. Nixon pledged to step up the Federal Government's participation in the battle against crime. The new budget request reflects his commitment to this pledge.

In his state of the Union address, the President gave environmental pollution control a No. 1 priority. The curbing of pollution by Federal facilities would be a big step in meeting that priority.

#### NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 251) to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 251

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the last Friday of April of each year "National Arbor Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

On page 1, line 4, delete the word "annually".

On page 1, line 5, after the word "April", strike the phrase "of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

On page 1, line 6, after the word "such" delete the word "a".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 251, my proposal to establish a uniform national observance of Arbor Day. Under

the resolution, the President is authorized to proclaim the last Friday in April 1970, as "National Arbor Day."

Twenty-two States have passed such bills and approximately eight more have bills pending in their State legislatures this year. Thus, nearly one-half the Nation is observing the National Arbor Day. My resolution is based on the proposition that a greater good can be done to educate all America to the importance and necessity of trees with a unified Arbor Day observance than through piecemeal observances held on different dates by various jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the enactment of this resolution would be a timely beginning for this new decade during which we all hope increased emphasis will be placed on environmental and conservation problems. With the growing awareness today of the environment and the need to protect and preserve our natural resources, passage of the Arbor Day resolution will serve to stimulate public appreciation of our trees and forests.

In conclusion, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Harry Banker of West Orange, N.J. Mr. Banker is the national executive-secretary of the Committee for National Arbor Day and has worked tirelessly for many years to promote a uniform National Arbor Day.

The joint resolution 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: "To authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1970 as National Arbor Day."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 481) designating February of each year as "American History Month."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 481

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future;

Whereas February 1967, has been designated by the President as "American History Month"; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication

to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as "American History Month", and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

On pages 1 and 2, strike out all "whereas" clauses.

On page 2, line 3, delete the phrase "of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

On page 2, line 5, delete the word "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution 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: "Designating February 1970 as 'American History Month.'"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SCHOOL BUS SAFETY WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 703) authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 20 through April 25, 1970, as "School Bus Safety Week."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 703

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period April 20 through April 25, 1970, as "School Bus Safety Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The joint resolution 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.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in con-

nection with the three joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### TAKE THE LEAD OUT OF GASOLINE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to ban lead from gasoline. The prohibition as set forth in my legislation would cover all gasoline sold in interstate commerce and would go into effect a year after the bill's enactment.

Today, an estimated 400 million pounds of lead pollute our environment each year through automobile exhaust. And, the continued annual accumulation of lead in our environment is posing a growing public health hazard, particularly for persons living in our cities.

The devastating effects of lead poisoning, caused by the ingestion of peeling paint and plaster, are familiar to everyone. Each year thousands of children in our slums suffer irreparable brain damage and some even die as a result of this poisoning. Gasoline lead contamination, resulting from both gaseous and particulate auto exhaust emissions, also affects lead levels in the blood and bones, although the extent of such toxification is still undetermined. But, it is known that gasoline containing lead is an acute poison and that the inhalation of such gasoline fumes can be fatal. In addition, it is estimated that 50 percent of lead in gasoline is emitted into the air through auto exhaust—one-third in gaseous form that travels for miles beyond the original point of pollution, and the other two-thirds as particulate matter which is absorbed by plant life and later ingested by man.

It is untenable that we continue to let the petroleum industry put into the atmosphere a substance of known harm to the body. It is time that our country takes the lead out of gasoline. Lead is an octane booster. Proper refining can obviate the need for lead; and indeed, the American Oil Co. has been supplying us with such "white gas" for over 30 years.

My bill would require that a year after its enactment the introduction, transportation, or distribution in interstate commerce of gasoline containing lead would be prohibited. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the act.

The following is the full text of the bill:

H.R. 15753

A bill to prohibit the introduction, transportation, or distribution in interstate commerce of gasoline containing lead

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on or after the effective date of this Act, the introduction, transportation, or distribution in*

interstate commerce of gasoline containing lead is prohibited.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of this Act. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice, as the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall determine.

SEC. 3. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of Section 1 of this Act or the regulations prescribed pursuant thereto shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect one year after the date of its enactment.

#### ROGERS CALLS FOR "GET THE LEAD OUT" CAMPAIGN TO FIGHT AIR POLLUTION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of time before lead is taken out of gasoline and I would urge petroleum companies to start preparing for this move now.

A "get the lead out" campaign will have strong backing from the public, the Government, and, I feel sure, the automobile industry.

We know that 60 percent of our air pollution problem comes from the automobile. If we can solve the major part of automobile pollution, we will have gone a long way in the solution of the entire problem.

The removal of lead from gasoline will open the door to allow us to combat air pollution from automobiles.

Although lead itself may not be pollutant per se, lead in gasoline would make ineffective a muffler device which would remove 90 to 97 percent of emission pollutants.

Last month, I wrote to four major petroleum companies asking what effect "getting the lead out" would have and I will urge that representatives from the oil industry appear before the House Public Health Subcommittee when it resumes hearings on H.R. 12934, the Clean Air Act of 1970 which I introduced last session.

The first reply from the oil industry was about what I expected. In brief, it stated that it would cost the consumer more, cars would have a hard time running on lower octane gasoline and that it would be a large task.

I have talked to people who have also studied this problem and they have told me that the proposition of converting to unleaded gasoline was indeed possible from a technical standpoint.

Testimony before the California Legislature estimated that it would take about \$200 million to convert the California refineries. Since California has roughly 10 percent of the Nation's total refining, it would be appropriate to say the national figure might be \$2 billion or more.

This will require investment on the part of industry, but I think that the Government can help in the way of tax incentives. It is worth the investment,

if it means that 200 million Americans will have cleaner air by the midseventies.

If the program gets underway soon, it might take 5 years to completely renovate the industry. But, I am encouraged that the automobile industry is already developing advanced antipollutant devices and engines which would operate on lower octane.

I hope that the oil industry of this Nation will voluntarily move into this program, which would avoid the necessity of legislation. If not, I think the Congress must act with responsibility to meet the air pollution problems of this country.

#### HOUSING: ON THE BRINK OF DISASTER

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, high-interest, tight-money conditions have now priced half the people of the Nation out of the housing market.

A study conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee staff has established that 28.4 million moderate-income households—101.1 million people—cannot now afford payments on a \$20,000, 30-year mortgage, the minimum loan for an adequate house in today's inflation-ridden economy.

The study shows that a family must have a gross income of at least \$13,000 a year and be able to make monthly payments of at least \$226 for principal, taxes, insurance, maintenance, and, last but far from least, interest. The interest on FHA mortgages has now reached a disastrous effective rate of 9 percent.

This is a crucial element in a situation which has seen housing starts tumble from an annual rate of 1.9 million at the beginning of last year to 1.3 million starts by last December.

The rapid deterioration of the housing market has prompted Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, to hold emergency housing hearings in an effort to develop additional sources of mortgage funds at reasonable rates.

Among the first witnesses was Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, one of the Nation's most widely known and highly respected urban leaders. Mayor Daley's statement to the committee clearly illuminates our housing crisis as it applies to our large cities and suggests specific action to alleviate this terrible condition which forces the low- and moderate-income families of the Nation to shoulder most of the burden of inflation in terms of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mayor Daley's statement in the RECORD so that it may aid all Members of Congress to achieve a better understanding of the housing crisis and what can be done about it:

REMARKS BY MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FEBRUARY 4, 1970

Chairman Patman, members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee to testify on behalf of legislation

which would make a genuine contribution to meeting one of the critical problems of our time—the shortage of housing.

I have studied a number of bills pending before this committee and I find considerable merit in the bills to make the Federal Reserve System more responsive and the establishment of a development bank to aid low and moderate income housing and to expand opportunity for unemployed and low income citizens.

I have appeared before many congressional committees in the past in support of bills with these objectives.

I would like to discuss H.R. 15402 whose objective is to make money available at reasonable rates so we can achieve our national housing goals. It would provide for the purchase of mortgages by private pension funds and Federal Reserve assets.

The programs and problems I will discuss are national in scope but naturally I will refer to them in the context of what is happening in Chicago.

The goal of the city is to provide a decent home for each and every citizen. At one time, this major task was left entirely in private hands, to the builder, the real estate broker, and the manager of property, and private social agencies.

The city and the Federal Government have stepped into this area because private industry failed to meet the needs, particularly for those in the lower economic brackets. The city basically has obligations under health and housing codes for the protection of its citizens. There is no authority or responsibility spelled out in the charters of cities or anywhere else making it the responsibility of the city to provide housing for its citizens.

The cities have accepted this responsibility because someone must—not only in the field of housing but in the broad social field. Now the city is held responsible for these services but without the financial resources and facilities to adequately provide them.

Unfortunately, in the past, the thrust of private enterprise and for that matter, the policy of the national government, has served to produce housing outside of the central city. This has been recognized by the Congress which has sought to fill the gap by the passage of many measures directed to the housing needs of low and moderate income families in the cities.

Although efforts to make the FHA more flexible in financing housing in the inner city have had some effect, there still is much the agency can do.

Despite all these efforts, we have not been able to meet the needs of low and moderate families in the cities and today we find that even middle income families have been priced out of the market throughout the Nation.

Since financing for housing is supplied almost solely through the mortgage market, when money becomes tight, the housing market shows the greatest sensitivity. New home production is usually contingent upon the availability of long-term mortgage secured loans to finance ultimate purchasers. If this financing is not available, it will have a drastic effect on the amount of building.

In recent years, real estate has become even more dependent on increasing amounts of credit per transaction. Changes in credit conditions may be transmitted to the mortgage market in several ways; the capacity and willingness of commercial banks to advance short-term construction credit to builders, interim credit to other real estate lenders, and permanent mortgage credit to buyers. Further, as yields on other types of competitive market investments become more attractive, they tend to divert the flow of funds from housing. In addition the policies established by the Federal Reserve



Banks and the Federal Open Market Committee which is used to influence the general availability and cost of credit has a direct effect on the availability of credit and interest-rate levels throughout the economy.

All the recent actions of these agencies in tightening credit and slowing down the economy to halt inflation is rapidly creating a crisis condition in the housing market.

Oddly enough, our efforts to improve housing conditions—with the active support of the National Government—have only served to worsen the situation. All of us are agreed that in our affluent society there is no justification for slums or substandard housing. The City of Chicago, like other cities, has many programs underway to reduce and eliminate these substandard conditions. For example, in the past 10 years the Building Department working through the courts has demolished more than 8,000 buildings which have been found to be in a hazardous condition. Ten years ago the city budget for this program was \$5,000. Today it is \$1,200,000 and that doesn't include federal financing.

We have a strict code enforcement program which often leads to court action and the vacation of the buildings because the landlords are unwilling or unable to comply with the health and safety standards.

In Chicago, we also have established a receivership program to take over properties where landlords have refused to comply with building and health ordinances. In hundreds of instances the Chicago Dwellings Association, a quasi-public not-for-profit organization, has been appointed receiver by the courts to take over such buildings. Where possible the C.D.A. rehabilitates the buildings and provides safe housing for the tenants. However, in hundreds of instances, the C.D.A. has found the buildings so deteriorated that rehabilitation is unfeasible. The courts then order the buildings vacated. At the present time, the courts are reluctant to order a building vacated, despite its deteriorated condition, because there are insufficient vacant apartments for the tenants.

In addition we have the normal attrition caused by fire and obsolescence, as well as relocation made necessary by the construction of such essential facilities as schools, police and fire stations, hospitals, public works and other community facilities.

The housing programs arise directly from the insistent demands by our citizens and the Department of Housing and Urban Development that slums be eliminated and housing standards be strictly enforced. But, as essential as these programs are—and they must be carried on—they, nevertheless, contribute directly to a reduction in the housing supply.

Frankly, the cities are caught in a dilemma. Our citizens and the Federal Agencies rightly demand we tear down every substandard home. At the same time, the same Federal Agencies say we cannot tear down bad buildings until we relocate the tenants in standard housing. Meanwhile, they say they cannot tear down bad buildings until we relocate the tenants in standard housing. Meanwhile, they say they cannot provide the resources to build relocation housing or new housing. This situation has been further aggravated by an intolerable tight credit situation.

Let us face facts. To demand that cities improve housing while denying them the resources to supply new housing is a basic contradiction—and places the cities in an untenable situation.

The city of Chicago, like many other cities, has taken advantage of every possible program to increase the supply of housing, especially for the low and moderate income groups. The Chicago Housing Authority now has almost 38,000 public housing apartments and they are all occupied. By the end of 1970, the CHA will have completed construction of almost 2,500 more apartments and homes.

Recently the city obtained from the Federal Government authority to build three thousand more units—1500 for families and 1500 for elderly citizens.

May I point that in 1969 alone, more than 1,000 new units were made available, and of these, 58% were three, four and five bedroom apartments to meet the needs of large families. Under our new policy, all public housing homes are built on scattered lots and are three stories or less in height.

At the present time there are 7,000 families and 12,000 elderly citizens on the waiting list.

We sought and were granted in 1969 eight hundred additional units for our leased housing program which uses the private housing market. At the present time the CHA has more than 2,100 leased units in private housing. Shortly we will have 400 more leased units—for a total of 2,500.

The Chicago dwellings association, which I mentioned before, has an intensive rehabilitation program on the west side. More than one thousand dwelling units are under contract now to be modernized. Many of these units are in abandoned buildings and so we are adding to the housing supply.

In its efforts to supply housing for low- and moderate-income families, the city made a major breakthrough when an agreement was reached with the Chicago building trades, industry, and the Government for the construction of modular or prefabricated homes. We built more than 200 three- and four-bedroom modular homes. For example, a three bedroom modular townhouse, including stove and refrigerator, offering comparable facilities to those of a conventionally constructed home and approved by the building code, building trade and FHA, was sold for \$15,000 excluding land cost. These were not subsidized homes but were built by private contractors, constructed and assembled by building trade members at Union wages. As a result of our experiences, we are now launching a program which we hope will see the construction of hundreds more of these homes.

In another breakthrough in the construction industry, we have seen negotiations involving the building trades union, contractors, members of minority groups, and the city resulting in agreement which will open the doors of opportunity for minority workers in the building trades. This was a voluntary agreement. It promises great hope for the future.

The Department of Urban Renewal, over the past decade, has provided and cleared sites for 7,833 homes and apartments. Most of these were for moderate and low income families.

In 1970 we anticipate construction starts on 6,000 homes and apartments for low and moderate income families in fifteen urban renewal project areas. Final planning for these areas and arrangements for land disposition procedures will be completed by the end of the year. Of course, much depends on the availability of mortgage money to developers and to home buyers.

I have not included in this recitation the thousands of apartments and homes built by private developers for middle and high income families.

The fact is that despite all our efforts, we were unable to meet our housing needs even before the recent Federal tight money policy.

The sharp increase in interest rates has served to aggravate the housing shortage. Under present conditions, money must be made available if we are to meet our current needs—let alone reach our national housing goal.

I am in full agreement with your chairman when he states: "Among the things which are obviously needed is the channeling of large blocks of funds into housing from the sources which until now have remained relatively untapped."

H.R. 15402 will require private pension funds to invest in federally-insured or guaranteed mortgages on low or moderate income housing in both urban and rural areas. It also will make available the assets of the Federal Reserve for the purchase of residential mortgages, especially mortgages for low and moderate income families.

The bill will do much to meet the imperative need for adequate financing essential to increase the supply of new housing. This is a priority of the highest order and it follows that those who need housing desperately should not be made the victims of anti-inflationary policies. I strongly urge the passage of the bill which will make mandatory the use of pension funds as an investment in the welfare and well-being of our citizens.

What is also needed urgently is an increase in Federal assistance for all the programs directed toward filling the housing needs of our low income families. Congress has heard of these needs from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the Urban Coalition and other groups vitally interested in the rebuilding of our cities.

There are many new programs which can be launched but they too are dependent upon a policy which seeks to encourage and stimulate housing. I would like to mention a few.

Since most of the Nation's major cities desperately need to augment their housing inventories, especially for low- and moderate-income families, and have virtually no vacant land on which to build, some new program approaches are needed to provide the land or space required.

One possibility would be to assist and encourage cities to make residential use of land in space now being occupied by obsolete, abandoned, and uneconomic industrial and commercial uses, which may not be located in blighted areas. For example, almost every city of any size in the Nation, has large open land areas which contain railroad yards and rail storage facilities which are obsolete and uneconomic. The uses of such railroad rights-of-way for new housing offer an immediate opportunity of increasing the supply of decent shelter in many of the existing inner-city neighborhoods with little or no displacement of residents. Existing law should be changed or new laws enacted which would provide grants to study the potential of alternative uses of existing railroad property. Also a new program should authorize acquisition of railroad rights-of-way by cities for residential use and provide a subsidy so that the land may be used for housing.

Another possibility is the use of air rights developments over expressways, railroads and in some instances, waterways, which cut through many of the nation's inner-city neighborhoods. The utilization of platforms over such rights-of-way could substantially expand the supply of housing without the upheaval caused by relocation.

Federal grants should be provided to local governments to cover the cost of preparation of air rights sites, design and construction of foundations, platforms and other facilities. Considerable progress has been made in eliminating the pollution problem accompanying the use of air rights over expressways. Federal grants should be provided to expedite this research because of its great potential.

Throughout city neighborhoods are strips of land, some times vacant or occupied by obsolete factories or loft buildings, junk yards and lumber yards. More often than not areas of this kind cannot qualify under the general eligibility standards set forth under the renewal program. A new and improved redevelopment program could make considerable amounts of desperately needed housing available with an absolute minimum of relocation. Further, such redevelopment pro-

grams would serve to eliminate a blighting element in many of our city neighborhoods.

While conventional wisdom dictates that we accept as sacrosanct existing parks and open space, there is no question that needs and conditions have changed and are changing. Certainly we should not reduce—we should add to the supply of park and open space land, especially in our major metropolitan areas, but the way such land is currently being used is open to serious question. The possibility of using existing parks and open space for residential or institutional purposes in cases where equal amounts or more can be subsequently cleared or made available in trade should be explored in detail. Federal funds should be available to test the feasibility of such land trades including the development of appropriated legal safeguards to guarantee adequate replacement.

There is no question that these kinds of programs call for great outlays of money and to some could be considered as contributing to inflation. But there can be no priority that is more important than to give every family an opportunity to live in a decent home. The existence of any slum in a society of affluence is intolerable.

One of the basic issues confronting the Congress is the problem of who has responsibility for the poor, the elderly, the unskilled and the sick. If Congress only provides funds for their needs in the city alone, then it follows that the populations of cities will consist mainly of the poor, the elderly, the unskilled and the sick. Just as Congress has responsibility for all citizens, so all of us, wherever we may live, have responsibility to meet the needs of our citizens and the metropolitan area—the suburbs—must do their share in assuming this responsibility.

Further, Federal aid should be given to the city not only for the low and moderate income families but to make housing available for middle class families, so that we may have a genuine social and economic balance.

In our present urban society we are interdependent upon each other. No community is isolated from the blight of another community. Some may think they are not affected by the urgent needs of a neighborhood located miles from them but they are directly affected. Crime, disease, and pollution know no boundary lines and certainly a good home in a good environment is essential if we are to rid ourselves of the ills of our society and improve the quality of life for our citizens.

There must be made available the financial resources to make these things possible and certainly one of the first steps we should take is to pass the proposed bill which would use pension funds to achieve our housing goals.

#### TB FOUND AMONG RESTAURANT WORKERS ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call something to the attention of this House that I think the Members should be extremely interested in, especially the leadership and the members of the House Restaurant Committee on the House Restaurant.

I have in my hand a wire service story entitled "TB on the Hill." It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Two Senate restaurant workers have died from tuberculosis and an-

other four active cases have been found among those workers inside the building in the last six months, a D.C. health officer said today.

As a result, Dr. Vedat Oner, acting head of the TB control division here, said skin tests are being conducted in the Capitol Building. Oner said 296 people have been given the tests, and another 100 or 200 more will be tested tomorrow.

The results have not been developed, Oner said. Also, he said a decision has not been made whether to perform the tests on the 14,000 people in the capitol area.

The two people who died both worked in the Senate restaurant, one as a waitress and the other a laborer in the restaurant's storeroom.

Of the four active cases being treated in hospitals, one was a wire service reporter, one a Senate kitchen worker, and the two other employees of the House and Senate sergeant at arms offices.

Oner said he did not know whether House members or Senators were being given tests.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter and should not be taken lightly.

The leadership of the House should look into the matter immediately.

#### INTERNATIONAL AVIATION POLICY

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 the Steering Committee appointed by the President to review international aviation policy and to recommend changes for the decade of the 1970's issued its statement on this crucial subject.

The statement in my judgment—and I believe you will agree—embodies the basic theme of protection for our U.S. air consumers. It recommends continuance of our low-cost transportation system by endorsing what the Congress has heretofore recommended, and that is the maintenance of all air carriers as a vital part of our air transportation system. In addition, it recommends that the United States follow a policy of insuring that its carriers, vis-a-vis foreign carriers, receive reasonable assurance of fair operating conditions and a fair and equal opportunity to compete in world aviation markets. It cautions our foreign friends that if they impose restrictions we in turn must use constraints. Hopefully, however, this may not be necessary. All in all, Mr. Speaker, I find the document to be a very forthright expression of U.S. intent of U.S. policy which should go a long way toward clarifying any question that may have existed concerning the rights of the consumer to low-cost travel and the rights of our various segments of the industry to their continued right to compete and operate in their respective areas.

Mr. Cherington and the members of the Steering Committee are to be congratulated for a job well done and I call their statement to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that they might review it and keep the recommendations in mind when we are considering legislation pertaining to our vital aviation industry.

#### ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 497) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 497

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, February 10, 1970, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, February 16, 1970.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 10]

Abernethy	Flynt	Mollohan
Addabbo	Frey	Monagan
Alexander	Fuqua	Moorhead
Anderson, Ill.	Gallifanakis	Moss
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Nix
Baring	Garmatz	O'Konski
Barrett	Glaimo	Ottinger
Blatnik	Goldwater	Pepper
Boland	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Brasco	Harrington	Pickle
Bray	Harsha	Powell
Brooks	Harvey	Price, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Quill
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Rees
Cabell	Hollifield	Reid, N.Y.
Camp	Hosmer	Rhodes
Carey	Howard	Riegle
Celler	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Jonas	Rosenthal
Clark	Karth	Rostenkowski
Collier	Kazen	Roudebush
Colmer	Kee	Scheuer
Conyers	Kirwan	Steed
Corman	Kluczynski	Stratton
Crane	Landgrebe	Taft
Culver	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Long, Md.	Tunney
Davis, Wis.	Lujan	Utt
Dawson	Lukens	Waggonner
Dent	McDade	Walde
Eilberg	McDonald,	Watkins
Evins, Tenn.	Mich.	Winn
Fascell	Mayne	Wright
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Flowers	Mills	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### DAVID P. THOMAS, ABLE CAREER FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RETIRES

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an able career Federal employee, David Duval Thomas, with

over 30 years' experience in regulating our Nation's air traffic, who is retiring this month. Dave Thomas, as he is affectionately known by Congressmen and Senators, by thousands of coworkers in the Federal Government, and by the aviation world, rose from an air traffic controller in 1938 to Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in 1965. In fact, he served as Acting Administrator from August 1, 1968, following the resignation of Gen. W. F. McGee, until John H. Shaffer was sworn in as the new Administrator on March 24, 1969. Dave Thomas certainly revealed his dedication to the Government and to the Agency by staying with the new administration until the transition could be accomplished.

Indicative of Mr. Thomas' dedication to duty and capabilities he has been the recipient of many awards.

In 1963 he was awarded the Laura Taber Barbour Award for Air Safety. The award cited Thomas, as "one of the outstanding experts in this country, if not in the world, on the management of air traffic control."

Two months later in a White House ceremony, he received the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, which is given for exceptional achievement in advancing important domestic and international programs.

In December 1966, he received Princeton University's 1966 Rockefeller Public Service Award in the field of general welfare or national resources. He was cited for his services affecting the general welfare and the benefits realized individually by the public and collectively by the Nation, from a healthy, expanding air transportation system and also for his efficient management of the Nation's airspace.

On April 21, 1967, he received the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League which recognized Thomas as the leading authority in the highly specialized technical aviation field of air traffic control.

After a number of field assignments, in air traffic control work, beginning in 1938, Mr. Thomas was transferred to Washington in January 1946 to serve as Assistant Chief of the Airways Traffic Control Section in the CAA. In June of the same year he became deputy international services officer, holding this position for 3½ years before taking the post of planning officer of CAA. In October 1953, Thomas was made Acting Chief of the planning staff, and less than a year later he was appointed Deputy Director of CAA's Office of Federal Airways.

In July 1956, he was promoted to the position of Director, Office of Air Traffic Control. He headed FAA's Air Traffic Service when this agency was formed in 1958.

In 1963 he was named Associate Administrator for Programs with responsibility in Washington headquarters for planning and coordinating the operating programs of the Air Traffic, Flight Standards, Airports, and Systems Maintenance Services. He held this position until his appointment as Deputy Administrator 2 years later.

Mr. Thomas is a native of Texas and

attended the school of mechanical engineering at the University of Tennessee and the school of business administration at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. He is a member of the Institute of Aerospace Sciences, and other aeronautical organizations.

Mr. Thomas is married to the former Dorothy Clark of Murfreesboro, Tenn. They have two children: a daughter, Mrs. David Robson, and a son, David Clark.

I am sure my colleagues, his many friends on the Hill, join me in wishing Dave Thomas and his lovely wife, Dorothy, a happy and healthy retirement.

The Federal Government is losing an able administrator, a topflight aeronautical expert, and a very human, honorable man.

#### THE TUBERCULOSIS SITUATION ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable said in the press and rumors fanned amongst you about the tuberculosis situation on Capitol Hill. I have been consulted about this. I know that our Capitol Physician has consulted with the best U.S. Public Health Service authorities in the United States and in the District of Columbia, and I would plead with you to act rationally but calmly on this situation.

To gainsay the fact that we do have cases of tuberculosis occurring on the Hill, and that some of them have been in places to which we are all exposed, would be foolhardy, this is true; but, I can assure you that everything is being done to protect your interests and those of your staff and your family, and all that might or might not have been in contact with these unfortunate people.

Perhaps it is sad, and something that should be corrected, that the District of Columbia does not have per se, a food handler's law. This too is being worked on. But of more particular interest to you immediately is that on our return from the Lincoln Day recess there will be established here in this building, or immediately available to all Members and their staffs, a screening process for the entire Capitol Hill complex of some 14,000 to 15,000 people that might wish to be surveyed.

I would strongly recommend that we all take advantage of this opportunity, and urge our staff to do so also. One of the finest interpreters of X-rays and chest examinations is being brought here by the Public Health Service from California, in cooperation with the District of Columbia so that simultaneously we can obtain the tuberculin test, and the chest X-rays.

Other facilities for heading off any little outbreak will be available, and these activities will commence on the 16th of February.

Now, of course, in the meantime it would be very prudent for anyone who has been unusually close to these unfortunate cases or otherwise feel they may be exposed, to visit their own physi-

cian or a clinic, or if you will go to the Capitol Physician's office priorities will be established for those who are more worried, or have perhaps had more exposure, a cough, or an unexplained weight loss, to be taken care of first.

This is a screening process. Fortunately, there are available in this decade prophylactic measures where, with a carefully regulated calendar and taking the pill INH—not related to the other pill of fame in the other body—we can prevent tuberculosis breaking out as an infectious disease in those who have been exposed or those who have suspicious signs in the screening process. Those who are unfortunate enough to contract the infectious disease can, of course, go ahead with the dual treatment under proper supervision. The way to detect it is by early diagnosis, and we urge you to come, and we urge you to participate in this processing, and we urge you to tell your respective staffs to do so.

There is no need for fanning rumors or expanding the severity of this unfortunate circumstance. It will be controlled. It is being correctly and properly handled by proper authorities and we can be thankful for them and our new Committee on Food Service in the House, chaired by the most knowledgeable and experienced JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, of Chicago.

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

(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, it was with considerable concern that I read the press dispatches this morning of what is in my judgment an unwarranted and certainly uncalled-for attack upon one of the brave members of our armed services who for 5 years was a prisoner of the Vietcong in Vietnam.

I refer to Maj. James Rowe and to the criticism leveled at him by the junior Member of the other body from South Dakota during hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday.

The junior Member from South Dakota has taken issue with Major Rowe because of the major's reports of the adverse impact upon American prisoners of war that has resulted from speeches of dissent such as those made by some Members of the other body and by dissident minorities objecting to our conduct of the war.

Certainly it is within his right to talk all he wants to about the war in Vietnam and whether or not he thinks it is being conducted correctly, or whether we should abandon the South Vietnamese, or whatever course he may wish to recommend.

By the same token, it is the right of persons like Major Rowe, who are in a position to know, to warn the country of the effect which some of this dissent has on the morale and treatment of our men in Vietnam. Very responsible persons, in addition to Major Rowe, have sounded similar warnings. Tomorrow I shall present proof of this upon the enemy.

Surely, the junior Member from South

Dakota would not embrace a concept of free speech which permitted him to voice his criticism, but which denied Major Rowe or any one else the right to analyze, evaluate, and criticize the Senator's statements. Freedom of speech must apply to both, equally.

The junior Member's comments strike me as simply another attempt to muzzle the responsible and authoritative voices who honestly and factually report the end result upon the enemy and upon our own men held as prisoners and those speeches of dissent which over the years have heaped criticism upon our national leaders but hardly ever find anything to criticize when it comes to discussing the motives and actions of the Vietcong.

The junior Member from South Dakota has staked out a position on this war which is a highly controversial one. That is his privilege and it in no way reflects on his patriotism or loyalty. It is a position, however, which if pursued as a national policy could have far-reaching, and many of us think disastrous, consequences for the country. Thus his views and their affect on the course of the war are fair game for criticism and evaluation.

That is the thrust of Major Rowe's speeches—not whether the Members of the other body are loyal or disloyal. This brave American has a right to speak and he has a right to question the effect of Members' speeches. I would suggest that he even has a right to question rhetorically the Members' motives, although I myself would not do so.

#### POSTPONEMENT OF H.R. 12025, NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Speaker.

Is it correct that the handling of the rule and the legislation which was programmed for today have been postponed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is the understanding of the Chair that the bill is not going to be called up today.

Mr. MARTIN. Neither the rule nor the bill?

The SPEAKER. Neither the rule nor the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) if that is not the situation.

Mr. SISK. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is correct; both the rule and the consideration of the bill have been postponed.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ALDO B. BECKMAN

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day that one of the truly capable reporters who covers the House of Rep-

resentatives for the Chicago Tribune will be spending here on the Hill.

His talent, ability, and dedication have earned him a new assignment. Hereafter, he will be covering the White House for the Tribune—a responsibility that he has consistently proved capable of assuming.

I would like to wish him a happy journey on his new assignment and I am sure I speak for many Members of this House—particularly those from the Midwest—who have read his stories reporting the day-to-day activities in this Chamber to the vast number of people who subscribe to the Chicago Tribune.

Aldo Beckman has been representing the Chicago Tribune in the Press Gallery. His stories about the House have revealed a new dimension of understanding of the complex nature of our work in this Chamber.

Very often bills that come before us are intricate, finely crafted, and very complicated. The amendments to those bills can be—and often are—even more complicated. The debate itself takes on various complexities and it is no easy task for a reporter to translate the essence of debate on a complicated issue when he is fighting against a deadline.

I know Aldo Beckman has earned the respect of his colleagues of the fourth estate and, certainly, he has earned the respect of the Members of this House. His integrity is unquestioned among the day-to-day historians who cover Capitol Hill, his intellect, insight, and outright writing skills are second to none.

Whoever replaces Aldo Beckman in covering the House of Representatives for the Chicago Tribune will have a large shadow to measure himself against, for Aldo has given this difficult assignment a new measure of responsibility. He has helped to elevate the standards of journalism in this Chamber and we, and all those we represent, are indebted to him. I am sure I speak for my colleagues in Chicago in wishing him success in his new White House assignment. We are going to miss him here on Capitol Hill.

#### PERHAPS ISRAEL WILL CAPTURE A MIG-23 AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I note in the press reports that Russia has threatened that unless the Israelis stop their responding to Egyptian attacks with reprisal attacks on Egypt, they are going to send their latest supersonic Mig-23 aircraft to the Egyptians.

This might be interesting because, as I recall, the first time the West had an opportunity to see the supersonic Mig-21 aircraft was when the Israelis captured it.

I also recall that the first time the West had an opportunity to see the SAM missile intact was when the Israelis captured the whole complex intact from the Egyptians.

Mr. Speaker, I also recall that the latest superduper Russian tank, their

heavy tank, was captured by an Israel commando raid in Egypt. They brought one or two of those back to Israel, and that was the first time the West had had an opportunity to see that tank.

Then I recall press reports that a Russian radar station, a 9-ton unit, was captured in Egypt and dismantled by an Israel commando team and brought back into Israel, where the Western experts could look at it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, remembering the manner in which the Israelis got those five ships out of France, it may well be that the Russian Mig-23 aircraft bound for Egypt will end up in Israel.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The program will be announced after the special orders.

#### FULL FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the housing problem in this Nation has reached a crisis stage. Neither enough new housing is being built, nor is there now sufficient decent housing for our expanding population. This crisis exists despite passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—Public Law 90-448—which proposed a goal for the next decade of constructing and rehabilitating 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families. The 1968 act stated:

The Congress affirms the national goal, as set forth in section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949, of a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

The Congress finds that this goal has not been fully realized for many of the Nation's lower income families; that this is a matter of grave national concern; and that there exist in the public and private sectors of the economy the resources and capabilities necessary to full realization of this goal.

I am today introducing, with 23 cosponsors, H.R. 15729, which is identical to H.R. 15643, which I introduced on January 29, to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, rent supplement, and low-income homeownership and rental housing assistance programs for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, including jobs in housing.

The following Members of Congress have joined me in cosponsoring this urgently needed supplemental appropriations bill:

JOSEPH P. ADDABO of New York.  
 JONATHAN B. BINGHAM of New York.  
 GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California.  
 DANIEL E. BUTTON of New York.  
 JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan.  
 CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan.  
 DON EDWARDS of California.  
 DONALD M. FRASER of Minnesota.  
 JACOB H. GILBERT of New York.  
 SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York.  
 AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS of California.  
 HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey.

EDWARD I. KOCH of New York.  
 SPARK M. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii.  
 WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.  
 ARNOLD OLSON of Montana.  
 THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER of New York.  
 BERTRAM L. PODELL of New York.  
 OGDEN R. REID of New York.  
 BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL of New York.  
 JAMES H. SCHEUER of New York.  
 JOHN V. TUNNEY of California.

Passage of H.R. 15729 is essential. The Federal Government has already fallen behind in meeting the commitment which the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act made. But the matter is not simply one of living up to past commitments; the real issue is recognizing the multiple beneficial ends which the Federal housing program serves, and acknowledging that these ends must be served to the fullest capacity.

H.R. 15729 provides an additional \$400 million for urban renewal programs, which in the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 1970—Public Law 91-126—received only \$250 million. This added amount will bring the appropriation up to the authorization level.

Today's urban renewal program was begun with the Housing Act of 1949—Public Law 81-171—which announced the goal reaffirmed by the 1968 act—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Basically, urban renewal involves locally conceived and administered programs of slum clearance and blight abatement. These programs aim at specific areas of cities. The Federal Government assists with grants, loans, and technical aid.

H.R. 15729 provides an additional \$425,000,000 for the model cities program, which was begun with title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966—Public Law 89-754. This added amount will bring funding up from the \$575,000,000 already appropriated for fiscal year 1970 to the \$1,000,000,000 authorization level.

The model cities program aims at rehabilitating the entire fabric of the areas involved. Grants are made, and technical assistance is provided, to cities to carry out comprehensive programs attacking social, economic, and physical problems of blighted neighborhoods in selected localities. Grants may be made for planning and developing programs, for administering the approved programs, and for the costs of projects and activities included in the approved programs.

As of January 1, 1970, according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 58 of the 150 cities participating in the model cities program have completed the planning phase and have received supplemental grant contracts from HUD. These grants are enabling the cities to implement first-year plans developed under comprehensive 5-year plans. The other cities are still in the process of developing plans, or are awaiting HUD approval.

The 58 supplemental grantees are listed below, as well as the total 150 cities

participating in the program. As should be well noted, 45 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, have within their boundaries such cities.

I include the following tables:

#### MODEL CITIES SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS

City	Amount of Contract	Date Announced
Alabama: Huntsville	\$1,969,000	May 29, 1969
Arkansas: Texarkana	1,899,000	June 30, 1969
California:		
Fresno	2,818,000	Oct. 3, 1969
Richmond	1,820,000	June 19, 1969
Colorado:		
Denver	5,766,000	June 26, 1969
Trinidad	1,225,000	Do.
Florida:		
Dade County	9,616,000	Sept. 29, 1969
Tampa	4,086,000	June 26, 1969
Georgia:		
Atlanta	7,175,000	May 10, 1969
Gainesville	1,330,000	Oct. 15, 1969
Hawaii:		
Honolulu	2,263,000	June 27, 1969
Honolulu (inc.)	4,378,000	Dec. 18, 1969
Illinois:		
Chicago	38,159,000	June 26, 1969
East St. Louis	2,083,000	June 30, 1969
Indiana: Gary	2,669,000	Oct. 3, 1969
Iowa: Des Moines	2,065,000	Oct. 13, 1969
Kansas: Wichita	3,955,000	Sept. 24, 1969
Kentucky:		
Pikeville	691,000	Oct. 15, 1969
Bowling Green	551,000	Dec. 31, 1969
Maine: Portland	1,826,000	June 11, 1969
Maryland: Baltimore	10,554,000	June 26, 1969
Massachusetts:		
Boston	7,718,000	June 27, 1969
Cambridge	1,523,000	June 26, 1969
Lowell	1,750,000	Dec. 19, 1969
New Bedford	2,109,000	Nov. 14, 1969
Worcester	2,125,000	Dec. 31, 1969
Michigan:		
Genesee County (Flint)	3,574,000	Oct. 15, 1969
Highland Park	1,724,000	June 11, 1969
Detroit	20,545,000	May 28, 1969
Minnesota: Duluth	1,680,000	Oct. 16, 1969
Missouri:		
Kansas City	8,706,000	Sept. 11, 1969
St. Louis	5,183,000	June 30, 1969
Montana:		
Butte	1,656,000	June 19, 1969
Helena	1,211,000	June 30, 1969
New Hampshire: Manchester	1,645,000	Dec. 18, 1969
New Jersey: Trenton	1,768,000	Oct. 3, 1969
New Mexico: Albuquerque	2,826,000	Aug. 13, 1969
New York: New York City	65,000,000	June 11, 1969
North Carolina:		
Charlotte	3,168,000	May 29, 1969
Winston Salem	1,895,000	Oct. 3, 1969
Ohio:		
Columbus	5,906,000	Oct. 3, 1969
Dayton	2,949,000	June 11, 1969
Toledo	4,410,000	June 26, 1969
Oklahoma:		
Tulsa	3,553,000	June 27, 1969
McAlester	1,183,000	Dec. 17, 1969
Oregon: Portland	1,282,000	June 30, 1969
Pennsylvania:		
Philadelphia	3,296,000	June 30, 1969
Reading	1,383,000	June 11, 1969
Pittsburgh	6,108,000	Dec. 31, 1969
Puerto Rico: San Juan	7,114,000	Sept. 11, 1969
Rhode Island: Providence	2,205,000	June 11, 1969
Tennessee: Smithville-DeKalb County	1,435,000	May 29, 1969
Texas:		
Eagle Pass	1,776,000	June 18, 1969
San Antonio	9,590,000	Do.
Texarkana	1,558,000	June 30, 1969
Texarkana (inc.)	499,000	Aug. 4, 1969
Waco	2,642,000	May 10, 1969
Vermont: Winooski	788,000	June 26, 1969
Virginia: Norfolk	4,524,000	Aug. 13, 1969
Washington: Seattle	5,200,000	May 10, 1969

#### THE 150 CITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

(U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development)

##### FIRST ROUND PLANNING GRANTS, SPRING 1968

Alabama: Huntsville.  
 Arkansas: Texarkana.  
 California: Fresno, Oakland, Richmond.  
 Colorado: Denver, Trinidad.  
 Connecticut: Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven.  
 District of Columbia.  
 Florida: Dade County, Tampa.  
 Georgia: Athens, Atlanta, Gainesville.  
 Hawaii: Honolulu.

Illinois: Chicago, East St. Louis.  
 Indiana: Gary.  
 Iowa: Des Moines.  
 Kansas: Wichita.  
 Kentucky: Bowling Green, Pikeville.  
 Maine: Portland.  
 Maryland: Baltimore.  
 Massachusetts: Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield, Worcester.  
 Michigan: Genesee County (Flint), Highland Park, Saginaw, Detroit.  
 Minnesota: Duluth, Minneapolis.  
 Missouri: Kansas City, St. Louis.  
 Montana: Butte, Helena.  
 New Hampshire: Manchester.  
 New Jersey: Hoboken, Newark, Trenton.  
 New Mexico: Albuquerque.  
 New York: Buffalo, Cohoes, New York City (Central and East Harlem, South Bronx, Central Brooklyn), Poughkeepsie, Rochester.  
 North Carolina: Charlotte, Winston-Salem.  
 Ohio: Columbus, Dayton, Toledo.  
 Oklahoma: McAlester, Tulsa.  
 Oregon: Portland.  
 Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Wilkes-Barre.  
 Puerto Rico: San Juan.  
 Rhode Island: Providence.  
 Tennessee: Nashville-Davidson County, Smithville-De Kalb County.  
 Texas: Eagle Pass, San Antonio, Texarkana, Waco.  
 Vermont: Winooski.  
 Virginia: Norfolk.  
 Washington: Seattle.

##### SECOND ROUND PLANNING GRANTS FALL 1968

Alabama: Tuskegee.  
 Alaska: Juneau.  
 Arizona: Gila River Indian Community, Tucson.  
 Arkansas: Little Rock, North Little Rock.  
 California: Berkeley, Compton, Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Pittsburg, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose.  
 Connecticut: New London, Waterbury.  
 Delaware: Wilmington.  
 Georgia: Alma, Savannah.  
 Idaho: Boise.  
 Illinois: Carbondale, Rock Island.  
 Indiana: Indianapolis, South Bend.  
 Kansas: Kansas City.  
 Kentucky: Covington, Danville.  
 Louisiana: New Orleans.  
 Maine: Lewiston.  
 Maryland: Prince Georges County.  
 Massachusetts: Fall River, Holyoke, Lynn.  
 Michigan: Ann Arbor, Benton Harbor, Grand Rapids, Lansing.  
 Minnesota: St. Paul.  
 New Jersey: Atlantic City, East Orange, Jersey City, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Plainfield.  
 New Mexico: Santa Fe.  
 New York: Binghamton, Mount Vernon, Syracuse.  
 North Carolina: Asheville, High Point.  
 North Dakota: Fargo.  
 Ohio: Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Martins Ferry, Youngstown.  
 Oklahoma: Lawton.  
 Pennsylvania: Allegheny County, Bradford, Erie, Lancaster.  
 Rhode Island: Pawtucket.  
 South Carolina: Rock Hill, Spartanburg.  
 Tennessee: Chattanooga, Cookeville.  
 Texas: Austin, Edinburg, Houston, Laredo.  
 Utah: Salt Lake County.  
 Virginia: Richmond.  
 Washington: Tacoma.  
 Wisconsin: Milwaukee.  
 Wyoming: Cheyenne.

H.R. 15729 also provides supplemental appropriations for the rent supplement program for fiscal year 1970. The rent supplement program was begun with title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-117. It is designed to make it possible for non-Government sponsors to house, with Fed-

eral assistance, low-income families. Under the program, the tenant pays 25 percent of his monthly income for rent. The Federal Government pays an amount equal to the difference between that 25 percent and the total monthly market rent.

The rent supplement program, if effectively and fully implemented, can achieve multiple beneficial results. The program encourages the construction of needed housing for low-income families. It brings private enterprise into the low-income housing field. And it achieves a measure of economic integration within individual projects—families of different incomes and ages can live together.

Despite its worthy aims, the rent supplement program has never received sufficient funding. The authorizations for rent supplement contracts have never been matched by the appropriations, as the following chart shows:

Fiscal Year:	[In millions]	
	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	\$30	\$12
1967	35	20
1968	40	10
1969	45	30
1970	40	50
Total	190	122

H.R. 15729 would appropriate \$68 million to bring the amount available for payments under rent supplement contracts up to the full authorized level. At a per unit annual cost of \$640, the amount estimated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this means an additional 106,250 units could be funded if my bill were passed.

H.R. 15729 also provides a supplemental appropriation for the section 235 homeownership for lower income families program. Under section 235, which was enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, the homeowner pays 20 percent of his income toward payment of his mortgage. But in no case can the payment exceed the difference between the required payment under the mortgage for principal, interest, and the mortgage insurance premium, and the payment that would be required for principal and interest if the mortgage bore an annual interest rate of 1 percent.

The following chart gives a picture of the average family for whom mortgages were written during the last quarter of 1969:

Average age of family head	32
Average size of family	5
Number of female heads	1 out of 4
Average gross annual income (not including income of minors)	\$5,647
Average total assets	\$290
Average unit sales price	\$15,029
Average mortgage amount	\$14,850
Average sales price—new house	\$15,582
Average sales price—existing house	\$13,879

The typical payment by the mortgagor was \$79, with a subsidy from the Department of Housing and Urban Development of \$54, making an average total mortgage payment of \$133. During the last quarter of 1969, approximately 57 percent of the houses mortgaged were from existing stock, and 43 percent were new houses.

The appropriation for contract au-

thority under section 235 contracts was increased by this Congress by \$90,000,000, which leaves a gap of \$40,000,000 below the full authorized level. H.R. 15729, would close this gap. Thereby, an additional 43,956 units could be funded, the estimated annual cost per unit as of February 2, 1970, being \$910, according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

H.R. 15729, would also increase the limitation on total payments that may be paid on contracts entered into under section 236 to the full authorized level. Section 236, enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, provides for assistance to lower income families for rental or cooperative housing, in the form of periodic payments to the mortgage on behalf of the mortgagor. These payments serve to reduce interest costs on a market rate project down to that which would have to be paid if the mortgage bore an interest rate of 1 percent. The tenant pays no more than 25 percent of his income per month for rent.

Last session, Congress increased the contract authority by \$85,000,000. This was \$45,000,000 less than the amount by which the contract authority should have been increased in order to reach the full authorization level, and H.R. 15729 closes this gap.

This additional \$45,000,000 will enable subsidizing 45,000 more units this fiscal year, the estimated annual per unit cost being \$1,000, according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

To appreciate how severe the need is for this additional contracting level, I would point to a report of the city of New York, released on January 28. This is but an example—the need is equally stringent through the country. The report stated:

New York City also needs a supplemental appropriation for low and moderate income housing. The Section 236 program is of prime importance to the City of New York. It is the basic vehicle we are now using to reduce housing costs for moderate income families. However, we are fast approaching a point where the lack of adequate funding will endanger our entire production schedule.

Whatever our successes in organizing sponsors, arranging sites, obtaining financial commitments and converting projects to 236, it may all be in vain unless we are guaranteed additional 236 funds. To proceed with our present production schedule we need approximately \$20 million in 236 money for the current fiscal year. Of this \$20 million, present indications are that only \$5 million of additional Federal funds will be available to New York City projects.

I would note that, because of the special urgency for section 236 funds, I have also introduced H.R. 15644, which provides supplemental contract authority for section 236, alone.

An obvious concomitant of expanded housing construction and rehabilitation to which we committed ourselves by the 1968 act is the resultant provision of jobs for construction workers. This is a crucial factor to be considered in assessing the need for an aggressive and active housing program, particularly insofar as jobs are made available to lower income workers, who are usually minority group

members. The importance of this job creation is recognized by section 404 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, Public Law 91-152, which provides:

Sec. 3. In the administration by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development of programs providing direct financial assistance in aid of housing, urban planning, development, redevelopment, or renewal, public or community facilities, and new community development, the Secretary shall—

(1) require, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, that to the greatest extent feasible opportunities for training and employment arising in connection with the planning and carrying out of any project assisted under any such program be given to lower income persons residing in the area of such project; and

(2) require, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that to the greatest extent feasible contracts for work to be performed in connection with any such project be awarded to business concerns, including but not limited to individuals or firms doing business in the field of planning, consulting, design, architecture, building construction, rehabilitation, maintenance, or repair, which are located in or owned in substantial part by persons residing in the area of such project.

Of course, the creation of jobs, and the continuation of present jobs, will not alleviate ipso facto the problem of discrimination against minority group members. The most recent available statistics show that Negroes make up only 8.4 percent of the close to 1.3 million members of the referral unions in the construction industry. And Spanish-surnamed Americans account for only 4.5 percent of the membership. Clearly, aggressive action by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance is essential to overcome this problem. The Philadelphia plan was one step. This approach must be expanded, and other avenues to overcome discrimination in employment by contractors on federally funded and federally assisted projects must be developed.

It is clear that the Federal housing programs should serve manifold purposes—insuring good new housing for lower income families, funding the rehabilitation of decaying housing and the renovation of neighborhoods, and providing essential job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the December 11, 1968, report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing reached what could only be described as a disturbing conclusion, and it proposed what could only be assessed as a necessary solution. The tragedy—and the fact which compels passage of the supplemental appropriation bill which I have today introduced, and in which 23 of my colleagues have joined me—is that the assessment made over a year ago by the committee is no less valid today. The report stated then what is true now:

We concluded that new and foreseeable technological breakthroughs in housing production will not themselves bring decent shelter within economic reach of the millions of house-poor families in the predictable future. To bridge the gap between the marketplace costs for standard housing and the price that lower-income families can afford to pay, appropriations of Federal subsidies are essential and must be substantially increased.

The time grows short, the need is becoming greater. We have not done enough. We must do more, and we must do it now.

#### THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL CARRIERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, upon the recommendation of a Special Subcommittee on the National Airlift, the Department of Defense vitalized the civil air reserve fleet—CRAF.

This civilian owned and operated fleet of modern aircraft serves as an airlift auxiliary to the Military Airlift Command in times of conflict or national emergency.

The CRAF program has been effective. Various airlines—scheduled, supplemental, and all cargo—have added to their fleets modern, long-range, jet aircraft, most of which are particularly suitable for flexible military response; that is, convertible for the transportation of either passengers or cargo.

This reserve capability has enabled the Military Establishment to fulfill its requirements and commitments without the necessity for the U.S. Government to spend substantial sums for acquiring and maintaining a fleet of such combined size in times of peace.

Certainly a major contribution to the CRAF program has been the supplemental carriers, both in number of new convertible aircraft acquired, and by the extent of their willingness and ability to furnish immediate emergency airlift without the necessity of a formal declaration of an emergency.

For example, during the Berlin crisis these carriers lifted 25 percent of the passengers and 57 percent of the cargo transported by civil carriers; during the Korean war they furnished 50 percent of the civil airlift; during the Cuban missile crisis they supplied 66 percent of the domestic emergency airlift. During 1969 these carriers supplied 24 percent of the overseas civil augmentation airlift, 100 percent of the domestic logistical supply airlift, and 68 percent of the domestic planeload charter requirements of the Army's Military Traffic and Terminal Service.

Last week this irreplaceable industry suffered a severe side blow that did irreparable damage to its public image and to the ability of some carriers to continue to effectively function.

On Friday, January 24, the Bureau of Enforcement, a department of the Civil Aeronautics Board, called a press conference, issued prepared press notes, and briefed the press on a complaint charging various charter violations against several U.S. supplemental carriers and two foreign carriers.

I am informed that this attention to the press, the extent and manner that they were informed of the complaint, incidentally prior to the carriers themselves being notified, was in marked departure from previous practices of the Board.

Whether by design or by misinterpretation, the press published erroneous reports of the complaint and its recommendations and consequences, conveying to the public the impression that the complaint was a finding of fact; that the suspension of the carriers' certificate was a fact, and not merely a recommendation if future compliance was not obtainable. The reaction was disastrously predictable—consternation among the carriers' stockholders, customers, suppliers, bankers, and employees. There seems little doubt that the named carriers have had their ability to carry on normal operations seriously impaired.

I now call upon the Civil Aeronautics Board and its Chairman to take such immediate steps as may be necessary to clarify to the public that the violations are only alleged, that the certificates of the carriers in question have not been suspended, nor can they be suspended without formal hearings on the alleged violations. The Civil Aeronautics Board is responsible for the development and promotion of air transportation. It certainly seems clear that they should now act promptly to correct the unfortunate impression that the press gained from the press conference on January 24.

To prove the serious effect of this unilateral action on the part of the Bureau of Enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I call attention to page 2103 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1970. Here is a classic example of conviction and sentencing without a trial.

On this page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find in print a conclusion that the supplemental carriers are in violation of the law, bringing about disastrous results to the scheduled airlines. The assumption is based solely on unproved allegations by the Bureau of Enforcement.

This is an example of what I am talking about when I say that the supplementals have been irreparably damaged by a type of bureaucracy that we should not tolerate in this Nation. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a concerted effort in certain parts of the airline industry, and perhaps in certain parts of this Government, to eliminate the supplemental carriers in order to fatten the pockets of the scheduled airlines.

Our committee will have more to say about this in the near future.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the very pertinent remarks of Mr. Edward J. Driscoll, president, National Air Carriers Association, delivered before the International Aviation Club, on January 22, 1970:

#### PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

(By Edward J. Driscoll, president, National Air Carrier Association, International Aviation Club, January 22, 1970)

I am very glad to have this opportunity to speak to you today because it gives me a chance to remind you of a phrase that seems to be disappearing from the vocabulary of the air transport industry—"Public convenience and necessity."

You can still hear it around certification hearings where public need must be proved before any type of service can be authorized. But once that is out of the way, public in-

terest often seems to get lost in the vast machinery of a cumbersome regulatory process.

Part of the problem, as explained in a recent speech by Assistant Transportation Secretary Paul W. Cherington, is that regulations and regulatory processes have not kept pace with a rapidly changing transportation system.

Calling for major reforms, Mr. Cherington said, "today's transportation system is massive and complex to the degree that it is simply not feasible to completely or comprehensively regulate it."

And, he went on, "The regulation which was originally designed to protect the public interest has itself been transformed so that today, in the view of many, it is overly concerned with carrier well-being, often to the exclusion of other *bona fide* interests of the public."

The present transportation regulatory system, he add, often fails to permit the full realization of the long-run benefits of open and free competition.

In air transport today, we are faced with a specific example of such a situation.

The U.S. supplemental airlines were granted ITC authority by Congress because, in the words of a Department of Transportation report, "They have provided a new degree of competitive endeavor which the scheduled airlines have been unwilling or unable to make, despite encouragement by the (Civil Aeronautics) Board."

But strangely, despite a fourfold increase for in-season transatlantic charter passengers—from 183,000 in 1963 to more than 700,000 in 1968—and despite the fact that the U.S. share of this market increased from 22 percent to 60 percent over the same period . . . the scheduled airlines do not recognize low-cost charter operations as being in the public interest.

They see the supplementals only as a threat to the fare-setting monopoly of IATA. And IATA's answer has been a declaration of war.

The supplementals account for 2 percent of the \$14.3 billion dollars of operating revenues for all airlines, worldwide. To hear the scheduled airlines tell it, that 2 percent is responsible for all their economic woes.

Now I have searched long and hard and I have to say that this is a unique situation in American business. In no other industry will you find such huge crocodile tears being shed by men who are grabbing off 98 cents of every customer dollar. The American people are compassionate and full of understanding. But they aren't stupid.

Despite the obvious lack of substance to IATA-based charges of passenger-diversion, the recent speech of SAS president Tore Nihlert, and the remarks made by Keith Granville of BOAC and Najeef Halaby of Pan Am at this same podium are clear evidence that U.S. and foreign carriers have banded together under the common cry: eliminate the supplementals.

This, and only this, is the reason for the sudden profusion of low-cost European vacations currently offered by the scheduled carriers. The mini-groups, the bulk fares, and the inclusive tour rates—all, by the way, far below fully allocated costs—are designed solely for the purpose of driving the supplementals from the airways.

And if you notice, the real bargain fares are available only if you are prepared to stay away from home for a period of 29 to 45 days. The strange logic behind this prompted one irate New York business man to ask the *New York Times* how it could "possibly benefit an airline directly or indirectly if a passenger stays abroad a long time rather than a short time."

The *Times* replied that "this was a deliberate attempt to recapture the charter flight market from the supplemental airlines."

What makes it even worse is that these

low rates are being subsidized at the expense of travelers such as this businessman—the individually-ticketed, short-stay passenger who should be the scheduled airlines' first concern.

What other explanation is there for the elimination of the five percent discount on overseas roundtrip fares? Particularly since it comes at a time when, according to our figures, IATA could have cut North Atlantic fares 20–25 percent.

As it now stands, more than three million first class and economy passengers will pay the scheduled airlines an extra \$35 million for their Transatlantic tickets during 1970.

What these three millions passengers do not know is that they've been hoodwinked into subsidizing the gimmick-laden promotional fares available under restrictive conditions to a small segment of the traveling public.

And, as I have said, the only purpose of these loss-leader fares is to divert passengers from the charter airlines.

Such practices hardly fulfill the aims laid out for the industry in Section 102 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958—namely the provision of QUOTE, adequate, economical, and efficient service . . . at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices, UNQUOTE.

The continuation of such practices can only mean trouble for the industry because, I submit, they demonstrate clearly that the air transport industry is still oblivious to what may be the most significant event of the 70's—the consumer movement.

Americans have grown impatient with industries and businesses that pay lip service to the consumer while palming off on him shoddy goods backed by false advertising claims and worthless warranties.

As a result, consumerism is on the rise in all aspects of American life. The voice of the consumer is heard in Congress and by those industries smart enough to be sensitive to the public mood. Truth in Packaging, Truth in Lending, automotive safety standards, meat inspection, drug efficacy, and other new developments, are a direct response to the demands of the people to know what they are paying for—and to be assured that they are getting a fair shake for their shrinking dollar.

The air transport industry and the appropriate agencies of government need to be sensitive to this development because the public mood that brought along Truth in Packaging will not long stand for the complex rate structure that came out of the recent IATA conference, with 31 different types of fares across the Atlantic. These fares and services, incidentally, involve the commingling of charter transportation and individually-ticketed service, which, as we understand the Act, is prohibited.

Truth in Packaging means that the shopper no longer needs a slide rule to determine the best buy at the supermarket. We think that's a break for the consumer. Therefore, the charter package is clearly labeled and priced on a pro-rated basis. Everybody pays the same. But under the new IATA agreement, you will need a computer to figure out the cheapest way to cross the Atlantic. Consumer advocates call that kind of thing "deceptive packaging" and we agree.

American businessmen are looking for ways to cut costs, and, as the letter to the *New York Times* shows, they are becoming less complacent about being taken for a ride by the scheduled airlines. I can assure you that the traveler who finds that his seatmate paid less for the same trip will become even more vocal in the 70's.

In the long run, consumers never benefit from destructive competition. They may gain a little in the short term, but eventually the low-cost competitor is usually driven from the scene and the "winner" once again

monopolizes the marketplace and returns to higher prices.

Obviously, it is not in the supplementals' interest to be driven from the marketplace and most certainly it is not in the public interest either.

I firmly believe that the supplemental airlines have earned their place in the national transportation structure. Since 1962 they have provided millions of low- and moderate-income Americans with their first opportunity to enjoy vacation travel by air. In addition they have made a significant contribution to the Nation's defense in the transportation of passengers and cargo. The rapid growth of the industry testifies that the need was there and that it had not been met by the scheduled airlines. It is noteworthy that numerous statements by CAB officials, the Departments of Transportation and of Defense, and in Congress attest to the fact that the charter airlines have earned the right to a "permanent place in the aviation community."

Unfortunately, that place is assured only in principle. A system that takes into account both scheduled airlines and charter airlines, is not yet a part of official U.S. air transport policy.

We are very pleased, of course, that the recent draft statement from the President's International Air Transport Policy Study group takes cognizance of the significant contribution the supplemental airlines have made to international air transportation and to the public interest.

The draft policy, which many of you have seen and which has been discussed in the Press, has some kind words to say about our industry. I think those words are well-deserved and timely.

While we may take issue with some areas of the policy statement, our overall impression is favorable. Our detailed comments should wait, we feel, until we can make them at the proper time and in the proper form. Meanwhile, we see this draft document and its favorable view of the contribution made by the charter carriers, as a positive first step toward what we all want—a rational, understandable, service-oriented international air policy for this country.

We hope for fast and positive action in this area because, as things stand now, the charter carriers have little ammunition for the fight against unfair and destructive competition.

The inherent slowness of our regulatory machinery means that, in too many cases, relief from unfair and destructive competition comes only after the damage has been done.

For example, as the scheduled airlines started to move in on the group tour business that the supplemental airlines developed in the Hawaiian market, competition got hotter and hotter, and GIT fares moved lower and lower—until the CAB had to step in and investigate.

A CAB hearing examiner found that many of these fares were not sufficient to cover the fully-allocated costs of the scheduled carriers involved.

The examiner handed down his decision on June 30, 1969. We are still awaiting the Board's final decision—although the charter carriers have been driven out of that particular market already because of destructive competition.

The Board is currently faced with a similar situation in regard to the bulk fares and large-group fares stemming from the recent Caracas meeting. Comments on these are due on the 26th of this month. We would hope that the Board, in light of its Hawaiian experience, coupled with the mammoth diversionary threat of the bulk and group-affinity fares, would re-examine its tentative position in order to prevent a similar situation from developing in the North Atlantic.

Needless to say, the supplementals were

gratified that the air policy statement included a specific reference to charter service rights in international landing and uplift agreements. We and the public have been waiting for this for a long time.

Currently, each charter carrier must negotiate landing and uplift rights for each flight with the government involved. Some countries do not permit any charter flights. Others have a strict quota. Others permit only certain types of charter flights.

Add to this the fact that state-owned IATA members are urging their governments to make it more difficult for U.S. charters to compete and you can see that we have quite a problem.

Tore Nihlert urged IATA members to enlist their governments as allies in the fight against the supplementals. Faced with this kind of noncompetition, U.S. supplemental airlines can only turn to their government for help. We believe that charter carriers are entitled to the same protection as the scheduled airlines, and that Americans who choose charter travel should receive the same degree of protection from their government as do individually-ticketed travelers.

Whether or not IATA and its member carriers are accountable under U.S. anti-trust laws is a question yet to be determined. We feel, however, that its activities and those of some of its members are counter to the spirit—if not the actual letter—of those very laws.

You may have read the review by Ralph Nader in the *Washington Post* of a new book, *The Air Net*, by Dr. Pillai. That book delineates, much more fully than I, the predatory practices of IATA and its future goals—one of which, he points out, is the elimination of the supplementals.

This must not be allowed to happen. But the supplementals themselves cannot prevent it. The only answer, as we see it, is official recognition that there are two classes of carriers—the scheduled airlines, specializing in individually-ticketed services, and the supplemental airlines, the charter specialists.

I was particularly pleased to note that the draft policy statement takes essentially the same view, because the development of an efficient, economical, worldwide air transport system is essential to the growing needs of our shrinking world.

But since this is a worldwide problem, I wonder whether a national policy statement can provide the whole answer. Is it reasonable to think that a policy statement by the United States government can bring us through the decade of the Seventies with new records of peace and success? I hope so. But we must make sure that this policy becomes an effective tool for international cooperation.

Will these ideas be understood and accepted by the foreign national and continental power blocs that form the IATA cartel?

Will the predatory actions of the IATA carriers against the supplemental airlines be stopped by more enlightened representatives of governments and industry overseas?

In a word, will all members of the air transport industry finally work together in the sound development of a strong, openly competitive international air system? Will we do this in the spirit of benefiting the consumer through improved fares and services?

The supplemental carriers hope the answer to these questions is a full-voiced "yes." We hope that this document, the draft of the President's Steering Committee, will signal the beginning of a new era of cooperation in the field of international air transportation, where the consumer will be the sovereign in the marketplace and the carriers will end the bickering and the in-fighting which has been characteristic of the past decade.

But let's be honest. Let us admit that wishing does not make it so. This is the real world—not Disneyland—and changes do not



occur overnight. We have to work at it together, we have to create the climate for fruitful discussion, and we have to build the forum in which the exchange of ideas can take place, leading to a new understanding of international air transport rights in this new decade of growth and opportunity.

How do we do this? One suggestion that the United States government might consider is a World Conference—or Convention—of the heads of aviation from all countries having a significant international air carrier operation. Such a conference could be called during 1970, while the decade is still new and the American statement of international air policy will be fresh in everyone's mind.

By calling such a conference, this country will demonstrate that it is ready to match deeds with words in the service of the world's travelers. I believe the calling of such a conference is a logical next step, following the refinement and publication of a U.S. International Air Policy. It is incumbent upon all carriers to work together to promote the new policy and the international spirit of free and open competition that will support it. Some of the objectives of such a world conference might include the following:

Elimination of all restrictive practices in the field of international air transport;

Acceptance of the principle that individually-ticketed service and charter service are in the public interest and both shall have equal access to world markets;

Broadening the base of air transportation in order to serve better the interests of the consumer, both traveler and shipper.

A few days ago, Vice President Agnew returned home after visiting the countries of Asia. His message was a message of a government that wants peace in the Pacific, in Asia, and throughout the world. Today we have heard the President of the United States describe the State of the Union, this Union of fifty States and five possessions in the middle of a world boiling with change.

I sincerely hope that our industry will demonstrate the type of leadership our President—and the world itself—needs at this time. I hope that we are on the threshold of the day when every traveler, from President to vacationing secretary, has a peaceful world to explore and enjoy. With a sound policy, a competitive marketplace, a respect for the consumer, and adherence to the concept of "public convenience and necessity" worldwide, we will surely see that day arrive.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL CARRIERS

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to associate myself with the remarks by the distinguished Gentleman from South Carolina.

It seems to me that these supplemental carriers have been treated badly which, while it may not have been the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Board Bureau of Enforcement, has resulted in the apparent public misconception that the carrier's charter permits have been suspended while, in actual fact, this determination is yet to be made by the Board. It well may be that the recommendation by the Bureau will be sustained, but it very well may be that the Board will reject the recommendation.

In the meantime, the public and the firms with which these carriers transact business erroneously have been led to believe that the revocation of these charters is a fact. This has caused the

air carriers involved a tremendous amount of inconvenience and threatened them with a tremendous and unjust financial loss.

It would seem to me that the carriers are fully justified and deserving in their request that the Civil Aeronautics Board issue a statement of clarification, and I urge that this be done immediately.

#### DEFENSE CUTS ENCOURAGE RECESSION

(Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in company with many of my colleagues, I am concerned that there are those who look upon the defense budget as a bottomless source of dollars for domestic spending. Present defense cuts do not show sufficient regard for the effect on the economy or on the Nation's security.

In the current fiscal year, the President's budget was reduced over \$5 billion by action of Congress. Coincidentally, this was approximately the amount of the reduction in the defense budget and it is obvious that there were no meaningful cuts elsewhere.

For the new fiscal year starting in July, the administration now proposes to cut the defense budget an additional \$5.2 billion while increasing other Federal outlays by \$8.6 billion. Again, defense is made to carry the brunt of the economy program. The projected level will place military expenditures at the lowest ratio of the Federal budget since the years immediately prior to the Korean war.

There is danger in this picture; danger to national security and danger to the economy. It would mean a drop of 551,000 military personnel and 130,000 civilian employees during the President's first 2 years in office. It is estimated that cutbacks in defense procurement will cause the loss of an additional 640,000 defense jobs across the Nation. This very substantial contribution to the ranks of the unemployed will have a definite bearing on the health of the national economy. The cutback in procurement of military hardware means that the serious gap in modernization which exists between our forces and those of the Communist world will increase rather than diminish. It means that Communist aggression will be further encouraged by this obvious retrenchment in the U.S. military preparedness program. It is a return to the peaks and valleys program which has been so costly in prior years and which leaves us ill prepared to cope with world problems.

It should be remembered that it is not the peace negotiations in Paris which have given a favorable turn to the war in Vietnam. It stems from the effective use of America's military strength combined with growing capability on the part of the Vietnamese, a capability which comes directly from American training and American weapons. The war is not over and the economy is becoming shaky. The military already has been cut deeply.

It is too early for further reductions to be made with safety. To establish a pattern of \$5 billion annual reductions would in another year or two destroy America's effectiveness as a world power.

#### CARSWELL NOMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANNUNZIO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Judiciary Committee has completed hearings on the nomination of G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court Bench. But the liberal members of that group are now trying to stall a final vote necessary to bring the nomination to the floor of the other body. They veritably admit the tactic is only to please certain special-interest groups that generally back liberal candidates. Their complete lack of regard for the rest of the country, which demands that the vacancy on the Supreme Court Bench be filled immediately, is inexcusable.

Judge Carswell has been proven to be a man of good standing, both as a member of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, the district court, and as a citizen of Florida. He recognizes that the duties of the Supreme Court are strictly to pass on the constitutionality of a law, not legislate new laws. Such strict interpretation of the duties of a Supreme Court Justice is desperately needed if the public faith in the Highest Court of the land is to be restored.

The Supreme Court, over the past few years, has been moving further and further away from the proper exercise of its constitutional duties. Rather than simply passing on the constitutionality of a law, some Justices of this Court have sought to create a new spirit of the law through judicial decision.

The Constitution of the United States clearly states:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Clement Haynsworth would have upheld the law of the land, but certain Members of the other body saw fit to prevent his being seated. Now, the name of Judge Carswell is before the other body. He, too, has pledged to uphold the law of the land. And such a person, with such a view, is badly needed on this Supreme Court. For reasons of justice and the integrity of the Supreme Court his name should be approved forthwith.

My only hope is that during the next 3 years President Nixon will be able to appoint several more men who will seek to return the Court to its proper position in our governmental process. More men like Chief Justice Burger and Judge Carswell should be sitting on the bench of the highest judicial authority of this country. If those disruptive justices now holding rein on that Court are permitted

to continue their wanton destruction of our governmental process through their usurpation of the legislative authority invested in Congress, this country truly will be ready for revolution. I may well be leading the vanguard.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE  
BURT L. TALCOTT

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, at the President's prayer breakfast this morning our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) made a very eloquent and moving address. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include the text of that address with these remarks.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST REMARKS BY  
CONGRESSMAN BURT L. TALCOTT, FEBRUARY  
5, 1970

Good morning Mr. President, my colleagues in government, and friends.

Earlier this morning some of us returned from a sad journey to California, where we helped to memorialize the life of our friend and colleague, Glen Lipscomb, and to share our loss with his family and friends from his home. But life goes on—this is a new day and I know Glen would want it to be a joyous one.

With personal humility, but great representative pride, I bring warm greetings from the House Prayer Group.

Some Americans would probably consider a hotel ballroom in Washington, on a Thursday morning, with no clergymen on the platform, and with a quorum of the House and Senate present, to be the least likely situation for a meeting at which prayer is the principal attraction.

For those I have a message that I invite you to convey to your associates in your home communities: Among your elected representatives there is a growing conviction that universal understanding, domestic tranquility and peace can be greatly advanced by a fellowship based upon a belief in God and sustained by prayer.

The most venerable of all traditions of the House of Representatives is that every daily session, from the first session in Philadelphia until today, has been opened with prayer.

Mr. President, we are especially grateful to you for your contribution, by personal example, to the spiritual renaissance so needed by our society today. Your presence here, your innovation of holding Sunday religious services in the East Room, and your prayer breakfast in the White House gave tremendous impetus to the concept of men meeting together on a spiritual basis.

The meetings of our House prayer group are informal, with minimal organization—there are no dues or "membership lists." Only members, and elected members of foreign Parliaments, attend our meetings. All discussions are "off the record"—this precedent enhances the candor of our discussions and the intimacy of our fellowship.

Capitol Hill is one of the most avidly political and keenly partisan places on Earth; but our group is strictly non-political and non-partisan.

Upstairs, on the House floor, we are fiercely adversary—disputation is the vogue; but downstairs at breakfast we are friends, the

mode is to listen, exchange ideas and to discuss points of view.

Our group does not profess any particular theology—there is little religiosity and no liturgical trappings; we are ecumenical—and we were, long before ecumenism became popular. Men of all religious persuasions attend our Thursday breakfasts. Ours is a simple fellowship of communication, of cancellation and concern.

Each of us is different—from widely different districts, with quite different backgrounds, training and religious experiences.

But, like mankind everywhere, it is essential that we retain a bond of friendship in spite of our extraordinary differences.

We open and close each meeting with prayer—some say "grace", some ask a "blessing", some give an "invocation" or "benediction". Sometimes we pray silently, each in his own way. But prayer is central to our meeting—it gives us a feeling of renewal, a spirit of unity with God, and a sense of oneness that is somehow above partisanship and politics—and somehow, almost mysteriously, inclusive of all our denominational, ethnic and national differences.

We Legislators deal with the future—the laws we enact are all prospective. So in our search for solutions, we are naturally attracted to the hope, the optimism, and the love of Christ.

We are living in a developing world, where people are continually changing and nothing is finished, but we find certitude in Christ, the eternal contemporary.

We believe that a network of private prayer meetings—whether at breakfast or lunch (or even without food)—whether in the Capitol, a church, an office or your home—whether you tackle hard political issues, difficult social concerns or nagging personal problems—is compatible with the teachings of Christ and the Kingdom of God.

If Members of the Congress—with all of our diversity and adversariness—can meet weekly in spiritual fellowship—certainly every other vocational group could do better.

So with our greetings this morning, the House Prayer Breakfast Group earnestly invites you to join and support the prayer group movement where you live or work. You will be promoting a growing, worldwide fellowship which we are convinced is the best hope for mutual understanding among men, tranquillity within communities, and Peace with Freedom among Nations.

NEW YORK CITY CONGRESSIONAL  
HEARING ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR  
POLLUTION

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 20 Congressmen joined me in holding an ad hoc hearing on automotive air pollution in New York City.

Testifying before the committee were auto industry critic and consumer spokesman, Ralph Nader, and the vice presidents of General Motors and Ford Motor Co. In addition, we also heard testimony from three experts on the effects of auto pollution on health and from a panel of experts on auto pollution technology.

The testimony we heard painted a stark picture of the future of our continent if radical steps were not taken to curb the level of air pollution our technology was spewing forth into the air. It revealed also the significant responsibility of the auto for this pollution; 60 percent of air pollution throughout the

country at large, and up to 92 percent in urban areas.

The most interesting and at the same time revealing aspect of the hearing was the marked disagreement between representatives of the auto industry and most of our expert witnesses.

The industry representatives saw the internal combustion engine as capable of achieving a reduction in air pollution to meet any possible standards. Members of our technological panel saw it as inherently dirty and limited in how far it could be cleaned up.

The industry representatives saw alternatives to the internal combustion engine as technologically and economically unfeasible. The technological panel saw alternatives as not only being technologically feasible within a few years but economically more desirable and even producing a more efficient engine.

Among the alternatives, Ford saw the steam engine as the least feasible. The members of the technological panel saw the steam engine as the most promising.

The industry thought it was expending a significant amount of its resources on the development of a clean engine. Many of the panelists saw the industry relegating the goal of clean air to a low priority and devoting only insignificant resources to it.

I believe the hearings were useful in exposing the public to information the auto industry has not been willing to publicize. Those in California have become familiar through years of hearings by the State legislature and the State resources board with the auto industry's credibility gap on issues of air pollution.

For many years the auto industry told California that development of a device to reduce auto emission standards was like trying to "find a cure for cancer." Only when the State finally passed a law requiring such devices and independent devices had been certified, did the industry finally admit that such devices were feasible. The entire history of the Justice Department suit against the auto industry suggests that such a credibility gap may well have been deliberate.

It appears to continue now that the dialog has switched from devices to reduce pollution to cleaner types of engines. It is interesting that when the bill to ban the internal combustion engine came before the California Assembly an industry spokesman testified:

The know-how isn't there to do the job by 1976. (Testimony of auto industry spokesman before California House Committee considering legislation to ban the internal combustion engine. (Los Angeles Times, August 1, 1969).)

But that after it was safely defeated, he had to admit it could have been met:

We would have complied, and of course . . . would have remained in the business of producing automobiles. (Statement of the same industry spokesman to a reporter's question after the California assembly had defeated legislation to ban the internal combustion engine (San Fernando Valley News, August 7, 1969).)

It is in this context that the best understanding of automotive pollution can be achieved.

Some of the cosponsors of this hearing will shortly be putting out a report based on the hearing. They will make a number of broad-based recommendations.

In the coming weeks, I am planning to establish a national citizen's lobby on air pollution to fight for clean air.

The text of the hearing transcript follows, with the remarks of General Motors revised by them:

#### HEARING ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

(Held on December 8, 1969, New York, N.Y., before Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Chairman; Hon. BERTRAM L. PODELL; Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM; Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH; Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN; and Hon. BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL)

#### LISTING OF SPEAKERS

Hon. Leonard Farbstein, chairman.  
Mr. Ralph Nader.  
Hon. William F. Ryan.  
Hon. Edward I. Koch.  
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.  
Hon. Bertram L. Podell.  
Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham.  
Dr. Paul Chenea, Vice President in charge of Research, General Motors Corporation.  
Dr. Stephen M. Ayres, Department of Medicine, New York University Medical Center.  
William Cruce, Scientist Committee on Public Information.  
Austin Heller, Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, New York City.  
Dr. Richard Morse, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.  
Dr. Robert O. Ayres, International Research and Technology Corp.  
Dr. Wolfgang E. Meyer, Transportation and Safety Center, Pennsylvania State University.  
Mr. S. Smith Griswold, President, Seversky Environmental Dynamic Research Association.  
Mr. Herbert L. Misch, Vice President for Engineering, Ford Motor Company.  
Mr. Donald Jensen, Director, Automotive Emissions, Ford Motor Company.  
George C. Mantzoros, Assistant Attorney General for Anti-Monopolies, Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York.

#### HEARING

Congressman FARBSTEIN. This hearing will now come to order.

I would appreciate if there would be no smoking during the hearing. I know that the hearing will be an orderly one.

I would like to introduce the members of the House of Representatives who are participating this morning with me in this hearing.

The members beginning on my right are Congressman Rosenthal, Congressman Ryan, I am Congressman Farbstein, Congressman Koch, Congressman Podell and Congressman Bingham.

We are all agreed, I am certain, the America of December 1969 is automobile-oriented. Because of the lack of adequate public transportation and the increase in the number of highways, and the ability of the automobile to get us where we want to go, the people of this country have come to depend upon it as the primary source of transportation. For those associated with the automobile industry, the manufacturer primarily, this has meant high profits. It has also meant the expenditure of public funds to accommodate the increased demands—thus even insuring greater profits.

But along with these benefits there is also a set of responsibilities to the public which must be recognized by the industry—responsibilities to provide a safe vehicle and responsibilities to provide a vehicle which does not make our environment uninhabitable.

With respect to the safety issue, there

has been a great deal of evidence to suggest an attempt on the part of the industry to avoid its responsibility.

The purpose of our hearing today is to explore whether the industry is following this same course of avoiding responsibility with respect to cleaning up the dirty air we breathe, air polluted by the internal combustion engine.

A suit filed by the Justice Department (U.S. of America vs. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., et al.) against the auto industry alleged that the industry had been failing to meet its responsibilities to develop devices to cut down on air pollution, not only by moving slowly in the development of such devices, but also by resisting their required use. We want to ascertain whether this is still the case.

Detroit has been telling the American people that it is not feasible to develop cleaner alternatives to the internal combustion engine. If this be the case, why have four entirely independent Federal panels, a Senate committee and the California State Legislature, all come to the opposite conclusion?

Why is it that when the California Legislature was considering legislation to ban all automobiles not meeting high anti-pollution standards, a spokesman for one of the companies testifying here today said that such an engine could not be built, but five days after the bill had been safely defeated, the same person told a press conference that his company could have met the requirements of the bill.

In other words, we want to determine if a credibility gap exists between the auto industry and the American public.

These hearings will attempt to explore this question through testimony from experts both in and out of the auto industry.

Mr. Ralph Nader is scheduled to be our first witness. He will be followed by the auto industry, whose representatives will have time in which to present statements and then answer questions from the Congressmen present. Third on the schedule is a panel of four experts on the effect of auto pollution on our health. Following them is a panel of experts on auto air pollution technology. They will discuss what can be done to clean up the current engine, as well as the desirability and feasibility of alternative systems such as steam and electric. These hearings will culminate with statements by the representatives of General Motors and the Ford Motor Company followed by questions.

I wish to acknowledge that by their presence here today, General Motors and the Ford Motor Company have demonstrated an interest in the public health. I regret that Chrysler by their absence and refusal to allow high ranking officials to testify did not demonstrate a similar concern.

Some might conclude from this that the Chrysler Corporation is more interested in profits than in helping clean up our air. I certainly hope this is not the case and that Chrysler will join with us in future efforts to end air pollution.

Before proceeding further, I would like to insert for the permanent record a letter from Congressman Edward J. Patten, one of the co-sponsors of today's hearing, who unfortunately cannot be here today.

The text of Congressman Patten's letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1969.  
Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish I could attend the hearings to be held on December 8th in New York City on the dangers and challenges of automotive air pollution.

However, because of previous commitments, I will not be able to attend. Despite

my absence, I will certainly be present in spirit, for I feel very strongly that air pollution is one of the most serious health problems we face.

I also believe that automobile manufacturers have a great responsibility to the American people to intensify and broaden their programs to reduce air pollution. I hope—and believe—that by working together, automotive leaders, Congress, and other groups—will expedite that long-awaited day when the American people will be able to breathe without discomfort, or fear.

Congratulations for your deep interest and strong leadership in the important fight against air pollution. The December 8th meeting should lead to significant progress in reaching the goal of effective air pollution control.

Please read this letter at the Dec. 8th hearings and also include it in the official record.  
Sincerely,

EDWARD J. PATTEN.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Whether or not the number of experts that have been scheduled to appear here this morning will be here because of the weather I am unable to say at this moment.

Nevertheless, their names shall be called and those present will present their testimony. My first witness is Mr. Ralph Nader, who I do not believe needs any further introduction.

After Mr. Nader there will be some short comment and questioning by the members of Congress.

Mr. Nader, you may proceed.

Mr. RALPH NADER. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, concerned members of the New York and New Jersey Congressional delegation, you have convened this hearing to bring forth a greater understanding of the seriousness of automotive air pollutants to human health and the technical and institutional remedies and changes that are required now and soon. The panels of specialists will provide the basis for much concern and presumably some hope. In addition, the auto industry's second echelon spokesmen will provide you with their un-failing presentation of invulnerable intransigence clothed with suitably decorous displays presently in their 19th year of redundant refinement.

In the brief time available, I should like to comment on several consistent behavioral patterns of the automobile industry which have, are, and, unless stopped, will continue to deceive, delay, obfuscate and conspire against men of good will, men of political power and men of technical solutions.

*Pattern No. 1.* The top executives of the auto companies—the Chairman of the Board and the President—have never consented to testify before any governmental forum—Federal, state or local—on their air polluting companies and products. When asked to testify, as they were for this hearing, they invariably delegate to corporate officials who speak with less authority and less visibility. Some Chairmen, like Chrysler's Lynn Townsend, decline even to reply and routinely dispatch Congressional inquiries to lower personnel who in turn decline to have their company represented. The refusal of top executives to testify permits them to wallow in ignorance and indifference toward air pollution while they spend their days in high finance, sales, distribution and personnel policies. Unlike Senators, Representatives, Governors and Presidents who want to and are expected to meet their constituents, top chiefs of massive corporate states (GM grosses \$2.4 million an hour on the average 24 hours a day with 750,000 employees) remain in their executive suites making decisions that reverberate life and death impact on their customers' health and safety. These corporate autocrats will not begin to feel the urgency of the pollution crisis until

they are touched by subpoenas, spurred by indictments and shorn of their calculated anonymity.

*Pattern No. 2.* By their indifference, venality and conspiracy, the auto companies are proliferating scales of violence throughout the land that have no parallel. Apart from their unsafely designed vehicles, these companies spew forth tons of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen whose silent violence attacks the health of man. Adhering to the principle that the infernal internal combustion engine is to remain eternal, the companies still maintain that there is no need to control these violent emissions, except possibly in Southern California. That remains to this day their basic philosophy and explains their determination to delay and deceive with impunity. Although the case has been settled via a consent decree, the Justice Department's charges that the auto companies and their Automobile Manufacturers Association conspired since 1953 to restrain the development and marketing of auto exhaust control systems stand as a reminder of the vast potential for members of this industry to agree to do nothing. This is the easiest of conspiracies, and one that was so blatant that these so-called competitors were caught last year giving identical speeches on air pollution through their coordinating co-conspirator, the Automobile Manufacturers Association. The recent initiation of antitrust suits by California, New York and Illinois should bring to public light the mass of documents produced by the five-year-long Justice Department inquiry before that agency surrendered claim to the anti-trust case of the century.

In the meantime, General Motors continues to be responsible for at least one-third of the nation's air pollution by tonnage by virtue of the engines it designs and the plants it operates. This is a GM produced violence that rarely invokes the demand for law and order to replace the anarchy that its predatory power has constructed and maintained. Because the emphysema, the cancer and other diseases that build up over time in human beings are deferred consequences of such violence, the law has not integrated them into a structure of accountability. This is the style of technological violence produced by executives who keep their cuff links on.

*Pattern No. 3.* The auto companies refuse to identify the problems and the hazards from their products. It was not the industry, but a Professor at the California Institute of Technology who made the connection between auto exhausts and photochemical smog in the early Fifties. All efforts at auto pollution control by California began in earnest from this discovery. Thus the first step in curbing any health hazard—the discovery of its existence—has not been assumed by the industry to be its responsibility. This is true to the present time. For although the law is only considering the three pollutants—carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen—three other serious pollutants—lead, asbestos and rubber tires—remain unrecognized and unstudied by the industry. Why should the companies make the connections with human disease when they can gain more time by waiting for outsiders to do so. The buildup of lead concentrations in the atmosphere, especially in the cities, is alarming scientists. (See *Scientist and Citizen*, April, 1968.)

Asbestos is receiving much more attention recently but not by the auto companies whose clutch and brake linings release it into the air. A Litton report prepared for the National Air Pollution Control Administration (HEW) this year noted that the latent period required to develop asbestosis, lung cancer, ormesothelioma is 20 to 40 years. The report stated that "Asbestos is an air pollutant which carries with it the potential for a national or worldwide epidemic

of lung cancer . . ." The auto industry has produced nothing by way of research on the risks from this pollutant and how it can be reduced. Particulate and other polluting matter from the wear or combustion of rubber tires were called possibly the most serious form of vehicular pollutant by Professor Rene Dubos of the Rockefeller University who urged immediate study of this ignored area. Neither the tire nor the auto industries have spent a dollar trying to find out.

*Practice No. 4.* The auto industry has practiced a policy of prevarication and deception that has lulled and blunted the ardor of many legislators. Examples could be adduced ad infinitum; let a few suffice.

On March 3, 1953, Ford Motor Company wrote Mr. Kenneth Hahn, Los Angeles Supervisor, as follows:

"The Ford engineering staff, although mindful that automobile engines produce exhaust gases, feels these waste vapors are dissipated in the atmosphere quickly and do not present an air-pollution problem. . . . The fine automotive powerplants which modern-day engineers design do not 'smoke'. Only aging engines subjected to improper care and maintenance burn oil."

On March 26, 1953, General Motors wrote Mr. Hahn that:

"The information that is available to us does not indicate that carbon monoxide is present in harmful amounts in the Los Angeles atmosphere and so we have not been concerned about the imminence of a serious health problem from this source."

Moving to the present, the deception continues but becomes even bolder. With a presumption that borders on pornography, Charles M. Heinen, of Chrysler Corporation, delivered a paper before the industry-indented Society of Automotive Engineers in April 1969, entitled "We've Done the Job—What's Next?" He goes on to say:

"I stated that we've done the job. [The main battle against automotive air pollution has been won.] Now, let me summarize what we have done. Starting with the 1961 model and including the 1970 vehicles, the accumulative up-to-date record will show:

"1. Hydrocarbon emissions down about 80%.

"2. Carbon monoxide down about 70%."

This has become the official industry line. Observe the ease with which it can be overwhelmed with refutation. First, the industry ignores the importance or necessity of four other vehicular pollutants—oxides of nitrogen, lead, asbestos and rubber tire pollutants. There is abundant evidence of harm done by the first three and abundant need to find out about the latter pollutant. Second, the Heinen approach fails to account for the projected increase in vehicles and mileage traveled. As a Senate Commerce Committee report declared (1969):

"The present emission standards will not stabilize, much less reduce vehicular air pollution. Studies indicate that, under existing controls, automobile air pollution in the United States will more than double in the next 30 years because of the projected increase in both the number of vehicles and miles driven by each vehicle. Ironically, under present emission standards, oxides of nitrogen emissions, the main villains in photochemical smog production, will be higher than they would be if no standards existed."

Third, the industry neglects specially vulnerable individuals such as the hundreds of thousands with respiratory diseases and traffic police who must work in environments having high vehicular emissions—to name two groups. These people have necessities that cannot be ignored by national pollution control policy. Fourth, vehicular pollutants destroy hundreds of millions of dollars of property—as in agriculture—and cause vast dollar damage to other property.

Since others, not the auto industry, bear this cost, the billions in property losses

caused by an industry that refuses to be toilet trained are ignored in the deceptively optimistic orgies that go by the description of technical reports from the auto companies.

Fifth, auto pollution is receiving increasing attention as a traffic safety hazard—ranging from the effect of carbon monoxide on drivers (GM recently recalled over 2 million vehicles because of this hazard) to reduction of driver visibility from smog on highways.

Sixth, auto pollutants and the dirty, ugliness that they produce constitute a nuisance and aesthetic deprivation that alone should be sufficient for their prevention.

Seventh, Heinen's and other's figures about reduction of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons knowingly ignore the degradation of performance as the mileage increases.

Federal regulations require that automobile emissions not exceed specified levels for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons. Certification procedures by the national air pollution control administration are supposed to guarantee that emissions will not exceed the maximum allowable for 50,000 miles with one major tune-up at 25,000 miles. However, an undisclosed national air pollution control administration financed study of the emission characteristics of Hertz vehicles, 1969 models, indicated that 53% of the autos tested failed either the carbon monoxide and/or hydrocarbon tests after only 11,000 miles on the average. General motors' failure performance was distinctive: 68% of the GM cars surveyed failed for either carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon at an average of 12,600 miles. The Federal testing of motor vehicles for compliance with the law is a shocking story which will soon be told in a coming report.

*Practice No. 5.* The auto companies have applied their considerable politico-economic power to avoid having to shoulder the burden of proof for their air violence. In a society with democratic control over its technology, it would not be up to the victims to have to show that a pollutant was harmful, particularly the kind that takes years to manifest its deadly impact on human beings; it would be up to the polluting company to show that its emissions were not harmful. The new cry of the students and the environmentalists to General Motors et al will be—"You prove its harmless or get it out of our air."

*Practice No. 6.* Having had great success in surrounding themselves with privileges and immunities, the auto companies have been able to keep their research and development budgets tiny. During the past two years, to illustrate the sense of priority, General Motors has spent \$250 million to change over its signs to read "GM—Mark of Excellence". Judging by its technical output, its lack of change, its facilities and manpower devoted to R and D, GM could not possibly spend more than \$8 million a year for system solutions to its vehicle's pollution. That amounts to about 3½ hours gross revenue. Such contempt for the inalienable rights of people to breathe pure air, coupled with industry-wide conspiracy, is a crime of staggering proportions for which there is no prosecution.

*Practice No. 7.* The auto companies' response to growing state and Federal demands for pollution control has been to sustain the perpetuation of a grossly inefficient internal combustion engine by applying tack-on "solutions". During the past four years, these tack-on, rather than systemic, approaches have produced with decreasing costs to the companies and increasing added price increases to the motorist. In addition, the cost of maintenance of these clumsy devices increasingly accelerates with every expanded objective. While promoting the myths of how much alternatives to the internal combustion engines would cost, the auto companies are milking millions from motorists in order that their capital commitment to the conventional engine not be disturbed. It is criti-

cal for Congress to analyze at what point on the continuum is the most efficient absorption of the cost.

Engineering history has shown that that point is the design boards. For example, company representatives are now providing an idea of how much it is going to cost California motorists to meet that state's forthcoming price increases allegedly due to added devices, it will cost California new car buyers about \$600 million in the first year. These kinds of figures are rarely stacked up against the cost of basic propulsion changes back in the motorcar plants. The external costs of the present internal combustion engine—health, property, fuel consumption, price increases, maintenance, traffic crashes, etc., vastly exceed initial, fundamental changes in the propulsion changes. But the auto companies, not the people or the government, make these cost decisions. The auto subeconomy is a classically authoritarian system in this regard.

In a period of our history when spectacular advances have been made in space, automated production machinery, computers and other areas, the auto industry continues to inflict the violent internal combustion engine—fuel combination on the public. With greater technological capability and affluence, the auto industry has had a commensurately greater ethical imperative to know the knowable and apply the solutions. The enormity of its criminal behavior grows larger every year. No longer should the people in this country delay in doing what should have been done in the 1920s and 1930s. It is recommended that the following action should be taken:

1. Vigorous antitrust enforcement to dissolve General Motors and restructure the auto industry under conditions that will generate competition for quality and safety.

2. The government should use its procurement powers and research-development funding to create maximum incentives for less polluting vehicles. This would include setting up a production capacity for non-polluting or less polluting vehicles. There is ample precedent for this move in less urgent areas—e.g., maritime R and D subsidy and the outright creation of a tax-supported private atomic energy industry. Without a government supported capability, the standards process will be controlled by the product-fixing policies of a collusive industry.

3. Existing air pollution control laws must be amended to provide for effective penalties and other sanctions to deter violators, for an expeditious recall power for correction at manufacturer expense, for strong in-plant investigation and inspection powers and for ample manpower to perform these missions. At present, millions of vehicles are produced that violate the pollution control standards. There is no way for the government to ascertain that the carefully tuned, prototype vehicles submitted for testing by the auto companies are in any way similar to production vehicles. Sanctions must apply to corporate officials, not just the companies.

4. The principle of maximum technological feasibility must become a prominent guideline for Federal policy. This is in accord with a new technological ethic that the machine adapts to the man. Quickly jettisoned must be the idea that our people must await two to three decades of medical studies before the human guinea pig evidence begins to bestir the auto manufacturers.

5. Strong, long-range cut-off dates should be established beyond which vehicles with certain levels of pollution can no longer be sold. Long-range decisive deterrents and heightened public expectations are built up in this manner.

Number 6 is particularly appropriate in the light of the refusal of corporate executives, top corporate executives to appear here today. I wish to remind you gentlemen that New

York is the corporate capital of the world. The auto industry has many corporate headquarters here.

In fact, General Motors' corporate headquarters are only a short taxi ride away, where the Chairman of the Board is now working.

6. A criterion of corporate insanity should be developed to apply to certain levels of indifference, insensitivity or venality. Once these levels are attained for any given area of corporate decision making—in this case, pollution—the corporate institution will lose its power over that area to the people. In the alternative, there could be a Federal declaration of policy that the quality of air can no longer be intruded upon by corporate or other polluters as their private sewers. This would permit interesting policies and rights to emerge—such as constitutional change pressures toward a fundamental human right to a pure environment or taxation of polluters to such a degree that the companies decide it is cheaper to adopt the control machinery.

7. Above all, a new governmental policy of meticulous investigation of the auto companies to disclose illegal practices, technology suppression and other patterns of activity that slow or block pollution control progress is needed. Disclosure is reform's first step. To continue the present permissiveness of trying to understand these generators of air violence through the contrived statements of a number of company officials is similar to trying to understand China and the Soviet Union through the utterances of Kosygin and Mao.

This nation applies more investigative manpower to one bank robbery than it devotes to the auto industry's violent activities. Those of us who have followed the tortuous path of the industry over the years can be forgiven the lack of patience displayed by public representatives newly exposed to the smooth semantics of corporate publicists. For us, the auto companies' assault on the biosphere must be stopped if only for the benefit of the young and still unborn generations who will never know what a breath of fresh air can be like.

I would also venture to predict, gentlemen, that the error of reliance on government intermediaries to force the auto industry to clean up the air is over. From now on, the techniques employed in the civil rights movement on the part of students, and anti-pollution environmentalists will be directed directly against the automobile companies.

I should like to request that the attached questions be asked of the auto companies as a start toward the necessary disclosures.

I submit these questions for your pleasure and hopeful use for questioning the auto industry, whether here or by letter in the future.

1. Under the Air Quality Act of 1967, motor vehicle manufacturers are asked to submit prototype models for testing to assure that evaporative and exhaust emissions are controlled in accordance with the standards established by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. What steps has your company taken to assure that production line models conform to these prototypes with regard to the emission of pollutants? Please describe the quality control program as it relates to this problem.

2. Why have the Presidents and Chairmen of the Boards of the automobile companies consistently refused to appear before public forums to discuss their companies' efforts—or lack thereof—in the field of air pollution control?

3. Are the automobile manufacturers at all concerned with the fact that inner city residents—black slum dwellers and others sometimes called the "silent majority"—are subjected to massively greater quantities of pollutants from automobiles than are the residents of Grosse Pointe, Michigan and

other suburban communities where the automobile executives lay their heads? If so, please produce the corporate studies which reflect this concern.

4. Why have the automobile companies raised prices for each of the last three model years, each time citing the cost of air pollution control as one reason, when there has been no significant change in that equipment over this period?

5. What research have the companies engaged in relating to the effects of air pollution from automobiles on the following: automotive safety, health, property damage, vegetation, wildlife, climate?

6. Please indicate, for each engine-carburetor-transmission combination, exactly what quantities of the following pollutants are emitted over the life of each vehicle: Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Oxides of Nitrogen, Lead, Asbestos, Rubber Particles and gaseous matter from tires.

7. What research have the companies undertaken to study the health effects of these pollutants? If they have not engaged in such research, why not? If they have, what have they done to alert the public to the health dangers of these pollutants?

8. Aside from claiming to meet inadequate Federal standards, what have the companies themselves done to reduce these dangerous emissions?

9. Do the executives assembled here today agree that automobile industry executives should be subjected to personal criminal penalties for failure to adhere to Federal standards for automobile exhaust emissions?

10. How much money have the companies spent, for each of the last five years, on research relating to steam, electric and other pollution free unconventional power sources for mass produced automobiles?

11. With regard to questions 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12, please compare the amount of money spent for those activities with the following:

(a) The annual advertising budget of the companies.

(b) The amount of money spent on bonuses and stock options for corporate executives.

12. Are the companies engaged in research to develop a cleaner burning fuel?

13. What is the position of the companies (individually) on Federal standards limiting the omission of oxides of nitrogen, lead, asbestos and tire-related matter from motor vehicles?

14. The newspapers recently reported that the automobile manufacturers were engaged in research relating to electrically powered lunar vehicles. Will the fruits of this research result in similarly powered vehicles for mass production on earth? If so, how soon?

I might also add that some of the technical specialists who are coming up later, such as Dr. Robert Ayres, and Professor Morse of MIT will present much technical corroborative data, and in particular that data referring to the contribution of a third of the nation's air pollution by General Motors comes from the computations of Dr. Robert Ayres, who has conducted extensive studies in air pollution in various kinds of vehicular propulsions.

Thank you.

Congressman FARBSTEN. Have you finished?

Mr. NADER. Yes.

Congressman FARBSTEN. I want to thank you, Mr. Nader, for having appeared here today voluntarily, at your own expense, and with great inconvenience, especially with this weather.

I know that your testimony will be appreciated and will be considered very closely.

I might say that one of the reasons that I called this hearing was because I offered an amendment to the Clean Air Act in Sep-

tember to ban the internal combustion engines, unless it could meet air pollution standards equivalent to those laid down by the California Legislature for low pollution vehicles.

I lost 22 to 99 so I felt this hearing was necessary to arouse the public to the dangers to the air we breathe caused by the internal combustion engine. I hope the information that comes out here today will arouse the public to demand of both the auto industry and the Government, action to produce clean engines.

Time is a little tight and so I will restrict myself to one question. Similarly each of the Members of Congress will have the opportunity to ask one question or make a very short presentation. Mr. Nader can then, if he wants, take a minute or two to close.

The question that I want to ask you is this: Are you suggesting that the automobile companies are shirking their obligation to the public to produce a clean engine, and if so, why?

Mr. NADER. I think my testimony, Mr. Chairman, made clear that the short answer to your question, is yes, that they are not being candid, to use the most charitable phrase I can think of at the present time.

The answers for their stubbornness is quite simple as well. Less polluting engines do not sell more cars. They just save more lives.

Secondly, there is no penalty under the law over the last two decades for delay. They can procrastinate, they can deceive, they can delay, they can assert economic pressure, and there is no penalty for it, so when you get the lack of incentive for human life on the one side and the lack of sanction and penalty on the other the consequence is that the behavior is as has been.

Congressman RYAN. I should like in the first place to thank you, Mr. Nader, for your statement—one that all of the members here could spend a great deal of time in discussing with you.

Unfortunately, our time is limited and we have to move along so the witnesses will have an opportunity to testify. Also, there is legislative business in Washington that calls upon us to be there during the course of this afternoon.

I would like to commend my colleague, Congressman Farberstein, for having called these meetings. I would like to make the following observation:

Although American automobile manufacturers knew of the dangers auto emissions presented to public health, they did not warn the public of these dangers. The manufacturers knew that devices could be installed to reduce these emissions, but refused to design and install these control devices until forced to do so by Federal regulation—and they stopped at what they had been forced to do. They did not instruct owners and mechanics in maintaining these devices. It is possible, after a few thousand miles of driving, if the devices have become clogged, that a car with control devices can pollute the air more than a car without devices. While the devices in current use are reducing emissions, the downward trend will start to rise upwards again by 1980 unless far more effective devices are installed—due to rapid increases in car population.

Motor vehicle registrations in the United States are expected to top 105 million by the end of the year. In New York City alone, there are more than two million automobiles in operation—twice as many as the area can support. Estimated emissions for New York City during a study made in 1968 were:

Carbon monoxide, 4140 ton/day; Hydrocarbons, 560 ton/day; Nitrogen oxides, 106 ton/day.

At one location, average hourly concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) exceeded 15 ppm from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. (New York State recommended that 15 ppm not be exceeded for 8 hours more than 15% of the time).

In New York City, automobile traffic produces over 8 million pounds of CO daily; people in moving vehicles in heavy traffic are exposed to sustained levels of 50 or more ppm. Brief exposures of 141 ppm have been found in New York expressway traffic.

Exposure to CO has been related to fatigue, headache, irritability, dizziness and disturbed sleep. Persons with anemia, heart disease and disease states resulting in increased oxygen demand or impairment of circulation to vital organs suffer more severe effects. CO is toxic in the blood because it inactivates hemoglobin. In levels of 5 to 10%, it reduces the amount of oxygen the blood carries to the heart and tissues, thus affecting the reflexes and the ability of the brain and heart to function. Several studies have connected CO with impaired performance in drivers; this has serious implications for traffic safety.

Other auto emissions are: hydrocarbons, which help produce photochemical smog and cause plant damage, eye and respiratory tract irritation and reduced visibility;

Nitrogen oxides, a major form of which, nitrogen dioxide, a yellow-brown gas, reduces visibility at low concentrations;

Oxidants, such as ozone and the peroxyacetyl nitrates (PAN) which are associated with eye irritation, odor and respiratory effects; and

Lead compounds, which are toxic to humans, interfering with maturation and development of red blood cells, and possibly affecting liver and kidney functions and enzyme activity.

The particulates produced by auto exhausts may seem small in comparison to the huge plumes emanating from factory or power plant stacks; however, this small volume has grave significance; it creates hazards in both visibility and health effects. Small particles form a "curtain" that severely curtails visibility (larger particles leave "gaps" through which some visibility may be retained). Large particles, when breathed in, may cause coughing and sneezing responses but are generally deposited in the upper airways. Small particles, however, are "respirable"—they may be carried deep into the lungs, into the bronchioles and alveoli, where—if they have absorbed SO<sub>2</sub>—they find the natural moisture of the pulmonary system an environment where they may oxidize and produce sulfuric acid.

There is an even more serious problem, much more difficult to control than emission levels—this is the status/power/sex symbol syndrome the automobile manufacturers have created in their advertising and marketing practices. Instead of selling transportation—simply a means of getting from one place to another—the manufacturers have made the American automobile a status symbol, even a potency substitute: they have sold the consumer fast starts, high-powered engines and the speed/power/pleasure/potency syndrome with such insidious and unrelenting pressure that they dare not even bring up the subject of pollution. They dare not let the driver know that his beloved fantasy object emits dangerous pollution. When they have mesmerized the motor addict into purchasing a surrogate for sexual potency, a romanticized compensation for failure, or a surging jungle animal, they can hardly add as an afterthought that driving this magic chariot will vilely and dangerously pollute the environment.

Manufacturers have even less enthusiasm for advising the potential owner that controlling pollution will cost money. Far better to let people spend money on "hidden" costs—cleaning bills, medical bills, poor health, absences from work—than openly admit that automobiles pollute the air and that the automaker and the individual owner are jointly responsible for preventing that pollution.

Electric cars, steam cars, gas turbine engines and fuel cells offer hope for reducing,

perhaps even eliminating, pollution in the future: but these solutions may take five, ten or fifteen years.

We can expect development of more efficient control devices (like Milton Farber's catalytic muffler, now being tested, but not by a strangely indifferent auto industry).

In the meantime, what can the driving public do to reduce the auto pollution of our planet's air?

What can the manufacturers do, now?

There is, already available, a simple inexpensive system that can be applied to presently operating motor vehicles—the dual fuel system, which uses compressed natural gas in city or heavy traffic driving, but can switch to gasoline for long trips.

This system is safe, less costly than gasoline, and emissions are below not only current national and California standards, but well below California standards for 1974. This system is closed and there are no evaporation losses. In mileage accumulation (already up to 60,000 miles in test vehicles) there has been no deterioration in vehicle emissions performance; further, there are fewer problems in maintenance because natural gas is a clean fuel; it does not cause oil deterioration or sludging, does not foul spark plugs.

Every driver who owns a motor vehicle can have this system installed in a few hours; his investment will be rewarded by decreased operating costs and decreased emission of pollutants.

What can the manufacturer do? They can design automobiles with space to accommodate tanks for the compressed gas; they can inform the auto owner of the problems of pollution, of the necessity to meet emission standards. They can sell autos simply as modes of transportation, not as sex/power/status symbols. They can treat the auto buyer as a responsible individual, not as an object to be manipulated.

I urge the administration of New York City, the State of New York, and the Federal Government as well as the automobile manufacturers to take every step possible to disseminate the facts about pollutants emitted by automobiles, the dangers to health if pollution continues, and methods to reduce these pollutants.

I urge government at all levels, automobile manufacturers, and industries such as taxi and delivery companies to test the dual fuel method and, if it proves to be efficient and economical, to install it at once in all urban vehicles so that pollution can be substantially reduced while we anxiously await improved control devices and pollution-free vehicles.

Mr. Nader, I make the point that the automobile industry looks at the automobile, not as a method of transportation, a means of getting from one place to another, but as a power symbol, a status symbol and if you will, sometimes even a sex symbol. At the same time the manufacturers have practically ignored the danger of air pollution. Do you want to comment on that?

Mr. NADER. The horsepower race is faster than ever. The emphasis on aggression and power is still a theme of current advertising.

In fact, the recent ad by Ford Motor Company for its Mercury Cyclone had the title "We make it hot, now you make it scream."

The picture showed a Mercury Cyclone surrounded by three crouched teenagers who appeared like they got the message.

Congressman RYAN. May I make one other comment, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the alternatives to the internal combustion engine, the electric car, steam car, and gas turbine engine—are several years away. However, there is now the dual fuel system, and I suggest that the New York City Administration and other governmental agencies start to test that immediately.

Congressman KOCH. Mr. Chairman, along with the others, I will submit a formal state-

ment because of the time requirement, but I would like to make a brief comment, and ask Mr. Nader a question.

I agree with you that the romance with the internal combustion machinery is over, and that the population in large insists and demands that Congress do something about it. What distresses me is that the administration in effect has supported the automotive industry in that they indicated that they are not going to press for low pollution standards mandatory until 1990.

I don't think we can wait that long. I think you have indicated that we can't wait that long, and I wonder whether you have a comment on the possibility of our requiring that a certain proportion of the existing gasoline tax, which runs anywhere from four to twenty cents on each gallon, perhaps even a little more in some states, that some small percentage of that, whether it is one cent a gallon or two cents a gallon, be set aside solely for Federal research and development into the question of control of air pollution.

Mr. NADER. You raise some very important issues. Let me say I would prefer the revenues to come from an excess tax on the auto companies.

They are increasing their profits. I think an excess tax to finish these kind of prototype non-polluting vehicles is clearly in order.

You mentioned the administration's posture. I think what we are going to see in the next few months, beginning with the President's State of the Union Message, is a major barrage concerning environmental hazards, whose function will be to shift the cost of eliminating these pollutants onto the taxpayer, and away from the corporations.

I see this in recent remarks a few weeks ago.

Recent remarks by Secretary of Transportation, who indicates that the Government might begin to make grants, not to just companies outside the auto industry, but to the auto industry themselves to clean up their engine, a kind of new-fangled bribe that has become increasing in characteristic of the corporate socialism that big companies are developing in this country.

The idea of a tiny agency like the National Air Pollution Control Administration, with a hundred million dollar budget pained General Motors, which grosses \$23 billion a year. I think we have to be careful of the present administration's attempts to shift the cost on the taxpayer, which, of course, increases the cost even more, because appropriations for air pollution comes very slowly.

Congressman KOCH. Would you then suggest that some part of the purchase price, so that it comes out of the automotive industry, be set aside for air pollution control research and development and in some way that that be governed by the Federal Government?

Mr. NADER. Yes, but the revenue device should be placed on the auto companies themselves in terms of an excess of profits tax.

Congressman KOCH. I agree with you.

I am very pleased to join today with Congressman Farbstein and others in sponsoring this hearing on the problems of automotive air pollution.

Americans are rightfully proud of the vast technological progress which industry has made. In recent years, however, we have all become increasingly aware that much of this so-called progress is seriously threatening our environment. Today our technological potentialities must be applied to the problem of restoring our environment.

The pollution of our air is a vivid example of the situation, and it is clear that the mass produced, internal combustion engine automobile is the greatest source of air pollution today. Residents of our major urban

areas, where 85% of the air pollution comes from auto emissions suffer the most, and the problem is growing more severe. In New York City, for example, over the last four years the sulphur dioxides and dirt in our air pollutants created by a variety of sources including incinerators and the burning of fuel oil, have been reduced 56% and 23% respectively, but the pollution from autos has increased. It is not so difficult to understand why when one realizes that over 1/2 million cars enter Manhattan daily.

Until a low-pollutant auto engine is successfully manufactured, it is clear that we are not going to be able to tackle the problem of air pollution. Yet we must improve the quality of air soon for there is ample testimony citing the health hazards caused by air pollution which only underscores the urgency of the problem.

Despite the obviously harmful health effects produced by the proliferating internal combustion engine, we still appear to be years away from the production of a low-pollution engine. In large measure this is a situation that can be traced to the unreponsiveness of Detroit. The automotive industry has in the past spent over one billion dollars for annual model changes while only one million annually for pollution control. In fact, despite the clear recognition of the problem, no pollution control devices were put on new model cars until so mandated by State and Federal law. The past performance of the automobile manufacturers has been an attitude of contentment with the status quo, an attitude that has proved highly detrimental to the general welfare.

In fact the AMA's behavior has been so delinquent in the pursuit of a pollution free auto that the Justice Department during President Johnson's Administration saw fit to bring suit against the major auto manufacturers, charging them with a fifteen-year conspiracy to suppress research, development and application of air pollution control devices. The fact that this suit has been settled out of Court by a consent judgment is, in my opinion, a great misfortune and reflects the Nixon Administration's apparent willingness to pander to the interests of the automotive industry. I believe that the public is entitled to know the facts, to know just how culpable Detroit may have been in this matter.

At the time that it was announced that the Justice Department was considering a consent decree I joined with eighteen other Congressmen in writing Attorney General Mitchell asking that there be a public trial and full disclosure of the facts. Although the Justice Department agreed to the consent judgment, I am happy to note that the Court required that the evidence collected by the Federal Government be made available to the cities that, as plaintiffs, want to bring future actions against the industry. I believe that our Congressional action was partly responsible for this and hope that we may someday have the true facts in this case.

Earlier this fall the Nixon Administration set a goal of 1990 as an acceptable date for the development of a low pollution auto engine and asked an allocation of 2.2 million dollars for research. This appears to reflect a real absence of commitment, and is a dangerous way of dawdling with a serious public health problem.

Of course it is not only the Nixon Administration and Detroit that have evinced a lack of publicly-spirited dedication in this area. This Congress and past ones have done much to foster the ever-expanding production of the internal combustion engine. Recent budget allocations show that Congress habitually marks about 4.5 billion dollars each year for highways compared to a meager 175 million for mass transit. More highways mean more cars which in turn means more congestion and more pollution in our cities. This imbalance must be changed. Approximately 70 percent of our population lives

in urban areas today and they are the ones who are suffering most. Naturally improved mass transit facilities would reduce the need for cars in the cities, and early in my term I introduced a bill, currently sponsored by 106 Congressmen, which would establish an Urban Mass Transportation Trust Fund to begin to rectify this situation.

But this alone will not solve the problem of the air pollution caused by automobiles. We need a national commitment for the production of a low pollution auto engine. Alternatives to the internal combustion engine must be developed, for it is estimated that the gradual increase of cars on the road through the 70's and 80's will negate the reduction of pollutants emitted by individual cars with control devices. Such a commitment will require funds as well as energy, and, if, as seems to be the case, Detroit will not meet its responsibility, the Federal Government should step in to assist.

With the technological resources of this country it would seem to me that a low pollution engine could be developed long before 1990. The government made the type of national commitment necessary in pioneering the way to the moon, a feat which was accomplished in the remarkably short space of ten years. Rather than having the Government subsidize private industry to the tune of 1.3 billion dollars in such a highly dubious project as the SST, it seems to me that far greater investment ought to be made by the Government to develop the technology to solve this urgent problem of auto polluting our air.

The necessary funds could be easily provided. Every gallon of gas consumed by our polluting autos cost around ten cents. The balance of the market price is made up in City, State and Federal taxes. If we were to take just one penny of this 20 to 30 cents in taxes on each gallon of gas and if we were to set that penny aside to fight pollution we would have a powerful tool indeed.

The major cities of this country are being suffocated by our history of infatuation with the automobile. But this romance is over for the majority of our population and the Government must wake up to this fact as must Detroit. Urban residents are breathing filthy air every day but are becoming more and more vocal in demanding their right to enjoy clean air. The Conservation Bill of Rights recently passed by the voters of New York State reflects the public concern with the problem of the environment in general. But the time has come for action rather than rhetoric, and the Federal Government must lead the way.

The Foley Bill of which I am a cosponsor is a modest step in the right direction. It would give the developer of a low pollution vehicle an economic incentive of 25% by requiring the GSA Administrator to purchase for the Government that car which meets new Federal pollution standards and to pay 125% of the cost of the vehicle which it replaces. In addition to measures such as this one, however, the Government must make a more active investment; an investment for the general welfare which must take the form of more funds for mass transit and for the development of an alternative to the internal combustion engine.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Mr. Nader, I find it intriguing to determine in my mind whose fault it is that we are in the situation that we are in. I think we can reach a consensus that we are almost at a last clear chance or beyond repair as to the danger to the environment.

Just being the Devil's Advocate for a moment, the auto companies are in the business to make a profit. They may have some implied responsibility to develop a safe car, or a non-polluting car, or do the kind of things that technology permits, but is it a failure of their moral leadership, or is it a failure of Government to step in when they see that

there is a threat to the general welfare, and the failure of Government to enforce livable standards in the commercial world?

Mr. NADER. With every hazardous activity there are two levels of responsibility, the immediate level of responsibility, which is in the lap of the perpetrators, in this case the producers of the motor vehicle, and a second level of responsibility on the part of Government to watch out for the health of its people, so they are both responsible, but I think that the auto industry was in the position earliest to detect the hazard, to have resources to avoid it, so the primary responsibility would be placed on their shoulders, to this day.

Oftentimes people say well, the auto industry is in the business of making money. A lot of people are in commerce as well. Does that mean that they can cease using sanitary toilets? Does that mean that they can justify violence to other people, just because it is attached to a beneficial activity, presumably, that of producing cars for mobility?

I don't think it can possibly be justified on that basis.

Congressman PODELL. I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Farbstain, on calling these hearings, because I for one am relatively new, both in the House, but not in the question of a great need for improving the pollutants of our air, or taking the pollutants out of our air.

I read, with a great deal of interest, the entire hearing in May 1968, before the Committee on Commerce of air pollution, and I have your statement before me.

First of all, I think the fault is not so much with the auto industry. I think the fault is the Congress itself, or the administration.

I think the responsibility for preserving the environment of our country is ours. I think the auto industry is to make profits for themselves. I think from the kind of testimony that I read out of this manual, I think it becomes the responsibility of government to step in and do something about it.

I was toying with the possibility, or the idea of setting up perhaps on a statewide basis, compulsory pollution stations in the same manner that we now have automobile inspection stations throughout the State of New York, where cars must have a pollutant sticker on each year to determine the amount of pollutants that the internal combustion engine may be giving off.

I think we have got to step in and do something about it. I think the government has the responsibility of doing so. May I get your reaction?

Mr. NADER. Yes, Congressman Podell, some of us in the consumer area have difficulties at times of distinguishing Congress from special interest or the auto industry in this case.

Congress cannot be any better than the level of vigorous citizenship, and up to now Congress has been reflected in its majority determination with the tremendous pressure that the auto industry is placing upon it, and so if we are to get a more active, more concerned, and more productive performance out of Congress, we have to go to the auto industry to determine how they are putting this pressure on and to devise ways to reduce it, or eliminate it, and that is why at the time that men of good will are heaping blame on governmental institutions of which they are a part, the fact is that the governmental institutions are a part of the fabric and that is where the focus must rest, in this case on the automobile industry.

Congressman PODELL. Would you care also to comment on the possibility of setting up these auto pollution inspection stations throughout the country?

In the same manner as we have an automobile inspection sticker on your car today, we can do the same for pollution.

Mr. NADER. Given the rapid breakdown in the efficiency of these so-called pollution

controls on vehicles that's quite necessary, particularly if used cars will be required to put these tack-on devices in order to determine their efficiency every 10,000 miles or so.

Congressman PODELL. Would you suggest that could be done on a Federal level?

Mr. NADER. Yes, it could be. The tragedy of it all is it is going to cost a tremendous cost on the consumer, because it was not used up by the auto industry.

Congressman BINGHAM. I would like to join in congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, in calling this hearing. I would also like to make a comment and add one question. My comment would be directed to the representatives of the automobile companies who are here. I hope that they will take very seriously what Mr. Nader has said, and the charges that he has made here today, and that others may make. I know from conversations I have had with very influential people in the automobile industry, or related to the automobile industry, that they tend to brush aside Mr. Nader as frankly some kind of a nut. In my judgment, and I am sure this is shared by all of us here, this is a woeful misunderstanding of the situation.

I think that Mr. Nader has made a contribution of enormous significance, not only in this field, but in many other fields, and my word to the automobile company representatives here is to take it very seriously indeed.

I would like to send this message to the representatives of the Chrysler Company, who were not courteous enough to send a representative here to testify. This relates to my feeling that the public must be involved in this.

As Mr. Nader suggests, young people are getting more excited about this, and they are going to be making their feelings known in an effective way. I think the public has a responsibility, just as government and the industry has a responsibility, to take effective action. For myself, I would like to send word to the Chrysler Corporation that I happen to have a Chrysler product which I am about ready to replace, and I am not going to replace it with a Chrysler product, since they have shown no awareness of the problem by failing to appear here today. Mr. Nader, just one question. I am concerned that in trying to improve the present anti-pollution devices, we are really missing the boat. As I understand it, if we continue to use the internal combustion engine, pollution due to automobiles will continue and even get worse, in spite of the best exhaust control devices simply due to the increasing number of cars. Don't we have to move radically in the direction of some other kind of propulsion system for our vehicles?

Mr. NADER. Based on what is now known I would agree with you that we do, that existing controls not only increase enormously the cost of maintenance and repairs on the part of the motorist, which will thereby build up a pressure to hold off these pack-on additions, but also they don't deal with many of the vehicular pollutants that prevail. Lead, for example, is not dealt with in this way. Oxide and nitrogen still remains to be seen, whether it will be suitably controlled by adjustment to the present internal combustion engine. I think we are going to have a much more fundamental approach in this.

Congressman FARBSTAIN. Mr. Nader, I want to again thank you for coming here.

Might I say in reference to the characterization of you as a "nut" that few subscribe to it, but if it is true, I will say that it is the "nuts" like you whom are responsible for the advances we have made. I might say also that I am sure the public generally will applaud and appreciate your testimony here today as I do as well-considered and thought provoking. Again I want to thank you for coming here.

Mr. NADER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two concluding remarks. First of all, I think we need to recharacterize with greater accuracy what air pollution is.

Air pollution is a form of environmental violence in the strict sense of the term. It is a form of environmental violence that discriminates as well. Black people in our slums and other people that live in the ghettos of the city are exposed to a far greater quantity of air pollutants than those who are more fortunate to live in the adjoining suburbs, and I think this type of discriminating impact on the part of the environmental pollutants should be studied so that we take very carefully sections of cities and compare them with sections of suburbs and develop some sort of concern toward which we can develop suitable apologies.

I think it is also clear from the history of post-war engineering development that if we want to achieve a certain technology, all we have to do is submit the necessary resources. We don't have to wait upon some spectacular Einsteinian idea in this area. We can schedule and program innovation, as we did in 1960 when we decided to go to the moon.

It is important to recognize that it is no longer a speculative thing. That all of these delays on the part of the auto industry and non-performance simply reflects an unwillingness to give even the most modest technological resources over the years to find the answers.

Congress is now appropriating 100 million dollars to the Federal air pollution budget. It must increase this to the equivalent total of funding two nuclear submarines as a start. Two nuclear submarines cost Congress 300 million dollars. I think we owe that to the people of this country.

Congressman FARBSTAIN. Thank you again, Mr. Nader.

Now I think we are going to give Dr. Paul A. Chenea, the vice president for research of General Motors, an opportunity to be heard. I believe he has been sitting here listening to the testimony of Mr. Nader and I hope will want to comment or take issue.

Dr. PAUL CHENEA. Thank you, sir.

Representative Farbstain and other Members of Congress, I am Dr. Paul F. Chenea, a vice-president of General Motors Corporation and in charge of the Corporation's Research Laboratories.

I am here today in response to your invitation to General Motors to appear before this panel of Congressmen from New York and New Jersey to discuss on behalf of General Motors the effects of the automobile on the air of the metropolitan area. I am accompanied by Dr. Fred W. Bowditch, director, emission control, of the GM Engineering Staff. Also present on my right is John Caplan, Executive Director, General Motors Research Laboratories.

I have been associated with General Motors Research Laboratories since June, 1967. Prior to that I was vice-president for academic affairs of Purdue University and acting dean of the School of Science, Education and Humanities from 1961 to 1967 and was a professor and administrator in engineering and mathematical sciences at Purdue during 1952-1961. I was on the University of Michigan engineering faculty during 1946-1952.

During those years I also was a consultant to government and industry.

In response to your invitation—and in an effort also to give perspective to the discussion before this panel—our report covers three broad areas:

1. A review of progress in reducing emissions from our current production cars.
2. What we are doing to develop future power plants.
3. Some comments on the automotive contribution to the metropolitan area's air pollution problem.



Mr. Chairman, as discussed with you in reaching general guidelines prior to accepting the invitation to appear here today, we are under certain legal inhibitions in discussing any subject matter related to pending air pollution litigation, including a suit in New York State.

However, we do not believe that this in any way will limit our ability to present a meaningful report that will be useful to this panel. As you know, we want to cooperate with you, and we recognize the importance of presenting our views on metropolitan New York air quality problems.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that air pollution problems are taken very seriously by General Motors. We have already made substantial progress in reducing emissions from our engines—including a number of improvements adopted by others in the industry—and we are continuing to reduce emissions each year. But most important—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—General Motors is and will be irrevocably committed to finding a solution to automotive emission problems at the earliest possible time. And in seeking solutions we will have no hesitation in using a power source other than the internal combustion engine if it will meet the needs of our customers, at a price they can pay, and will solve the emission problem.

We are concerned about the health and safety of the public. The cars we are producing right now—not some time in the future—are in themselves evidence of our concern. Our cars emit approximately 70 percent fewer hydrocarbons than the unequipped cars of 1960; next year it will be 80 percent. Carbon monoxide emissions have been reduced nearly 65 percent in the same period.

More importantly, while emission levels of our current cars are substantially lower than emissions of pre-control vehicles, achievement of the levels now being considered for 1975—and we certainly are hopeful of achieving them—would result in reducing auto emissions even further—with hydrocarbons 95 percent and carbon monoxide 85 percent below uncontrolled cars of 1960.

The facts clearly demonstrate that our current model General Motors' cars greatly reduce the automotive contribution to atmospheric pollution in the metropolitan New York and other major urban areas of the nation.

This effectiveness of emission control systems on 1970 cars was recognized recently by a most eminent public authority on air pollution, Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit. He is chairman of both California's Air Resources Board and of President Nixon's Task Force on Air Pollution.

Dr. Haagen-Smit discovered how photochemical smog found principally in the Los Angeles Basin is formed. He said in an address last month that the sum total of hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions from motor vehicles on the road today are lower than they were last year. He continued:

"They will be even lower next year and the year after that. This is true even though we will have more cars each year. The decrease in total emissions will soon be true for oxides of nitrogen. The above are significant accomplishments and are ones that should not be casually accepted as having been easily accomplished."

This has been accomplished despite the number of older used cars that lack emission control equipment.

All of our air pollution work at the Research Laboratories has had three basic objectives: the understanding of the nature of atmospheric effects, the understanding of the nature of vehicle emissions, and the development of new control concepts.

We started intensive research into automotive emissions and their relationship to photochemical smog in 1952. The main effort in the beginning was to determine the na-

ture of the problem and develop instruments needed in such research. As knowledge was gained, hardware was developed.

One of our first tasks was to develop techniques for analyzing trace components in exhaust gas. Automobile exhaust contains more than a hundred different hydrocarbons—some of which form photochemical smog a thousand times more readily than others. Some lead to eye irritation and some do not.

However, even today many mysteries remain concerning exhaust gas and the atmosphere. For example, carbon monoxide disappears from the atmosphere rather than accumulating, and the scientific community has never been able to determine where it goes. This illustrates the difficulties of the area in which we have been working.

We are participating in an \$11 million, three-year cooperative research program which was started in January 1968, to find answers to such questions as to what happens to carbon monoxide. It is funded by the Federal Government, the petroleum industry and the auto industry.

We are also seeking answers to questions concerning the effect of pollution on plants, the causes of haze formations, the effect of low level carbon monoxide on human and animal behavior and the concentration of carboxy hemoglobin in the blood of various population groups in New York City.

Since 1952—when our intensive air pollution research program was launched—a great deal has been accomplished by General Motors. Systems have been developed to provide controls for all sources of emissions from the automobile—blowby gases from the crankcase, exhaust gases from the tailpipe and evaporative losses from the fuel tank and carburetor. These accomplishments have included the following:

1. The Positive Crankcase Ventilation control system (PCV) developed by General Motors.
2. The GM Air Injection Reactor System (A.I.R.).
3. The GM Controlled Combustion System (CCS).
4. Evaporative controls, which will become standard on our 1971 model cars.

These developments were aided immeasurably by the GM smog chamber—the first and largest privately-owned facility for laboratory simulation of actual smog formation—and the GM laboratory at El Segundo, California, to monitor exhaust emissions of the GM vehicles in the hands of the public. This was the first facility of this type in the industry.

We have taken the most productive steps first in achieving the 70 and 80 percent reductions referred to earlier. The remaining, smaller segments will be much harder to achieve.

Regardless of what we have done so far—and whatever GM and other manufacturers may be able to do in the immediate future—we should all clearly understand a few facts as to existing problems that limit the impact of reductions achieved with new auto emissions on the total automotive pollution problem. For example:

The lower emissions of present model automobiles will not have full effect on air quality until older cars that lack effective emission control systems are eliminated from the vehicle population.

While we are working on the problem, no practical system has been developed to retrofit older model cars with current, improved control systems, with the exception of PCV valves, which can be installed in pre-1963 model cars. PCV valves are available at GM dealerships, but owners of pre-1963 cars have shown little interest in having them installed.

Moreover, if there is a desire to speed up the impact of improvements on new cars, then:

Owners of cars must recognize the extreme importance of improved maintenance of emission control systems.

Changes in fuel will be needed, such as lower volatility.

Looking forward, we feel it is our responsibility to develop the technology which, with time, can eliminate the automobile from the list of significant air pollution sources.

Reaching lower pollutant levels may require substantial technological breakthroughs in hardware and materials, or major modification of fuels—whether by alternate power plants or improved piston engines.

The required advances will be the products of research. Research is the product of ideas. Even unlimited sums of money do not assure the needed ideas.

Research is to manufacturing as prospecting is to mining. In research it is our business to explore, to learn, to know and to understand. Design for production comes later and is a different matter entirely.

In research we seek to prove that there are no laws of nature that prohibit what we wish to do. Making a production prototype is quite another matter.

The researcher makes apparatus which can be made to work in a laboratory. The production engineer strives to make devices which will not fail. An automobile, for example, which is produced in volume, not only must operate properly, but it must continue to function over a long period of time even when used under adverse conditions or not properly maintained.

To attain even lower levels of emissions of new vehicles we have intensive, parallel programs involving development of alternate forms of automotive power and improvements of the internal combustion engine.

There is no one, quick answer to the total problem. It will take contributions from many design parameters to minimize emission from any power source.

Now, let us look at the work we are doing on alternate power plants. Specifically, these include continuous combustion engines—that is gas turbines, steam and Stirling engines—as well as electric power systems and hybrids, which are combinations of two or more power plants.

Continuous combustion engines offer the opportunity for more complete, steady and, therefore, more precisely controlled combustion. They can be designed to have reductions perhaps 80 to 95 percent below the emission level of the 1960-level uncontrolled internal combustion engine. This is an emission level to which the internal combustion engine can be reduced by further improvement.

One of the most promising continuous combustion engines is the gas turbine. Our gas turbine research dates back 20 years and has included experimental trucks, buses, and the first gas turbine automobile in the United States, built and tested in 1953.

For the immediate future, a gas turbine engine is scheduled for production by our Detroit Diesel Engine Division for trucks, buses and stationary applications. This power plant, aimed at the heavy vehicle market, will be a relative of the experimental gas turbine developed by the Research Laboratories a number of years ago. The GM turbine-powered bus will have an automatic transmission comparable to those in present buses rather than a manual shift.

While research indicates that the turbine is much better suited to the requirements of trucks and buses, we are working on designs for passenger cars, too. Disadvantages of the turbine for passenger cars in the present state of development include poor fuel economy and inadequate response in traffic.

One possible limitation on mass production feasibility of the gas turbine for passenger cars is the fact that a major required material

is not available in sufficient abundance. Present turbine engine components require large amounts of nickel, perhaps more nickel than present free world availability. However, we are continuing to search for new designs and more available materials that could make this low emission engine practical for production automobiles.

As to steam engines, interest in research and development has been running high. Government-sponsored programs for the testing of steam-engine buses are underway in Dallas and San Francisco. At General Motors, we also have had a number of steam engine research and development programs in progress.

We exhibited two working steam engine test vehicles last summer at a "Progress of Power" exhibit. We are continuing to do experimental work with them.

One is a Chevrolet Chevelle, powered by a steam engine designed and installed by Besler Developments Inc. The second car, a Pontiac Grand Prix, contains an engine designed and constructed at the GM Research Laboratories.

We have found that size, cost, fuel consumption, serious lubrication problems and weight are formidable obstacles—not to mention the cold weather freezing problem.

An external combustion engine, the Stirling, is quiet, vibration free, and about twice as efficient as the steam engine.

The GM Research Laboratories have done development work on Stirling Engines over the last 12 years. Our experimental hybrid Stirling-electric car, the Stir-Lec II, features a battery-powered electric drive system with the 8-horsepower Stirling engine driving an alternator for battery charging.

At its present state of development, the Stirling is bulky, heavy, complex and expensive. It requires materials not readily available in quantity, and both durability and maintainability are unknown. Our current research is directed toward designing lighter, smaller, less costly engines.

In addition to our work on petroleum-burning engines, General Motors has several active programs on electro-chemical energy converters and electric drives. We demonstrated our Electroair II and other battery-powered cars at our "Progress of Power" exhibit. These vehicles, built as prototypes to gain more definitive answers in our research, were the products of several years of investigation into various electric drive vehicles. The Electroair II, successor to Electroair I built in 1963, was demonstrated in Washington in 1967 in connection with a Congressional hearing.

Our intensive investigations of the electric car have shown that the major advantage of this vehicle is reduction of air polluting emissions.

We have researched and built a limited application or short range "shopper" vehicle—something between our compact-sized Electroair II and a golf cart. Although slightly smaller than most electric cars built today, its performance characteristics are similar to those of other electric vehicles.

A vehicle of this type would be used almost exclusively for local shopping, driving to a commuter station, various short-distance community errand-type driving and other limited range transportation tasks.

A number of limitations compared to current all-purpose cars—at the present state of battery development—are imposed by this type of electric vehicle. For example:

Top speeds range up to approximately 45 miles per hour.

This poses a safety hazard if such vehicles are intermixed with larger cars on urban expressways and comparable roads where constant speeds of 40 miles and more per hour are maintained.

Besides initial cost, replacement of batteries approximately every two years could

be expected to cost in the area of \$200 in today's market.

Cold weather and passenger compartment heating would place heavy burdens on performance. Battery performance deteriorates in cold climates. At zero degrees Fahrenheit, a lead-acid battery will deliver only about 60 percent of the driving range and peak power than it would at 80 degrees.

A "shopper" that has a range of 40 miles on an 80 degree day would be cut back to a range of 24 miles on a zero degree day if the heater were not used, and only 12 miles if the heater were used.

In our battery work, we are faced with an age-old problem. For vehicular propulsion, a battery must deliver high power for acceleration and hill climbing, and it must offer high energy storage for traveling long distances. The lead-acid battery provides enough power but inadequate range. Fuel cell characteristics are just the opposite and the other concepts fall in between. Cost, size, weight and availability of materials represent a continuing challenge.

No one has yet produced a battery which meets all the requirements. We are continuing development work on some of the most promising contenders. One of these is the zinc-air battery, which has about three to five times the range performance of the lead-acid battery.

In addition, we are studying the lithium-chlorine cell. It has more than adequate power and the energy storage capacity is 10 to 15 times greater than a lead-acid system. However, it operates at extremely high temperatures in the neighborhood of 1200 degrees Fahrenheit. Vehicular application is still many miles down the road.

One major electric vehicle problem in the New York area is the availability of adequate power. As you know, problems related to both air and thermal pollution have limited the utilities in expanding economical power availability. Power supplies are expected to be so tight in the summer of 1971 in New York, according to a recent report in *Business Week*, that the utility company is said to be planning to mount emergency power generators on barges around Manhattan Island. Nationally, utility companies are expected to increase generating capacity fourfold by 1990 just to meet normal demand. This expansion does not provide for capacity that would be needed to recharge batteries of electric vehicles.

In addition to problems related to potential inadequacy of power supply in some locations, shifting motorists from present passenger cars to electric vehicles could produce side-effect problems. True, use of battery-powered vehicles would eliminate auto emissions.

However, generating additional electric power to charge the batteries could result in increased pollutants emitted by stationary sources.

In summary, some of the various alternate power plants that we are investigating have more promise than others in certain respects and our development programs on these concepts will continue. However, in view of the apparent shortcoming of these alternate power plants in various respects, we have continued to work intensively on further development of the internal combustion engine. We will now reveal this work.

Our programs in General Motors to provide additional reductions of emissions from the internal combustion engine have produced most encouraging results. We have been able to obtain very low emission levels with experimental engines in the laboratory.

Exhaust manifold reactors are one of the routes to still lower emissions from the internal combustion engine. Basically, these are large volume exhaust manifolds from two to four times the size of conventional manifolds. These are devices to consume gases in the exhaust. Their effectiveness depends upon

the temperature that can be maintained and how long the exhaust gases mixed with additional air can be kept at the elevated temperature.

Extremely low levels of emission compared to even the currently controlled emissions have been obtained. This effectiveness is offset by a number of problems which we are trying to solve. The principal problem is that of a material. We need heat-resistant material that is longer lasting than any available today.

Another system also involves enlarged manifolds but does not require added air and does not have the fuel economy penalties and high temperature material problems of the previously described reactors. However, these lean-fuel manifolds do not produce as low emission levels, and there are difficulties in providing satisfactory engine operation.

We have actively conducted efforts to apply catalytic control to exhaust emissions—an effort started in the middle 1950's. To date we have been unsuccessful with any catalyst if the gasoline fuel contains lead. The catalysts are rendered inert in a relatively short mileage when leaded gasoline is used.

Our work now is concentrated on catalysts for use with unleaded fuels. We have found that this approach is very effective in further reducing emissions from the internal combustion engines.

Congressman PODELL. May I interrupt you just for one moment. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the attempts of progress that have been made by General Motors.

In going through the hearings for the Committee on Commerce, I detected that it was first brought to light some 17 years ago, and that is practically 1953, when the question of pollutants in the air had been destroying our environment, derived to a certain extent from the emissions of the internal combustion engine.

Do you know what else was created in 1953? It was the space program, and in those 17 years we have put a man on the Moon, and I tell you, sir, it is difficult for me to be persuaded that the automotive industry has devoted itself in these 17 years to trying to improve their internal combustion engine and get one as emission free as possible, when in 17 years we created the entire space program.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. You may continue.

Dr. CHENEY. However, this success has been attained with precious metal catalysts which require materials limited in availability. Problems of catalyst durability and temperature control must also be solved.

A number of other techniques for emission improvement have been developed which show promise as an aid in attaining lower emissions. These involve combustion chamber design, fuel injection, valve timing optimization and exhaust gas recirculation.

Our studies and experience with these experimental systems have indicated that an improved piston engine has the potential to provide the same very low level of emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrous oxides achievable with the gas turbine, steam or Stirling engine.

As a result, selection among these power plants for future production will be based upon characteristics other than emission level. Further, we believe on the basis of the problems yet to be solved that we will be able to achieve a production version of the improved piston engine earlier in time than any of the alternate power plants.

This makes it clear that we must continue to develop the improved piston engine if we are not to delay the advent of still lower emission level automobiles.

Considering all the relative advantages and disadvantages of the various power

plants which might be used in automobiles, the internal combustion engine offers at present the best pollution control value. All of the potential power plants must be measured against each other on the basis of emission level potential and value—in all its aspects—to the owner of the car.

We would like to make it absolutely clear that General Motors has an open mind as to power plants for automobiles and will continue to explore all possible alternatives.

Recently, we demonstrated to many scientists and others interested in power plant development some of the latest results of our continuing investigation of various possible forms of automotive power.

We showed examples of working, experimental propulsion systems at a "Progress of Power" exhibit at our Technical Center near Detroit. These experimental designs still under investigation included both alternate power plants and improved internal combustion engines. We are continuing our work to develop these laboratory prototypes toward manufacturing feasibility.

A booklet containing copies of reports on these various power plants is submitted with this statement.

We invite you to visit the GM Technical Center to see these vehicles and, more importantly, the work we are doing in emission control research and engineering.

All the gasoline-burning engine approaches reviewed previously have important fuel composition requirements if we are to achieve maximum control of emissions.

The most important of these is the elimination of lead from gasoline. Lead creates several problems, such as making exhaust manifold reactors less effective and destroying effectiveness of catalysts.

Use of leaded gasoline rather than gasoline without lead may also cause greater emission control deterioration with accumulation of mileage due to combustion chamber deposits. Also, lead deposits form rapidly in some of the narrow passages which form a major part of some contemplated control systems.

Recently, various government agencies have indicated interest in eventual control of particulates from automobiles. By far, the major share of such particulates are lead or lead products. If significant reduction in these particulate levels is to be achieved, lead must be removed from gasoline.

We have talked so far about the automobile and what we have done and what we are trying to do with respect to auto emissions.

As we go further down the road, reduction of car emissions to an acceptable level would solve only the automotive emission segment of the total air pollution problem.

We are confronted with far-reaching air quality problems that will not be solved even with reduction of auto emissions to zero. This is a fact beyond question. Air pollution will not go away just by restricting auto emissions.

Now let us turn to the data on metropolitan New York's atmospheric pollution problems.

There have been a variety of opinions expressed as to the sources of the metropolitan area's polluted air. Admittedly, the automobile is a contributor to the problem.

There is a tendency to measure gross tonnage and place equal value on all the various types of pollution tonnage in the atmosphere. This type of assessment is misleading.

The tonnage figures should be weighted by the potential harm to health that any given type of pollutant will produce. Even this does not give adequate recognition to time concentration or dosage.

Nevertheless, if we use assessments of the toxicity of the various types of pollutants to modify the tonnage, we obtain a more factual picture of the importance of the individual pollutants in a city's atmospheric problems.

Pollutants present in metropolitan atmos-

pheres include hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, nitrous oxides, sulfur oxides and particulates.

On a tonnage basis slightly over 50 percent of the metropolitan air pollutant volume is attributable to automobiles.

Because carbon monoxide is the largest tonnage pollutant emitted to the metropolitan atmosphere, it is often assumed that this is the principal metropolitan area pollution problem. Since most of the carbon monoxide comes from automobiles, it is further assumed that the automobile is the major cause of this area's pollution problem.

According to government figures, carbon monoxide is far less significant in terms of potential harmful health effect than are many other pollutants.

If potential health harm of these individual pollutants is considered as well as tonnage, the relative importance of present levels of carbon monoxide in the atmosphere becomes much less. Rather than being responsible for more than 50 percent of the problem, automobile emissions become less than ten percent of the metropolitan air pollution problem.

We think this type of assessment is important in keeping in proper perspective the relative role of the automobile in contributing to harmful pollution. This does not mean, of course, that we believe there should be any relaxation in efforts to control emissions from the automobile, but it does mean that the government at all levels should at all times keep the total problem in mind.

Thus, it follows that regardless of the improvements in automobile power plants, air pollution will continue to be a problem and will continue to concern all citizens and governments for many years.

This is a by-product of our continuing urban growth, population growth and the proliferation of additional products that have their own role in atmospheric pollution. Just as we are dedicated to reducing auto emissions, General Motors supports all useful efforts to find solutions to other sources of atmospheric pollution. This is a big job, and all of us as good citizens must work toward the goal of cleaner air.

For our part, we have undertaken extensive projects to control emissions from our manufacturing facilities, as well as emissions from the cars we produce.

The criteria established in studies of what represents suitable air quality should become the basis for control standards with which automobile manufacturers and all other contributors would comply, taking into account both technological and economic feasibility.

The automobile industry can perform most effectively in reducing emission levels if stable standards are set sufficiently far in advance to allow time for development of an optimum approach to solution of the problem.

In closing, let me assure you that General Motors will do its part in the effort to find means to reduce automotive pollutants. We are working hard to develop alternate power plants. We believe, on the basis of our work, however, that the internal combustion engine currently is the best overall power plant in terms of all value considerations.

It is our firm conviction that auto emissions will diminish satisfactorily, and we are determined to eliminate the contribution of the automobile from the list of significant pollutant sources.

Thank you.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Chenea. You have suggested that you have been testing the gas turbine ever since 1953, that for the last 12 years you have been developing the Stirling engine as well as various other forms of propulsion. You have not, however, stated when any of this research will come to fruition and you will have in production an automobile with a pollution free engine.

Must we wait another ten or fifteen years?

Dr. CHENEVA. The—as I stated before, Mr. Congressman, the air pollution standards, which are proposed for '75, will eliminate 95% of the hydrocarbons from automobiles when compared to pre-control days. We expect to meet and we can meet these with the internal combustion engine—and will.

We think that the internal combustion engine at this level, will have exactly the same low emissions that you are going to get from other engines.

All of our research indicates this. In addition, the internal combustion engine has many other desirable performance characteristics that these engines do not have.

Consequently, this seems to be the quickest and most effective way to get to these standards as we see the problem.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chenea, you have only talked about one of the three major pollutants, hydrocarbons. You have not mentioned carbon monoxide or oxides of nitrogen.

Dr. CHENEVA. Yes. First let me speak in regard to carbon monoxide, the difference in emissions between any of the petroleum burning engines—the turbine, the steam engine, the sterling, or the internal combustion engine, fully controlled, appear to be the same. The situation is not quite the same with regard to nitrogen oxide. We do not know, for example, how to get a gas turbine as low as we can get the internal combustion engine, on nitrogen oxide.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. I understand that there have been producers of automobile engines, I do not believe internal combustion in California who have been able to meet the standards that the California State Legislature has set for low pollution autos, namely 5 grams hydrocarbon, twelve grams of carbon monoxide and 1.0 grams per mile of oxide of nitrogen. Would you care to comment on the prospects of the internal combustion engine meeting these standards?

Dr. CHENEVA. I know the standards of which you speak, and we can meet these in the laboratories too, with individual vehicles. Our problem is to develop the necessary hardware that can be reproduced in manufacturing mass production techniques before we put it out on the street. This is a much different matter than mass production.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chenea, I understand in a report to the California Air Researchers Board, its technical advisors committee, on emissions after 1974, its technical advisory committee has suggested that you will be in a position to meet these standards set by the California Legislature for the 1975 model auto.

Do you have any comment on that?

Dr. CHENEVA. We have every intention of meeting the requirement in California and in any other State of the union. We are committed to meet the requirements as they are established.

Congressman FARBERSTEIN. Do you believe you will be able to meet these standards for mass production by 1975?

Dr. CHENEVA. We believe so and that is our intention.

Congressman PODELL. What is your reaction in this new development that you are talking about as to noise pollution? Will it have the same effect of a diminishing noise pollution? I am told that the steam type engine would have a much lower noise level and obviously the electric will.

How about this engine you are talking about?

Dr. CHENEVA. The Stirling?

Congressman PODELL. The one that you are talking about.

Dr. CHENEVA. We will also meet the noise requirements, and incidentally noise is a serious problem and rightfully so, I think, the noise is a serious problem and we are meeting noise regulations as they are coming up. The gas turbine is only a quiet engine

if you have a regenerator or a recuperator, of some kind, otherwise it is an extremely noisy engine as anybody knows who has ever been to an airport.

Congressman PODELL. I would like to say this to you. I for one believe that our major corporations have as well as the profit motive in mind, the motive or the feelings of the people that they serve. I think they go hand in hand. You are not going to make profits, I am sure you know, if you are not going to satisfy the public. Certainly I believe that you are going to do what you possibly can.

Somehow, however, I, as a resident of this great city of ours, feel that enough hasn't been done in the past. I think that the automotive industry should have done this a long, long time ago. They see the handwriting on the wall. I am only concerned about things from your point of view. I think you are going to have a big problem for yourself. I don't think 1975 is early enough. I think you got to get on this thing immediately, today, tomorrow, and all you have to do is try driving around in my own neighborhood where I live, which is a residential area. It is not a ghetto area. It is a residential area. Drive around there and see what the air is like, where the kids can't play in the streets, because the smog and the level of pollutants in the air are so bad, so I can only say I think you have got to reemphasize your priorities and get this job done a lot longer than before 1975.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chenea, you have just stated that you expect by 1975 you can have an automobile which will meet the proposed California air pollution standards. Can you give me any idea of how much it will cost to meet those standards?

Dr. CHENEA. Mr. Congressman, I cannot, because the final cost of that automobile has not been established. There are several alternatives, and I cannot give you that. I am sorry I do not have it.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Can you furnish that for the record, a statement as to what those whom in authority say will be the additional cost of producing an air-pollution-free automobile, whether it be with the internal combustion engine or whether it be with an alternative engine?

Dr. CHENEA. I do not have it with me. Congressman FARBSTEIN. I understand that, but will you furnish for this record, within the near future, the answer to my question?

Dr. CHENEA. Yes. Mr. Congressman, may I add that the implication has been made that the automobile industry is not working on this problem, that we are going to wait to work on it until 1975, or shortly prior to that. We have been working on this problem and it is a very difficult problem, very hard, ever since it was first recognized by this company, and the public as a whole, and the automotive industry really recognized this problem about the same time.

Since this time, our efforts have led to the many things that we have done to minimize the emissions coming out of an automobile, and I said before that we plan to meet every specification, every requirement, with vehicles that we produce.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Dr. Chenea, do you have any idea as to costs for any phase of this improvement?

Dr. CHENEA. No, I do not. My job is the research laboratory. I am not a production man.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Don't you have anybody here in the room who is able to testify in connection with costs?

I would like to know how much your company has spent for research and development in connection with low emission engines. Are you able to testify to that, or is there anybody else in the room who is able to testify to that point on behalf of General Motors?

Dr. CHENEA. I can tell you how much we spent for research.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Break it down, please, for years, if you are able to do so.

Dr. CHENEA. It doesn't vary that much from year to year. The average over the last three years has been in the neighborhood of \$30 to \$40 million.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. A year?

Dr. CHENEA. A year. I think the last three years totaled something over \$125 million, for research and development efforts on emissions or alternate power plants. In research laboratories it is our present trend to turn away from working on the internal combustion engine, with more emphasis on the alternate power plant, because we knew less about them. At the moment we are spending half again as much on alternative power plants as we are on the internal combustion engine.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You say you are spending approximately 30 million dollars a year?

Dr. CHENEA. I said 30 to 40 million. Congressman FARBSTEIN. For the purpose of developing pollution free internal combustion engine; is that correct?

Dr. CHENEA. Yes, I want to make sure you understand that such an amount is spent each year.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Can you break down that 40 million dollars insofar as the number of researchers you have, and what you are spending for each project that goes to make up that 30 or 40 million dollars?

Let me put it to you this way. How many people do you have doing full-time research on the creation of a pollution free internal combustion engine?

Dr. CHENEA. Approximately 1400 people in the corporation working on the internal combustion engine and alternative power plants.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Are they responsible for the cost of which you speak?

Dr. CHENEA. This is their primary duty. Congressman FARBSTEIN. And they are full-time researchers?

Dr. CHENEA. They are researchers and engineers working on the development of a solution to this problem.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Do they have any other duty besides working on air pollution control?

Dr. CHENEA. No significant other duties. Although we have many men who devote full time to emissions control work, several times that number work part of their time on important segments of the problem. Thus, our total effort, in terms of men working full time, was developed by combining the pollution control efforts of each man into the computed total figure which I gave.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Do you expect to be able to greatly reduce the amount of all pollution from the automobiles before 1975, or must we wait until then to obtain a relatively clean internal combustion engine?

Dr. CHENEA. We are meeting the 1970 standards now. We will meet the 1971 and 1972 standards, which are lower, and we will also meet the '74 and '75 standards. The production is going on now and the automobile emissions are going down. It isn't a matter of doing nothing until 1975.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Are you doing any research on alternative engines?

Dr. CHENEA. Which kind of engines? Congressman FARBSTEIN. Alternative to the internal combustion engine.

Dr. CHENEA. As I mentioned, sir, we have programs on gas turbine, on the steam engine, and on the Stirling engine, as well as electrical power plant.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Please break down the relative amounts of money that you are spending for research for each of these different types of engines?

Dr. CHENEA. That I cannot do. I don't have the figures with me. I do, however, have figures on effort in terms of people,

numbers of people assigned, and they are not appreciably different. They are about equal.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. What do you mean they are about equal? Do you mean that the sum of money—spent for researching the internal combustion engine annually is the same as that spent by the various alternative engines?

Dr. CHENEA. No, we are now spending 50 percent more money on alternative power plants as a whole, than we are spending on the internal combustion engine, and among the alternative power plants, the distribution of efforts is roughly equal.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Will you please provide for the record the sum of money you are spending for producing a pollution-free engine, breaking down the sums you are spending for each type of engine, for the record?

Dr. CHENEA. No. Congressman FARBSTEIN. I have no further questions.

I appreciate your coming here voluntarily and at your own expense.

You will return to the stand subsequent to the testimony of the panel on technology?

Dr. CHENEA. Sir, as you know, we have to testify tomorrow before the duly-constituted clean air committee, and I think we will have to leave because of the weather.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I will now call upon the panelists who will testify on the effects of air pollution on health.

I will call their names and those of you present please sit at the table.

Dr. Steven Ayres, Mr. William Cruce, Leonard Greenberg, and Austin Heller.

I guess Mr. Greenberg would not find it possible to be here. I want to thank you other gentlemen for your kindness and thoughtfulness in coming here this morning to give us the benefit of your expertise in connection with the effects of air pollution from the automobile on human health.

After you have each finished testifying, if there are any comments on any statement made by any of the other panelists, I shall be pleased to hear you.

You may commence, Dr. Ayres.

(Stephen M. Ayres, M.D.: Associate attending in Department of Medicine, New York University Medical Center; Former Chairman, Manhattan Action for Clean Air Committee; Member, U.S. Surgeon General's Subcommittee on Cardiovascular Aspects of Smoking and Health and the Medical Advisory Committee, New York City Department of Air Pollution Control.)

Dr. AYRES. Thank you very much. I would like to merely introduce this panel by saying that the health of our nation today is really exposed to at least two environmental time bombs. I am referring to the cigarette and the internal combustion engine. I will limit my remarks to the internal combustion engine, but I would like to point out the striking parallels between the composition of automobile exhaust and the cigarettes.

I would like to question public policy which has been the same and use of food sweeteners, the cyclamates, on relatively weaker data, that exists for the air pollutants.

That law, the requirement states that if any adverse affect is demonstrated for a food additive, it is not permitted. The evidence is quite weak with the cyclamates. The evidence that all of the pollutants that we discussed today caused considerable damage in experimental animals as well as in humans, is quite compelling, and I would like to just draw that parallel. I think in terms of factual presentation I would like to point out that the pollutants that were discussed, the oxides of nitrogen, turn out to be the only way in which one can produce the disease emphysema in the experimental animal. Emphysema is one hears and reads about more today. One can produce in the

experimental animal an illness that looks exactly like human emphysema merely by the feeding of the oxides of nitrogen for 20 to 30 weeks. Again, I would stress this is a common disease, and I think it is very suggestive that the increase in automotive pollution is related to this.

The other pollutant I should mention very briefly, discussed widely, is carbon monoxide, to point out that the major impact of carbon monoxide is its effect on brain tissue and on heart tissue, and I would like to caution you in reading experimental evidence to not become interested in the effects of carbon monoxide on a healthy dog or human being who is healthy, but to consider what happens to the 50 percent of us in the room with coronary diseases, and it is this rather susceptible group of our population that we have recently appropriated a review of the available health literature on the subject, and I will make this available to you and other members of the committee, and I will merely conclude by saying that the medical evidence that automotive exhaust is harmful is inescapable, and I thank you for calling this hearing.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you.

Mr. Cruse.

(William Cruse: Rockefeller University, neurophysiology studies, lectured widely in New York and testified before legislative bodies; Member Air Pollution Committee, Scientist Committee on Public Information (will be testifying as a representative of the Committee).)

Mr. CRUSE. Congressman Farbstein, today for lack of time, I am going to focus my attention to one specific example of auto pollution. It is pollutant levels from which we can project the future health effects. After trying for two years we finally obtained National Air Pollution Control Administration in 1967. This was a study of carbon monoxide levels in the George Washington Bridge Apartments, which is located above the 12-lane interstate highway 95.

The study found that over a period of two weeks in the summer of 1967 the carbon monoxide levels inside a third-floor apartment averaged 14 parts per million (ppm) on a 24-hour basis. This may be compared with an average level of 15 ppm measured on a heavily traveled street in midtown Manhattan during a business day (9 a.m. to 7 p.m. at 110 East 45th Street).

The levels at both locations exceed New York State's tentative Ambient Air Quality Objectives for carbon monoxide (An 8-hour average of 15 ppm or higher should be exceeded no more than 15 percent of the time on an annual basis). Exposure to such levels of carbon monoxide for a short time may cause temporary impairment of certain mental abilities (visual and time discrimination) by starving the brain of oxygen. The long-term medical effects of exposure to these levels of carbon monoxide are not known, but (based on studies at higher levels) they may show up as damage to the brain and heart, the two organs of the body most sensitive to oxygen deprivation. Lead is another air pollutant from automobile exhaust (it was not measured in this study) and it may act synergistically (more than additive) with carbon monoxide to deprive the body of oxygen. Nitrogen dioxide is a third major automotive air pollutant (also not measured in this study) and long-term exposure to it (based on studies at higher levels) may lead to lung damage, thus indirectly depriving the body of oxygen.

The Scientists' Committee for Public Information, Inc. has already called attention to the possible health dangers which automotive pollutants pose to workers in the Queens-Manhattan and Brooklyn-Battery Tunnels. These workers are exposed to slightly higher levels of automotive exhaust than are people living in the George Washington Bridge Apartments, but they are only

exposed for relatively short periods of four to eight hours. In the George Washington Bridge Apartments we have the first known instance in which large numbers of people are being subjected continuously to high levels of automotive pollutants in their homes.

The city, state, and Federal Governments should conduct a long-term medical study of the inhabitants of the George Washington Bridge Apartments (coupled with a more extensive measure of the levels of all air pollutants in and around the apartments). Such a study would be of value in the planning of future "air rights construction" over highways; it would also yield valuable data on long-term exposure to automotive air pollution which might tell us something about what to expect from exposure to automotive air pollution at lower levels in the general urban environment.

Since the high pollution level in the George Washington Bridge Apartments is a direct result of the new "air-rights construction" above a highway, there should be a halt in the construction of any additional buildings above highways until completion of the above medical study. For example, there should be a change in the plans to build the Herbert H. Lehman High School in the Bronx above the heavily trafficked intersection of East Tremont Avenue and the Hutchinson River Parkway.

"Air Rights construction" above highways will probably never be advisable from a health point of view until the internal combustion engine is eliminated from the vehicles on our highways or until its pollution emissions are dramatically reduced. A third possibility would be to completely cover over highways under an "air rights development" making them in effect a large tunnel. This would tremendously increase the cost of such construction and would still leave us with the larger problem of dumping the tunnel air into the general urban atmosphere.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you very much. I would like to thank you for testifying. The record will include the qualifications of each panelist and let me assure you all of these gentlemen are truly qualified to testify in the fashion they are.

I will now call on Mr. Austin Heller, the Commissioner of Air Pollution Control for New York City.

(Austin Heller: Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, New York City.)

Commissioner HELLER. I am very gratified that Congressman Farbstein has convened this panel, and pleased to be able to share with you some details of the New York City experience in pollution control. During the past three years we have had great success in controlling sulfur dioxide and particulates, and we have the capacity to reduce automotive pollution. The important thing is that we act now. The problem is already severe, and we cannot afford to wait twenty years for a pollution-free vehicle.

Each weekday morning, some 700,000 vehicles enter Manhattan's central business district below 60th Street. In the City's five boroughs almost four million gallons of gasoline are burned daily, because of the lack of evaporative controls on existing motor vehicles, it is estimated that about 100,000 gallons of gasoline are lost into the atmosphere each day as waste products, for an economic loss to New Yorkers of \$10 million annually. This does not include an additional loss of unburned hydrocarbons due to engine inefficiency.

As of September 1969, the annual motor vehicle emissions in New York City were estimated to be: CO, 1,370,000 Tons/yr; HC, 159,000 Tons/yr; NOX, 50,500 Tons/yr; Pb, 2,000 Tons/yr.

However, these emissions are not evenly distributed across the City. They are concentrated in midtown and lower Manhattan.

Our measurements show that carbon monoxide concentrations relate directly to local traffic congestion. For example at peak hours of traffic volume, usually between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., weekdays, the carbon monoxide concentrations at 45th Street and Lexington Avenue regularly exceed the recommended New York State standard for an eight-hour average of 15 ppm.

Concentrations of other pollutants associated with auto exhaust such as nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons and lead appear to follow the same pattern.

In meeting the problem of automotive pollution, we can make both behavioral changes, such as re-routing traffic, and technological changes. Today, I am going to speak about the latter.

The "Clean Air Package" mandated on all 1968-1969 cars, and proposed changes for 1970 are steps in the right direction. It is important, however, to point out that it will take until 1973 for 50% of all vehicles on the streets of New York City to be equipped with a control device. And not until 1979 are all cars expected to be operating with the device. This decade of change does not take into account the added burden from the increase of automobiles, about 2½% per year for the City as a whole. With no control for nitrogen oxides and lead, the air quality can be expected to deteriorate as a trade-off for questionable improvement of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons in New York City's atmosphere.

If control devices are not adopted to reflect local conditions and local problems, they can have an opposite effect from that intended, for example, a national survey of taxi fleets reveals that in some cities, including Los Angeles, the clean air package required by current Federal standards has increased gas mileage by 15%. In New York City, due to congestion and stop-and-go driving patterns, the same control device has reduced mileage by 10%.

The excess gasoline attributable to the clean air package in New York taxis is about five million gallons, annually, for an industry loss of over \$1 million. Because the Clean Air Package does not control NOx or lead, the excess gasoline is adding, at least, 1,000 tons of NOx and 13,000 pounds of lead to the New York City atmosphere each year.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Mr. Heller, I take it you do not agree with the recent statement by Chrysler's Chief Engineer, Charles M. Hyman, that the battle against air pollution has been won, that air pollution from automobiles has been brought to acceptable levels, and that further reductions are not necessary.

Commissioner HELLER. I disagree.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Mr. Heller, because of time and my need to get back to Washington, I would appreciate if you would insert the rest of the statement in the record.

Commissioner HELLER. Congressman Farbstein, I do appreciate the time element, but I would just like to, for the record, make a point about what Mr. Cruse said with respect to New York City.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Please, just a few seconds.

Commissioner HELLER. First of all, I want to make it clear that we have under way now a comprehensive urban extensive study to define the problem of highway design and its effect on the environment. This is an inter-agency study with a cost of about \$200,000. We are underway with that now.

The Department of Highways of the State of New York, the Department of Transportation in the City of New York, our own department, and the Bureau of Public Roads, are all involved. I think this is a very important piece that ought to be on the record.

In deciding on alternatives to the present internal combustion engine, we are faced with both short and long-term choices. We must begin testing other vehicle systems now

In order to establish an orderly base for change. We can begin to convert to non-leaded gasoline, which will eliminate lead emissions and improve engine operations. Use of non-leaded gasoline with a catalytic muffler will also reduce CO and HC emissions. If the Clean Air Package is removed from the non-leaded gasoline/catalytic muffler combination, and if exhaust gas re-circulation is incorporated, there may be additional benefits by reducing NOX perhaps to 300 ppm.

LPG and CNG have attractive potential, but today they are not readily available within the city and the systems appear to be costly. Steam and electric vehicles are also available today. Prototypes can be built within six to eight months if funding can be provided. These systems must be tested to demonstrate total feasibility. New York City is about to do just this in a comprehensive test program. Our program includes both steam and electric powered motor vehicles, plus conventional but gaseous fueled (LPG, CNG and LNG) motor vehicles. We intend to test these vehicles over a two-year period.

We have had many studies and much talk, but no major demonstration of how low or non-polluting motor vehicles can be placed into the urban system.

The time for action is now. We at the local level are committed to do our part. We now ask you at the Federal level to make a similar commitment. This would include:

1. Accelerated development of low pollution vehicles, with a target of five years, certainly not 20 years;
2. Major changes in strategy to meet the pressing urban situation, where the major problem lies, and
3. Allocation of monies and personnel to achieve these objectives, and
4. Monies for mass urban transit systems commensurate with the expenditures for Federal highway construction.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. If you gentlemen seek to react to any statement made by any of the health experts, you may do so. Let's bring this sort of in a panel thought.

Mr. CRUSE. I have a number of questions. I will try to keep them short. One, I would like to ask Commissioner Heller, if there are any plans for medical studies, along with the study of highways?

Commissioner HELLER. Yes, there is. We work very closely with the National Air Pollution Control Administration, in which we will join them in doing an evaluation of our urban expressway study. I would just like to also make another point, Mr. Cruse, that we do have available, and I am sure you will have no problem seeking it out, carbon monoxide levels in the City, which we have monitored for the past year, at ten of our stations on a continuous basis.

We have at the same time carried out rather extensive carbon monoxide and lead studies in the City, and our carbon monoxide study was carried out in five states, as you know. We have just finished doing some work on estimating and determining what the lead levels are at 45th and Lexington. In the document that I am going to submit for the record that information is available.

Mr. CRUSE. I am not criticizing you, Mr. Heller.

Commissioner HELLER. I understand, but I just wanted it to be clear that the information about the atmosphere with respect to carbon monoxide and lead is an area we are actively engaged in.

Mr. AYRES. I may mention one other thing that is underway, and these are the men that work in tunnels, and this is a good study. One might point out that it looks like, from Commissioner Heller's study, that the pollution level may be as high or higher in the plazas outside the tunnel. These are not merely for the tunnel workers, but for those of us who have to sit in those areas for any time.

Mr. CRUSE. I have a series that I would like to direct to the gentlemen of GM.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Unfortunately, they have left. If you will send them to me, I will be pleased to forward them and include them in the record whether or not they are answered.

Mr. CRUSE. In written form?

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Yes, put them in written form and send them to me, and I will include them in the record, and we will send them on to General Motors.

If there are no further questions and comments, I would like to thank you gentlemen for coming here.

Next we have the gentlemen who are experts in low pollutant technology.

The gentlemen who will testify are Richard Morse, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Robert U. Ayres, vice-president, International Research and Technology Corporation, F. Smith Griswold, president, Seversky Environment Dynamics Research Associates, Wolfgang E. Meyer, Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Chairman, Traffic Safety Division.

Professor Morse, do you want to start this thing going by giving us the benefit of your knowledge, in connection with the various systems of propulsion, and how far the various automobile companies have gone in connection with developing them.

(Richard S. Morse: Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; former chairman Federal Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles; former assistant Secretary of the Army; former president, National Research Corporation.)

Mr. MORSE. You have asked for quite a long list.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I appreciate it. I may ask for more, but please proceed in your own manner.

Mr. MORSE. First, let me correct any impression that people may have that I am an academic student. I have spent most of my life in hardware, industrial and government. I got introduced to this pollution business during the Johnson Administration, when I was asked to head up the group with some 75 people with the executive branch of the government to look at the air pollution problem. We had a very good group. We had representatives from the three auto companies, associated with us, and this was an unpaid kind of public service activity for both industrial and academic people.

Most of my experience comes from that. I have been associated with two small companies, and another with a radical approach to battery problems. There were some remarks here which tended to oversimplify whose to blame in this business. We, as citizens, are to blame. The smoking problem is not the auto problem.

I don't care, Mr. Chairman, particularly, whether you or someone else smokes, that's up to you. I don't happen to smoke cigarettes, by choice, but the auto is a little bit different.

The average citizen doesn't worry about whether his car pollutes. He worries about whether the other fellow's car pollutes. I think Congress is to blame. We have been sitting around here discussing the space program, for example, and yet who has had the guts to stand up and recognize the great disparity, and our ability to allocate resources in this great country.

Don't think there is any fallout from the space program that is going to help solve this problem. That is not true. I think we are all to blame.

We, the citizens, are the blame, and I am delighted the young people are going to be involved in this.

Since the report I finished in '67, we reported to Senator Muskie and others, not much has happened.

General Motors today inaccurately mentioned the City of Dallas working on steam

buses, and that is not true. I was in Dallas yesterday. The company was originally involved in a program and abandoned a particular approach six months ago.

You hear a lot of things in newspapers about action. I think we should concern ourselves with not only re-allocation of some of the resources on the Federal level, who are not subscribing to Mr. Nader's comments on the Federal Government. I think we also should address ourselves to the organization in the Executive Branch. There is confusion in the department as to who has sole responsibility.

There is somewhat confusion. At the moment, we don't have, for example, an executive secretary in the Department of Transportation. The people there are very competent people, but they are overworked. We don't have the technical talent, the right talent to look at this in Washington.

With respect to the auto industry, it is a funny business, and I want to say at the outset that I don't think you can lump all the auto companies into the same category. My experience is that there is a considerable difference in management attitudes and technical ideas between some of them. They are in the business to make money, and I applaud that. On the other hand, it is a highly competitive business, in spite of the relatively high profits that some of them make.

They have not, I will admit, got on to the pollution problem as early as they should have. I do not know of any piece of material that is available today that was not available 15 years ago. I don't understand the members of General Motors not to pick on them. They mentioned 40 million dollars a year as I heard it, and 1100 people, and that comes out to 40,000 dollars per man. I can only conceive that that also includes their technicians in which case this means they have 3300 people.

If you take the national average of R and D in this country, that is a lot of people working on merely anti-pollution devices. I am amazed.

I think one of the things that we have to recognize of the auto industry, and this is true of other industries, is general innovative ideas come from outside the industry. This isn't just the auto industry. The business machine business did not develop Xerox. Kodak has developed very few tela processes. This is the way the country goes. Innovative ideas tend to come from outside the establishment.

Ford Motor Company has gone outside the organization to work with small companies, and I applaud this. I don't think in general the auto industry does research the way other companies do. They do things for effect, in many cases. Their approach is quite different than the chemical industry or the electronics industry.

It is inconceivable to me, for example, how a company, for example, can build liquid oxygen, towing the liquid oxygen with a 1700 pound van on it, and a sign that says "Don't smoke" on it. This is a poor way to do research. I don't think I would spend much of my money on a battery system, that ran on 1200 degrees—

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Who did that research?

Mr. MORSE. General Motors. This makes a pretty good rocket.

To do that on a small scale is good, but to rush into demonstrating this kind of animal is not the way the chemical research industry does things. I don't think we should be confused by the dollars of the 40 million mentioned. I think to be specific about technology, I think I would agree with General Motors, that we are not going to have a steam automobile right away.

On the other hand, if you take the costs, the cost, and you asked for this data, the cost of a low emitting engine is going to go up. If you project a steam car, for example,

against the current status of the IC engine, it will be far more competitive than General Motors will admit, and their is new technology—

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Excuse me, you say the steam engine will be more competitive than General Motors will admit insofar as the internal combustion engine?

Mr. MORSE. I am saying that we should not look at the internal combustion engine today, but the internal combustion engine that will have to be made to meet these standards. I believe right today steam buses would be excellent to have right here in New York City, for example.

Those are the general comments I have. Perhaps I have gone too long, but it is a funny kind of business. It is highly competitive, but I think the blame can be shared by us, the public, and those in Congress, as well as the auto industry.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you very much, Professor MORSE.

I bow my head as a member of Congress who has tried to do something in this area not very successfully because the public hasn't been made aware. They do not have the information on the effect upon health of the pollution produced by the internal combustion engine, or else they would demand either of their government, or their company that has produced these automobiles a radical change.

Mr. Lear, I read in the newspapers some days ago, said that the steam engine was not eminently feasible. Would you care to comment on his statement, after all, because he is supposedly a pretty good technician?

Mr. MORSE. Why do you say that?

Congressman FARBSTEIN. This at least is what I have read.

Mr. MORSE. I don't believe anything I read in the newspapers, and particularly about Mr. Lear. I think Dr. Ayres has some data he can give on that. I am indirectly familiar with Mr. Lear's steam engine design which has been abandoned. I know at least two or three other companies that have abandoned that idea a few years ago.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I read this several weeks ago, and you would think from Mt. Olympus has come the ultimate statement that it is not feasible. I am glad to have your statement on the record.

What company, if any, has done any research on steam technology?

Mr. MORSE. I think Dr. Ayres, perhaps, has had access to more companies than I have. I don't know. There is very little being done. We have a dozen or so inventors. We have a small group in Japan, two small companies in the Boston area and other companies around the world. There is very little really good advanced technology work under way in a corporate level, I would say in the steam auto field.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I understand that you and Dr. Ayres have taken this position in connection with alternatives to the internal combustion engine. I understand that the industry has said that alternatives are not feasible, but the three Federal panels, the Senate Committee and the California Legislature, who share only the fact that they are not connected to Detroit, can each come to the opposite conclusion from that of the auto industry. How do you account for this?

Mr. MORSE. I can't speak for the auto industry. The question one might ask is if I were running General Motors and was certain that alternatives to the IC engine was impossible, how would I spend so much money of stockholders' money that isn't a good answer, but it is an answer that one might suggest. Detroit is an industry unto itself in the R and D game. You find in new technical enterprises that those people won't work for General Motors. Who would want to continue to work on a Stirling cycle engine for 14 years and not see something happen with them. Good people like to be associated with suc-

cess. They like to be, and I want to say for the record that the young people today are the greatest group I have seen in our life. They don't want to work for General Motors. They want to be where something is happening. They want to see results for their activities.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You are suggesting that the purpose of the research of the automobile companies is to discourage the finding of an alternative engine to the internal combustion engine, and even to attain an engine that will free the atmosphere of pollution?

Mr. MORSE. I don't think I would say that, and I further want to say that I don't think you should lump all the four companies in the same area. They are doing R and D work. They have a long time before they can introduce an item to the consumer. They have constraints. People constraints, management constraints, and others.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. What do you think should be done?

Mr. MORSE. I think if the Federal Government would get itself organized to do some demonstration programs, I think that this would be the best incentive to show that some of these things will work, but at the present time, it is not being done, some of the patent clauses the Federal Government has is such that the good many really innovative companies wouldn't want to take Federal funding, and I think we are making progress.

It has been very slow, and it is late. I think you are going to find that some of our non-conventional engines, such as battery operated, one company I am familiar with within the last six months, steam, or hydrocarbon monoxide, or any other system, but these are going to come into the market something other than the Detroit monster. I think once this starts you will begin to prove this will work technically, and economically.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. In view of your knowledge of the industry, would you care to advance your opinion on which company is doing the most in the way of research, among the four large automobile companies. Who is spending the most money?

Mr. MORSE. I don't think I am competent to do that. I again want to caution you, don't get fooled with the money gain. Spending 40 million dollars a year can be just like putting it down the rathole, if you don't have good innovative people. Spending 10 million dollars on liquid hydrogens and liquid oxygen on an automobile which you couldn't legally drive through a tunnel is not my idea of well-spent money.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Would you say that any of the companies show any degree of innovativeness in connection with this?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Ford Company is in some areas.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. How about the others?

Mr. MORSE. I know when I was concerned with getting together a group of people on this study I did some years ago, and they were all very cooperative. They all offered people to serve with us, and they did, and they were very helpful.

The President of American Motors said there wasn't any reason for his people being on the panel because they weren't doing any research.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Dr. Ayres, would you tell us your connection with the auto pollution question and give us the benefit of what the auto industry is doing to solve this problem?

(Dr. Robert U. Ayres: Vice President, International Research and Technology Corporation; former technological-environmental specialist, Resources for the Future; member Hudson Institute, former theoretical physicist.)

Dr. ROBERT AYRES. Thank you, Congressman

Farbstein. My connection with this subject is primarily through a study that I was involved in sponsored by Resources for the Future, which is a non-profit research organization in Washington that you may be familiar with. This work was done at the same time, or perhaps a little earlier than some of the other panel reports that you mentioned.

It is roughly 18 months since hearings similar to these were held before the Senate Commerce Committee and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. The format was different but some of the casts are the same. The purpose of the earlier hearing was to determine whether or not steam or more accurately rankine vapor cycle engines might be possible low pollution alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

At those hearings—which Chrysler also boycotted—Ford and General Motors technical representatives testified variously that such engines would be unsafe, excessively complex, heavy and costly. Other witnesses disagreed, however, and two operating steam cars, built by individuals, with negligible resources, were there to underline the point.

During the following year there were three important events. First, the Commerce Committee Staff completed a study which reviewed the material brought out by the hearings, including additional submissions by Ford and General Motors and concluded nevertheless that a rankine cycle engine would be entirely satisfactory for automotive applications.

About the same time the Department of Transportation awarded two contracts for demonstrations of vapor cycle powered buses—one in Dallas and one sponsored by the California Legislature, the San Francisco Bay area. And, finally, the National Air Pollution Control Administration embarked on an R and D program to develop a rankine cycle engine powered automobile.

Both the DOT and HEW programs are moving along at a reasonable pace; with the results of the California bus demonstration project, with which I am most familiar, should be available within 18 months or two years. If it is too early to claim success, it is certainly much too early to claim that steam is dead, as some gentlemen from Detroit have been saying lately.

The reason given for this pessimism is that Bill Lear seems to have given up his highly publicized effort to develop a steam automobile after spending 5.5 million dollars in the quest. I don't suggest that Lear's was the most outstanding industrial achievement of the year—though he seems to be planning to sell \$25 million worth of stock on the strength of it. However, it is worth pointing out that Lear attempted to develop a totally new and unproved reciprocating engine design, and install it in an Indianapolis 500 car within nine months—even though something like a breakthrough in lubricants would have been needed to make the system work. When the lubrication breakthrough wasn't forthcoming in time, Lear discarded this engine altogether last spring, in favor of a vapor turbine.

Again, Lear gambled on quick success and again it didn't come off. Lear's latest plans represent still another major change in direction.

Since Bill Lear has been an outstandingly successful and innovative industrialist, one is inclined to give him the benefit of several doubts. He may have had good reasons for attempting to telescope the usual three or four-year development process into a matter of months.

However, eight months of effort, however intensive, isn't enough to prove that something can't be done—only that it can't be done in eight months. Even General Motors took longer than that to build a steam car from scratch, and General Motors would be

the first to admit that its prototype didn't incorporate any significant breakthroughs.

Notwithstanding Lear's experience no fact or analysis has come to my attention within the last 18 months to alter—except in minor detail—my statement at the previous hearings. In short, if the best current ranking cycle technology were put together—which has not been done—I regret to say—the resulting propulsion system would be compared to an internal combustion engine as follows:

1. Mechanically simpler (no clutch, transmission, starter, distributor, carburetor, fuel injection system, muffler, etc.).
2. Longer lived and more reliable.
3. More powerful for the size and weight.
4. Cheaper to operate.
5. Virtually pollution free.
6. Quiet.

Safety and start up time are simply not problems. I will comment in detail on elements of the system in response to questions, if any.

However, I want to anticipate one point which is sure to arise. Detroit witnesses always claim that a steam engine is less efficient than an internal combustion engine.

At the previous hearings Lawrence Hofstad, then vice president for Research of General Motors, said that the energy conversion efficiency of a steam engine would not be above 18 percent, whereas an internal combustion engine could achieve 25 percent to 30 percent.

While this statement might be true, if you specify the conditions of the test properly, it is totally misleading as applied to an operating vehicle in a typical urban driving pattern.

The internal combustion engine is quite efficient as long as it operates at optimum speed. However, in a vehicle it is constantly operating at speeds lower or higher than optimum; moreover operating the cooling system, air pumps, and pollution control equipment, muffler, automatic transmission, and so on eats up huge amounts of power.

In actual tests over a mentioned two hour and 40-minute route in and around Pittsburgh, the efficiency with which energy in the fuel was converted to power at the rear wheels of a standard automobile was 10.7 percent.

In New York City, I'd be surprised if taxis or cars exceed 8 or 9 percent on the average.

Against this, a steam engine which achieved 15 percent actual efficiency at the rear wheels, using cheap, lead-free fuel, would be a very great improvement.

I will be glad to comment further on any point, if questions arise.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** Just one question I want to ask of you, Dr. Ayres. Do you believe the production of 10,000 steam cars would be sufficient to make an operation self-sustaining?

**DR. AYRES:** That is hardly a question for a simple yes or no.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** Give me your best estimate. One is led to believe that unless a company can produce hundreds of thousands of automobiles they can't make a profit. In any event it has been suggested that the cost of producing steam engines would compare very favorably with internal combustion engines.

**DR. AYRES:** I would say first that it is certainly true that the size of the automobile companies now in the industry was not dictated by manufacturing economies, economies on the sale of manufacturing. It is dictated by considerations involving control of the markets.

In fact, as you well know, the auto companies have their factory distributed all over the place, and apparently the optimum size for a plant, in terms of the machine tools and that sort of investment, is of the order of production run of 10,000 or perhaps 100,-

000 per year, and it would be in that range, I think.

I am not, of course, a production expert, so you can probably get better answers from other people.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** Would you say it could be possible for a number of small companies to produce a steam car and still make a profit with the technology that we have today for building a steam car?

**DR. AYRES:** That depends on the marketing consideration. If they are up against General Motors and General Motors controls the marketing outlets they could not make a profit.

If, however, the bill that was recently submitted, both in the House and the Senate, which would provide for some purchases by the Federal Government, that is by the General Services Administration, Post Office, for low pollution vehicles, if that bill were passed and provided a guaranteed market for a vehicle which could meet the very low emission requirement, then I think it could certainly be profitable for some company to get into that business.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** I believe the State of California is paying a premium for pollution free vehicles; aren't they?

**DR. AYRES:** Yes, a law has been signed, and it would provide a market for about 700 vehicles a year.

**MR. MORSE:** That was one of the recommendations of our panel three years ago. The Federal Government, three years ago, used buying from the Federal Government as a means of stimulating interest.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** Just one other question. I understand that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is going to spend 300 million dollars on a moon jeep. How much research and development would this buy on a steam engine?

**DR. AYRES:** It depends who does it.

**CONGRESSMAN FARBERSTEIN:** I thank you very much, Dr. Ayres.

**MR. MEYER:** We would be pleased to hear from you in connection with your expertise on this subject.

(Wolfgang E. Meyer: Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Chairman Traffic Safety Division, Transportation and Safety Center, Pennsylvania State University; panelist, motor vehicle pollution, 1962 National HEW Air Pollution Conference; researcher on the internal combustion engine and its emission levels.)

**MR. MEYER:** To identify myself I am a Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and Chairman, Traffic Safety Division, Transportation and Safety Center, at Pennsylvania State University, and I am ashamed to admit for the last 20 years I have been doing research on internal combustion engines, and I have found it exciting, and I find students that find it still exciting, because there are still new problems to be solved, new questions coming up, that have not been here before.

I make this statement in regard to the fact that people dally around on some question for many years and nothing comes out of it. Researchers find themselves in other areas, and merely turning out new gadgets. This is important to consider, and it also strikes me in some of these discussions, and remarks that I have heard, that dollars are being very frequently associated with brains.

Particularly, Mr. Nader was critical of the fact that not enough dollars were being spent. I don't think that should be done, and have to be very carefully done. Talking about dollars, though, I don't know who is asking for what, and when and where Congress is involved, and the general public, but there was a comparison with the space program that was made. One must not forget that the automobile today is being sold at one dollar a pound, and that is very cheap. If you wanted it to do all sorts of other things, we must be prepared, and I personally would be prepared, to pay more

for it, but that is one of the problems that must not be overlooked, that if we are going to have a perfectly clean exhaust, or whatever have you, it will require money. It will require time, too.

We are talking in pollution terms about parts per million. You are not talking about pounds and percent, parts per million.

We are arguing about whether 175 or 140, or down to 50 is right, but those are parts per million. They are supposed to be maintained in units that are being produced at the rate of 10 million a year. I think that many of the production control problems are like outside the technology of the vehicle.

Have you gentlemen considered whether or not restricting the movement of automobiles in highly polluted areas is not the way to go? Cyclamates were mentioned. It is discovered that they are dangerous. A prohibition is threatened and they are being dropped from the market, but no one will ever, at any situation, whether it be tunnel, whether it be apartment houses, which are built over freeways, where the concentration gets too high, but nobody says these people have to evacuate this building, or the traffic has to be stopped, when there is supposedly a dangerous situation.

Even if we were today, today would be a non-polluting vehicle available, it would still take us ten or 12 years until there would be no pollution, because the average life of the American automobile is about 12 years, so you would have to allow about 12 years for the polluting vehicles to disappear by attrition, or whatever, unless somebody wants to buy them up, or do something with them.

These facts must be kept in mind, I believe, before any actions are taken. I am not pleading for not doing anything, but I do feel that some of the arguments are getting somewhat out of focus. I think the automobile industry, for instance, has been ridiculed for not having made much effort in the emission control in the last ten years, nitrocarbons to take an example, has been reduced by 85 percent. 85 percent improvement is a darn big one, in anything you do in life.

This may be not enough from a health standpoint. If more has to be done, it should be done, but I think it is not going to get us anywhere to ridicule these companies.

#### STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE TESTIMONY OF W. E. MEYER

Although the stated purpose of this hearing was to explore the possibilities for reducing the emissions from motor vehicles to tolerable levels, if necessary through the development of new powerplants, it dealt almost exclusively with the question of why the automobile industry is not putting more effort than it does into the development of unconventional powerplants.

In consequence the question of whether or not it is technically possible that the emission levels which are postulated for 1975 by California and the federal government are technically attainable did not get any airing at all. Neither has it been clarified what regulatory steps will be necessary to ensure compliance with such tough standards, not only at the factory, but in the hands of the user. Nor was there any serious discussion of what the remedial steps would add to the first cost of the vehicles, their operating and maintenance cost and how much the regulatory and enforcement machinery would cost.

I consider this extremely regrettable because I am of the opinion that by 1975 (or 1980) no satisfactory substitute for the internal combustion engine will be available. Electric and steam powerplants were held up as the proven panaceas for the despoliment of the atmosphere but the real issues concerning them were not examined. These alternatives are currently at the same stage, and here I am being charitable, as heart transplants. It has been shown that perhaps some day the novel technology will work, but no one can foretell when that will be and what



will be involved to make it a success. Who has driven an electric or a steam car which can even begin to do what the present-day family car is capable of doing? Such vehicles have been postulated, but what will they cost?

I also consider it unfortunate that the 1980 projections that emissions in California will, with present-day standards, return to 1940 levels, were brushed aside. Impatience was expressed with the fact that this was not being accomplished now. As I pointed out during the hearing, it could be done if all pre-1969 vehicles would be bought up by the government at prices which would permit their owners to replace them with 1970 models. This would involve about 95 million vehicles, or something like \$200 billion.

Clearly, this is impossible, but even if it were done and the substitute vehicles, if they were ready and they could be produced, would not solve the problem once and for all. A steam engine, or a gas turbine, for that matter, still produces emissions. I am sure the committee is aware of the problem and the difficulty of controlling jet engine emissions. True, less CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and hydrocarbons would be emitted, but instead we would have much more particulate emissions. Although they do not contribute to photochemical smog (which is a real problem only in California and a few other isolated spots, but not in the major portion of the nation), particulates are becoming more and more suspect as health hazards. I consider it folly to promote the introduction of alternate powerplants as long as we cannot properly assess the health hazards they may produce.

This applies also to electric automobiles. Since no expert gives the fuel cell a chance for general automotive use in the foreseeable future, the electric automobile must be battery powered, that is, electricity must be generated elsewhere and then stored in the vehicle. Although with the best of new batteries now conceivable this will be an inefficient process, it does have the advantage that no fuel has to be burned at the point of power use. Powerplants use either fossil or atomic energy. In both cases pollution is likely to occur. Most fossil fuel plants will eventually have to use coal because the world has large reserves of coal, but very little oil. Coal burning produces fly ash and gaseous pollutants. Some of them can be controlled fairly easily, others cannot, at least not cheaply. Nuclear powerplants present other hazards, the most serious one being heat pollution. I will refrain from elaborating on these problems, but I do wish to call the Committee's attention to the probability that large scale use of electric automobiles would mean exchanging one set of problems for another one.

The times of easy solutions to our socio-technological problems is past. Wishing or ordering the internal combustion engine out of existence will solve nothing. Such a course is as hazardous as fighting boll weevils with DDT: in the long run it solves nothing; on the contrary, the cure may be worse than the disease.

The overall and the sum of the individual effects of an abrupt, mandated change in technology must be most carefully considered. It is my plea to this Committee that it do this, instead of letting itself be persuaded to search for a villain and that there is an easy way out.

Where, for instance, would the lead come from, if electric vehicles would have to be built now in large quantities? Lead batteries are still the only practical one, even though much research (most of it outside the automobile industry) is going on in the search for alternates.

No battery now in the offing can provide a very large operating radius and charging takes time. We would need a network of stations at which empty batteries can be replaced against charged ones. Failing this electric cars would serve for city use only.

This, however, means that a large number of people, who now have and can afford only one car, would need two or do without a cross country car. What are the economic and sociological consequences?

Gentlemen, please, consider these and a myriad of other problems which attend inexorably the mandated or forcefully "suggested" abolishment of the internal combustion before you give the public the impression that it is merely vested interests which prevent us from breathing country fresh air in the canyons of New York City.

The City's and its metropolitan area's air pollution problems can be alleviated greatly by many other means than outlawing the internal combustion engine. For one thing, I do not hold with the school of thought, that the internal combustion engine is the villain, not in the New York metropolitan area. There are many more, much more obnoxious and noxious sources of emissions. We have very little evidence that respiratory and circulatory ailments are significantly aggravated by internal combustion engine emissions. Indeed, much of the popular clamor about exhaust emissions is traceable to the visible and odoriferous exhausts of diesel engines which do not produce to any measurable degree adverse health effects.

Insuring better traffic flow, banning private automobiles and admitting only clean burning diesel trucks and busses into the metropolitan area, improving public transit, subsidizing taxi fleets with controlled emissions are just a few of the steps which could be taken without drawing the country into a panicky solution.

Emission control costs money. It seems imperative that all possible precautions are taken to prevent large sums from being spent on solutions which seriously endanger our economic system or produce effects which no one bargained for. My suggestion is therefore that this committee review the automotive emission problem from a systems standpoint. It will obviously take a broad cooperative effort to reach the desired goal of significantly cleaner air in the metropolitan area. The most effective inhibitors of cooperation are seeking to fix blame for sins past and present and to assume that solutions are at hand before claims for them have been substantiated.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I am going to recess for five minutes. We will continue. (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Do you agree with the findings of the technological panel of the California Air Resources Board that control of vehicle emissions can be brought down to 0.5 grams per million of hydrocarbon, 12 grams of carbon monoxide, and 1.0 grams of per million oxygen, for the 1975 model vehicle?

Mr. MEYERS. I believe so. I also am a believer not only in the current, I think if the standards are a little tough, that is a stimulant to comply.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you very much.

I now call on Mr. S. Smith Griswold. (S. Smith Griswold: President, Seversky Environmental Dynamics Research Associates; former chief, abatement branch, Division of Air Pollution, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; former air pollution control officer, Los Angeles County Air Pollution District; former president Air Pollution Control Association; member, Surgeon General's Environmental Health Committee; credited with initiating Justice Department air pollution suit against auto industry.)

Mr. S. SMITH GRISWOLD. Congressman Farbstein, it is my dubious pleasure to be connected with the motor vehicle pollution control program, probably longer than any other government official.

This started in '53, when I was control officer of Los Angeles, and it was necessary for that large county to clean up every other

source of pollution, to the limit of technological ability before the motor vehicle industry would accept the fact that they were responsible for Los Angeles smog.

The preceding 11 years, from '53 to '65 were ones which included the passing of a legislation in California to require '66 model vehicles to be equipped with smog control devices, and it was at this time that I came back to the Federal Government to initiate the Federal control program at the Federal level, which I did for two years.

Basically, I think the program as it currently exists is regrettable. I think it is regrettable because the public is not getting what they are paying for in connection with control devices on motor vehicles.

There is no potential for enforcing other than to keep the device on the car, for enforcing its compliance for meeting the Federal standards for a period of 50,000 miles, because it is based on an averaging concept, so therefore motor vehicle inspection stations, such as was mentioned by one of the Congressmen previously, could not actually require that any one car would be cleaned up to a point where it met the standards.

I think another great critical problem with the entire motor vehicle pollution control program is the fact that the program entails too much responsibility on the owner of the motor vehicle, requiring him to maintain a motor vehicle in a certain degree of operability, or maintenance, is asking a lot of 100 million automobile owners.

All he can do is take it into a garage and tell him to adjust this and pay \$60 or \$70 and he can't be assured when it comes out it will even meet an inspection capability.

In other words, he is paying for something. He isn't getting it. He is expected to go on paying for a device that has a very critical maintenance problem.

Certainly this is one of the reasons that I feel it is very important that there be a new type of propulsion system invented, one that is fuel proof, one that doesn't expect everything of the individual car owner, whether it be a fuel powered vehicle, steam powered vehicle, or potentially an internal combustion engine with a different type of fuel, or absolutely fuel proof equipment.

I think the fact that the Federal Government requires performance of these vehicles for 50,000 miles, these vehicles are not meeting the standards after 11,000 or 12,000 miles, is a very serious offense.

Automobile owners are spending a lot of money every year. With the '70 model year, which is now in progress, that will be one billion dollars they paid since the Federal program started.

Just generally, I think to expect to run under current conditions 100 million vehicles through an inspection system, whether it is run by a state, or the city, or the Federal Government, every year to be sure that they are operating, is completely unrealistic and time consuming.

The characteristics on these cars should have ability in air pollution control. In connection with the technology there is a thing which hasn't been mentioned here. It is not a new concept. It has been tried for years, that of utilizing natural gas as a fuel for internal combustion engines.

The only thing that is new, relatively, and here again this was not developed by the auto industry, but by a public utility in California, as a technology for getting equivalent performance, except under the very highest speed of operations, by just utilizing natural gas with very moderate hardware, the type that could be installed on any internal combustion engine in four hours and taken off in a half-an-hour, and used on subsequent model cars, but the concept of using a cleaner fuel in the internal combustion engine, of course, is one that has been looked at, and it was looked at in Los Angeles during the period that I was there, trying to clean up

the gasoline, before spending all the money trying to clean up the engine, but I do think that a very careful look should be taken at the composition and the type of fuel that is utilized by the internal combustion engine, pending that time when we can arrive at adequate development, commercial development of a new type of a propulsion system.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I won't keep you long, but I would just like to ask a few questions.

Are you suggesting that Mr. Chenea is in error when he says General Motors will be able to produce a low pollution engine by 1975?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I suggest that I doubt very much that Mr. Chenea will be able to produce what he suggests he will produce by 1975, which will perform in the customers' hands with reasonable maintenance, of the type they will generally get, at a reasonable price. I suggest that this program on oxides of nitrogen is going to be one of the things that throws him for a complete loss. Probably what he will do is come up with a device which California will require before that time, Congressmen, but he will come up with a device which he will say will cost the motorist \$300 additional, and he will tell the people of California that if you want control of oxides of nitrogen, here it is, it will cost you \$300 per car, and it will use ten percent more gasoline per mile.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Ford is following you, and we will hear what they have to say about this.

How did the automobile industry react to the California Senate passing that bill banning the internal combustion engines?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I am sure that they will follow and be able to give you their own personal opinion on it, Congressman.

I am well acquainted with how they felt about the first legislation that was passed in 1960 requiring the control of internal combustion engines originally.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Would you care to make a statement on that?

Mr. GRISWOLD. No, the program was pretty well started. I don't think they thought the legislature would pass it, or could pass it, but the Senate was considering reapportionment at that time, and the Senate went along with the Assembly on it.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you, gentlemen.

The next witness will be the representative of Ford. I appreciate your testifying.

Mr. H. L. MISCH is the vice-president of Engineering, Ford Motor Company, and will now testify as our last witness.

According to the indication that I have received from Ford, Mr. Misch is fully able to discuss his company's policy relating to automotive emissions. I think you have some advantage over the others, having heard the testimony of Mr. Nader and the panelists. We will let you reply to them and give us an idea what Ford is doing to produce a pollution free engine.

Mr. HERBERT L. MISCH, Mr. Chairman, at your pleasure, we can either hand in the prepared statement that I have for the record, and answer any questions that you have, or I can go through the statement, whichever you wish.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. We could put the statement in the record, and you may testify extemporaneously. I would like to frankly be out of here in about 25 or 30 minutes. I have to go back to Washington.

Mr. MISCH. We have the same problem.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Suppose you put that in the record and tell us your story as best you can.

Mr. MISCH. I am Herbert L. Misch, Vice-President, Engineering, Ford Motor Company, and with me today are Donald A. Jensen, Director of our Automotive Emissions Office and Ross Taylor, Assistant Chief

Engineer, Ford Motor Company's engine engineering. At your request, I am here today to describe briefly the efforts of Ford Motor Company to control emissions from our vehicles, the impact of our programs on air quality, particularly in the greater New York City Metropolitan area, and to discuss what we are doing in the area of alternate power sources and their prospects for application to motor vehicles.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we recognize the seriousness of the air pollution problem in the metropolitan New York area. The problem has been delineated in the 1967-68 Progress Report of the Department of Air Resources of New York City. According to this report, the principal pollutants in the New York Metropolitan area are sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. The automobile emits two of these pollutants—CO and particulates. It also emits hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen. Because we are aware of no evidence that HC and NO<sub>x</sub> pose a significant problem in this area, I will direct my remarks to the two problem pollutants—carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

To set the carbon monoxide problem into perspective, I would like to quote from the City's Department of Air Resources report. It states:

"Carbon monoxide has long been identified as one of New York City's major pollutants. It has been estimated that 1.5 million tons of carbon monoxide are emitted, on an annual basis, into its atmosphere with most of it coming from automobiles. And yet measurements over the last ten years at the City's principal monitoring site in upper Manhattan, rarely indicated levels of carbon monoxide that could be construed to be of concern. However, data collected from 1966 to 1967 in a more detailed study showed that a number of areas in the City experienced greater than desirable levels of carbon monoxide."

I want you to know that we have already accomplished a major reduction in the amount of carbon monoxide emitted by recent model automobiles. Our 1970 model cars emit about 70 percent less CO than did their 1967 counterparts. It should be clear that these improvements will go a long way toward elimination of the automobile's contribution to carbon monoxide levels in the atmosphere of New York City.

With respect to particulate matter, this same report states that 88.6 percent of the particulates in the New York-New Jersey area arise from sources other than motor vehicles and it establishes that the majority of that 88.6 percent is attributable to such sources as space heating, incineration and power generation.

With respect to the remaining 11.4 percent attributed to mobile sources, we know that lead additives in gasoline are responsible for a part of it. But, we also know that even if there were no lead additives in gasoline, the automobile would still emit some particulate matter. My point is that we do not yet know as much about the medical, engineering and scientific aspects of this problem as we must in order to address it intelligently, and, in this connection, are working to advance the state of the art.

I do not mean to underplay the role of the automobile as a contributor to the emission problem in New York City, but rather to give a balanced perspective to the overall problem.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the certitude reflected by some of the statements made this morning, there remain even at this late stage of the evolutionary process—an amazing number of unknowns relative to the atmosphere in general, the thresholds of toxicity and the synergistic effects of various contaminants of the atmosphere. In other words, we—government and industry—still do not know enough about the vagaries of the

atmosphere to be certain how much of any given pollutant is "safe" or "harmful".

Although the responsibility for this definition resides primarily in the government, we are attempting to aid in this effort through, among other things, the support of a research program managed by the Coordinating Research Council. This 13 million dollar program is funded by the auto and petroleum industries and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Experts from each of these entities, totaling over 200 scientists, engineers and medical doctors organized in 32 committees, aid in the management of this program through the Air Pollution Research Advisory Council known as APRAC.

The research efforts include atmospheric studies such as plant damage by air pollution, fate of carbon monoxide in the atmosphere, origin and importance of haze formation, the source and fate of light hydrocarbons in the atmosphere, as well as study programs to measure and identify particulate matter. Medical projects include studies of the effects of low concentrations of carbon monoxide on behavior, cardiovascular activity, blood effects, and so on.

I am not here to suggest that further action on the air pollution problem should await further definition of the specific needs. However, I am sure you will agree that the more certain all of us are on the relevant facts, the better able industry will be to solve the problem and the more informed government's appraisal will be of the cost and performance relationships implicit in compliance with the new and more stringent emission standards.

Now I would like to address the remainder of my comments to the subjects about which you and the other members of Congress here today have deep concern, what Ford is doing to reduce vehicle emissions.

First, let me discuss alternate power sources.

Although we have prepared rather elaborate paper studies and carefully analyzed all publicly available literature on the subject, we have found no cause to become optimistic about the Rankine cycle engine. In a Senate Committee hearing in Washington in May, 1968, I indicated that, in our opinion, the Rankine cycle was too complex and fraught with too many seemingly insoluble problems to be considered a likely successor to the internal combustion engine. We have found nothing since that time to alter our evaluation of the Rankine cycle.

Our activities in electric vehicle research were described to Senate committees in March 1967, by Dr. Michael Ference, Vice-president of Ford's Scientific Research Staff. He cited the development work on a concept battery—sodium-sulfur—a zinc air battery concept, improved motors and control systems. It was pointed out that Ford Motor Company had hopes that these major advances in battery development and in control and motor technology might give the electric vehicle a good chance to succeed as a small urban-suburban passenger car and delivery or service vehicle within a decade.

Then, as now, the principal problem was to find ways to minimize the electric vehicle's disadvantages of short range, poor speed and acceleration and hill climbing and long recharge time compared with the quick refueling of gasoline powered cars.

Our position is essentially unchanged today. Problems associated with the fabrication of sodium-sulfur batteries have proved to be more difficult to solve than had been anticipated. As a result, we are nowhere near as far along at this time as we hoped we would be. Also, the hoped for short range potential of air-zinc and nickel-zinc batteries did not materialize.

Some research with lead acid batteries appears promising. This development, if successful, would permit the production of a

city car with about 40 miles range in city driving. This represents a two-to-four-fold improvement over previous technology. It also has been the motivation to re-examine the hybrid engine, electric vehicle concept.

The most promising of all alternate power sources, in our opinion, is the gas turbine engine. Emissions levels of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide from gas turbines appear to be extremely low; however, there is some question as to the level to which oxides of nitrogen can be controlled.

We have been devoting an important share of our research, engineering and testing to this engine during the past 15 years. Three years ago we introduced our experimental 707 turbine, a seventh generation turbine engine designed by Ford engineers. The 707 was designed specifically for heavy duty trucks. We have tested these engines for thousands of hours on dynamometers and at our proving grounds in Michigan and Arizona. Some 18 months ago we installed the engine in a few of our own fleet trucks which haul Ford parts from Michigan to our plants in Ohio. Results have been very encouraging, but work must continue to develop adequate durability and performance.

We have extended our turbine activities beyond truck application and, earlier this year, launched a program for application for off-road uses, such as stand-by generator sets, oil well cementing, construction machinery and marine pleasure craft. We also have installed a gas turbine engine in a Continental Trailways bus which soon will be making a test run across the country.

Application to automobiles is still a bit down the road. However, preliminary analysis indicates that the use of gas turbine engines in passenger cars would entail a significant cost penalty and, in the case of city driving, high fuel costs. These cost and technical factors will have to be overcome before the gas turbine can be considered as an attractive substitute for the internal combustion engine in passenger cars.

Whether or not any of these alternate power sources ever proves to be worthy of becoming a volume-produced power plant remains highly speculative at this point. The near term improvements for vehicle emissions must be realized from the internal combustion engine system. Further, we think any objective analysis of the evidence supports our conclusion that the goal of a virtually emission free power source can be reached sooner with the internal combustion engine than with an entirely different and unproven power plant.

For these reasons a greater share of our efforts is directed toward the control of emissions from the internal combustion engine.

One very substantial program dedicated to these future improvements is what we term the Inter-Industry Emission Control Program. It is comprised of Ford and ten other companies, six of which are petroleum companies and the other four foreign auto manufacturers. The IIEC was established in April 1967, with Ford Motor Company serving as project manager.

The IIEC utilizes the respective talents of petroleum and automotive specialists in the quest to develop a virtually emission free car. Some very ambitious goals were set. Program targets are 65 ppm hydrocarbons, 0.3 mole per cent carbon monoxide and 175 ppm oxides of nitrogen. These emission targets represent a 90-97 percent reduction from pre-emission controlled vehicles.

We have attained these very low levels in the laboratory and now have a program involving concept cars utilizing advanced hardware and undergoing tests at our proving grounds to determine whether or not these approaches are feasible in terms of durability, operating economy and performance. We are proceeding at full speed to reach the necessary conclusions, and should these tests

show promise, we will explore the adaptability of these concepts to mass production techniques.

Gentlemen, I submit that our progress to date and our future objectives which we confidently expect to attain in the control of emissions from the internal combustion engine will serve our mutual objective of providing clean automobiles and a better environment for everyone. As Mr. Henry Ford II said last Tuesday (December 2) in an address at the Harvard Business School, "It doesn't take much imagination to see that before too many years have gone by, the only market left for motor vehicles will be the market for vehicles that are emission free."

In closing, let me assure you that Ford Motor Company intends to be an aggressive participant in that market.

I will just highlight it now.

I would like though to introduce those gentleman who accompanied me here, Mr. Donald Jensen, director of our automotive emissions office, and Mr. Ross Taylor, assistant chief engineer of our engineering activities at Ford, and Mr. James McNea, who is a member of our office of general counsel.

Mr. Chairman, in response to your request in the prepared statement, we have indicated that we have noted the serious problem of air pollution for a long time, and we have been working very diligently on it. We know the problem isn't licked. We know there is a lot more to do, but quickly let me just speak to the specific problem as we understand it in the New York area, New York, New Jersey area, and quoting from a Department of Air Resources report for New York City, the problem in the main in the New York City area is carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter.

Now, the automobile certainly does contribute a great part of the carbon monoxide and there is a small matter of the particulate matter, according to the New York Department report, something like 11 percent of the particulate matter that they have measured is traceable to mobile sources, of which the automobile is a part.

The particulate matter of specific interest with regard to the automobile is the lead and lead salts. It has been covered, I think, adequately, as to what our 1970 vehicles and 1971 vehicles nationwide will do with regard to improvement in the reduction of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, and, of course, Ford vehicles meet those requirements.

However, let me very quickly skim through some of the work that we are doing with regard to alternate power sources. We are not at this time optimistic about steam as an alternative source of power for automobiles.

I testified in the Senate Committee hearing that was referred to by the previous witnesses, saying that our analysts have indicated a gross complexity compared to what we believe the internal combustion will be when it is a virtually emission free engine, and these are our opinions. We continue to do paper studies, be aware of the state of hour and elevate it, and if we see anything that changes our opinion we certainly are going to be aggressive in pursuing this.

Along that line we have arranged with some outside organizations, and one is Thermal Electronic Corporation, in Massachusetts, and we are sponsoring with them certain research work, thinking that as the problems have been identified, they can work on those specific problems, if they find promising solutions then we can take the next step, research with regard to steam engines, or Rankine cycle engines, whether it be steam or some organic materials used.

Dr. Michael Ference, vice-president of Ford Scientific Research reported to the Senate Committee in 1967, March of 1967, in regard to our electric car work, and reported there that we were working on sodium sulfur battery concepts, and a zinc-air battery concept, and improvement in emission controls in

order to get an electric car that would appear to be useful. As we see it at the moment, we have run into considerable problems with regard to the sodium-sulfur batteries. We are far behind where we thought we would be from this point at this time. We do have some interesting research with regard to red acid batteries. We devoted by far the majority of our work, our efforts on an alternative source on the gas turbine, and we have high hopes that tomorrow a 707 Ford gas turbine will start cross-country, installed in a Continental Trailways bus.

If we were to indicate as clearly as possible our opinion as to priority for possible success, we would have to say that improvements in the internal combustion engine are in our opinion the best possibility for success in a virtually emission free vehicle, and for that reason we are putting a greater share of our technical efforts in this direction. Our second choice at the moment would be the gas turbine. So far, we are looking at it only for trucks, heavy applications.

We are expanding it some to look at stationary applications, such as oil well equipment, and that sort of thing, but by and large there still has to be a considerable breakthrough before we would see the gas turbine as a replacement for the internal combustion engine in passenger cars.

Quickly in the internal combustion engine work, I would like to cite just one program that I believe will be of significant interest to you, what we call the inter-industry emission control program, that was established in April of 1967 with Ford Motor Company as the manager.

There are 11 participants in that program, and I think six are petroleum companies and the other four foreign auto manufacturers. We established at the start of that program, targets that we then thought were the three most important pollutants, the targets that we established were 65 parts per million hydrocarbons, 0.3 mole percent carbon monoxide, and 175 parts per million oxides of nitrogen.

These targets, if attained, would represent between a 90 and 97 percent—depending on which material you are talking about—between 90 and 97 percent reduction from present emission controls.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You mean this reduction is from every vehicle you produce. Is that correct?

Mr. MISCH. Yes, sir; that is a target of the research program.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. There have been statements made to the effect that there will be a reduction of the pollution from individual autos of 95 percent. There, however, has been no statement taking into effect the multiplication in numbers of automobiles on the total level of automotive pollution expected. This is the reason I am asking the question directly.

Mr. MISCH. No, we are saying that the new vehicles, once we could meet these targets, the new vehicles would perform at these levels, and, of course, you would have to have the attrition of the population, the replacement of the population, before all vehicles would do so.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. How far advanced are you on the production of an internal combustion engine that meets the standards that you have just discussed.

Mr. MISCH. Let me cite it in terms of this particular inter-industry program. This program was to be completed in April of next year. It is being extended one more year, that is through December of 1970, and we have every hope that the research portion of the program will have been completed successfully.

We have already met these targets in the laboratory. We have concept vehicles that are running on our proving grounds to determine whether in fact we can develop these

concepts into producible designs on a mass basis.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Then I take it, if I understand you correctly, that by 1972 Ford will be able to mass produce—

Mr. MISCH. No, sir. I don't want to be misunderstood. I said that by the end of 1971 the research in this program would be completed and there is an additional phase in reducing that phase to practicality in the automobile as it would be mass produced.

At the moment, I would have to guess as to when we in fact will have production automobiles. I would say '66, '67, maybe '68.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You mean '76, '77 or '8?

Mr. MISCH. Yes.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You heard Mr. Chenea say they hoped to have it by 1975. Won't you be able to meet that date?

Mr. MISCH. These are lower goals than he was talking about. I will say that Ford Motor Company is going to be in swinging, and we are going to get part of the business.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. If you expect to get a part of the business, won't you have to meet the standards when they go into effect?

Mr. MISCH. Yes.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Do you agree with the finding of the Technological Panel of the California Air Resources Board that the control of emission can be brought down to 0.5 grams parts per million of hydrocarbons, twelve grams of carbon monoxide, and 1.0 grams parts per million oxide of nitrogen?

Mr. MISCH. I believe vehicles can be built for those levels.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. By 1975?

Mr. MISCH. No, I don't think so.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. When then?

Mr. MISCH. I think that we are giving the most honest answer we can, as to what we think we will be able to accomplish. If we can move faster and if we are more fortunate the time is going to move up. I am giving the best estimate that we can give, and it is only an estimate.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Are we going to have to wait to the mid-1970's to see a significant reduction in auto emissions or is it going to begin before?

Mr. MISCH. I am not sure.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Can we expect a major reduction in auto emissions levels before 1975 or 1976? Can you produce an automobile with less than the California 1975 standards within a year and improve the standards further year by year until you produce a pollution-free engine?

Mr. MISCH. If I may, sir, I would like to answer it this way. We have a series of changing standards, already established through 1974, and these standards, as they become more stringent, as they require a more stringent control, do require differences in the approach to the hardware. I think we are saying, however, through 1974, these will be evolutionary in nature. By that I mean those things that we are working on now will resolve by that time to meet the requirements. We believe it. We haven't done it yet, but we believe that it is the way it will happen.

Now, for the low levels that I am talking about here it will require more completely new approaches.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Mr. Misch, how much money has your company spent during the year 1969 for research and development in connection with low emission engines. If you can't give it to me for '69, because it is current, how about '68 and '67. Also break that down into what went into salaries and what went into material.

Mr. MISCH. It is a little hard to break it down. Around 700 people are involved in Ford in emission work, internal combustion work, and alternative sources work.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Full time?

Mr. MISCH. I would say the equivalent of

that many full time. If some of the people spent part of the time on that, and part on something else, there would be a larger number involved. I am saying there would be the equivalent of 700 people full time.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. On low emission engines?

Mr. MISCH. Yes, both the internal combustion engine and the alternate source.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Mr. Misch, how many individuals are working on the internal combustion engines, as compared to alternative engines?

Mr. MISCH. Yes, I do have an idea.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Would you please tell us.

Mr. MISCH. I would say more than half.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. If you are spending more than half of the money and personnel on alternatives, how do you divide it between the various types of engines, steam, turbine, electric?

Mr. MISCH. I can tell you to this extent. At least in the order that I prioritize it. The first priority I give is to the internal combustion engine. The next highest effort is the gas turbine. The one following that is the electric. The one we are spending the least on is the Rankine or steam engine.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Do you believe the steam engine is worthy of less attention than the others?

Mr. MISCH. That is obviously the reason why we prioritized it that way. That is our opinion.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. You certainly have a right to your opinion. There are, however, naturally differences of opinion.

Mr. MISCH. Let me assure you, sir, that it is not just my opinion. It is the opinion of our technical organization that I reflect.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Are you experimenting at all with alternative fuels?

Mr. MISCH. Yes, we are. Once again, in this inter-industry program, where we have six petroleum companies involved in the research, we have several programs. If you have the time, we could tick off very quickly a few of the things that we are doing. Mr. Taylor would be glad to do that, or at least by title indicate what they are.

Mr. TAYLOR. This program, as Mr. Misch indicated earlier, is a cooperative program between the oil industry and the automotive industry. Its official purpose was to the expertise of people in fuel designs with those best versed in automotive engine designs.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. There is one question that sticks in my mind. I am really unable to understand how the Morse panel, the Battelle Memorial Institute Study for National Air Pollution Control, the Senate Commerce Committee and the California State Assembly, each coming from different backgrounds and perspectives, all come to the opposite conclusion. Each seems to feel that the steam engine is worthy of attention, research, and the expenditure of money. They say it will not need any unique metals, and can be produced as cheaply, perhaps if not more cheaply than the internal combustion engine, and that is the reason I can't understand why you give such a low priority to it. Can you explain that to me, Mr. Misch.

Mr. MISCH. I can certainly try. We evaluate—we have evaluated, and continue to evaluate, Rankine cycle concepts, and compare them in total power plant packages with the internal combustion engine, as we think it would be required to be an acceptable product in the hands of the customer. When we do this, and I will cite my testimony before the Senate Committee, we believe that both the cost and complexity of the Rankine cycle system is greater than the internal combustion engine. For that reason, we think that the internal combustion engine is the right one to put the emphasis on.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Would your company object to mandatory standards for a

pollution free engine being established for the internal combustion engine?

Mr. MISCH. I think you have to say virtually pollution free.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Let's say the standard set down by the California Legislature.

Mr. MISCH. Our company has supported the clean air project.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. The technology panel of the California Air Resources Board, excuse me.

Mr. MISCH. They are about the same numbers. Yes, I would like to answer it this way. I would like to say that our company has supported the Clean Air Act. We have supported the development and implication of standards and requirements on vehicles, and we would continue to do so. I think we have continued always to say that for everyone's good it is highly desirable that we are certain that the demands for control are reasonably in step with the need, because increased control is going to in fact either cost in compromise of product, or in dollars, or something. It is going to cost something, so let's just all of us be sure that we are progressing properly, that's all.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I asked that question, Mr. Misch, because the California Deputy Attorney General, Charles O'Brien, on March 4, 1969, at the HEW hearing said, and I quote:

"California has had a long and discouraging relationship with the auto industry in attempting to control automobile produced smog."

That is the reason why I am asking the question.

Mr. MISCH. Let me answer by reading a statement that is in the close of my prepared remarks, and it is a statement that Mr. Henry Ford made last Tuesday, December 2nd, in an address to the Harvard Business School:

"It doesn't take much imagination to see that before too many years have gone by, the only markets left for motor vehicles will be the market for vehicles that are virtually emission free."

He assured that Ford Motor Company is in that market.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I am glad to hear that, but I still haven't got your answer to the question of whether or not you were opposed to mandatory controls.

Mr. MISCH. I thought I answered. We have mandatory controls.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. The standards being discussed by the California Air Resources Board for 1975.

Mr. JENSEN. I am Don Jensen, the Director of Automotive Emissions at Ford. The standards you are referring to were recommended to the Air Resources Board. They are not now a standard in California. They are having a public hearing on these on January 21st. Since they were announced on November 19, each of the companies is reviewing their internal program to see what their position would be. I think Mr. Misch has been responsive to the questions based primarily on our previous controls.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Would you care to make a statement on these standards; what is your position on them?

Mr. JENSEN. I think I made it clear, Mr. Farbstein, that they were announced on November 19th. The public hearing is on January 21st, so obviously we have to look at the standards, but the numbers going on already at Ford, or the inter-industry program that Mr. Misch mentioned were lower than the numbers in that particular report.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. I am about finished, gentlemen. If there is anything further you want to add, I would be pleased to hear from you. Before we close, a representative of the Attorney General of the State of New York has been kind enough to come here to make a short statement in connection with

the Attorney General's position in relation to these hearings.

Will you state your name and position? Mr. MANTZOROS. My name is George C. Mantzoros, Assistant Attorney General, Anti-Monopolies Bureau. I am here representing the Attorney General, Louis J. Lefkowitz, who has the following statement to make:

The discharge and emission of contaminants into the air is contrary to the public policy of the State of New York and in violation of state statutes and the statewide Air Resources Program.

It is my hope that from this committee's hearing will come a plan of positive action at the Federal level in support and implementation of the program which is already underway in New York State.

My office already has begun an action to punish the major automobile manufacturers by requiring them to pay treble damages to the state and its municipalities for the harm done to property, crops and individuals by the emission of contaminants from automobiles of their manufacture.

At the same time we are asking a mandatory injunction against the auto manufacturers requiring them with all deliberate speed to install as standard equipment on any auto sold in New York State effective motor vehicle pollution control equipment.

I congratulate this committee for its action and endorse its efforts to bring about an elimination of the air pollution which seriously affects everyone in the State of New York.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. Thank you very much for your statement. Before adjourning, I would like to insert the text of a letter I have received from Mayor Lindsay in connection with this hearings:

(The text of that letter follows:)

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
New York, N.Y., December 4, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: I was pleased to learn about the hearing you and several other Congressmen from the New York Metropolitan region have scheduled for next Monday, December 8th, on automobile pollution.

I fully support your efforts and offer my cooperation for your hearing and any activities that may follow.

Automobile exhaust pollution is a problem of deep concern to millions of New Yorkers. New York City, as you may know, has undertaken active leadership in this area. For detailed carbon monoxide studies conducted in the City indicate that our problem is different from that in other parts of the country and requires closer and more special attention than it has been accorded. Recently I outlined a five-point program of steps the City will take to insure more effective programs to combat this pollution, including encouraging faster development of pollution-free vehicles. The City plans to purchase and test several of these vehicles to determine whether a practical model can be made available sooner than we can now anticipate. I have been in touch with leading industry executives to explore what further steps the City can take at this time to promote this important project.

I am sure the results of your efforts will be of great value to our program. I look forward to these findings.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,  
Mayor.

Congressman FARBSTEIN. The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon at 1:30 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)

#### APPENDIX

On November 7, 1969 the following letter was sent to the presidents and chairmen of the boards of the major automotive companies, and the following replies received:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1969.

GENTLEMEN: We are writing you today as Members of Congress, representing the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region, concerned about air pollution.

We are sure you will agree that air pollution has become a matter of grave concern to every American and that the automobile industry has the responsibility to make every effort to alleviate this problem.

It is our intention to hold hearings to examine the impact of the automobile on the air of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region. These hearings will be held in the Ceremonial Court Room, U.S. Customs Court Building, One Federal Plaza, New York City at 10 a.m. on December 8.

You, as the head of one of the major American industries, are in a position to exercise your responsibility for helping to solve this severe environmental problem by appearing before our panel at that time.

We are anxious to become acquainted with what your company is doing, or plans to do in the future, to overcome the adverse effects on the atmosphere of pollution from automobiles. We are not so much concerned with the details of how your company is meeting specific governmental requirements. Rather, we are interested in the broader context of what steps you are taking for the improvement of the internal combustion engine and the exploration and development of alternative means of propulsion. Thus, we are more desirous of hearing from you, the people at the highest policy-making level of management, than from technical or other laboratory personnel. You are, of course, welcome to bring such personnel to advise you.

We would appreciate your favorable reply to this invitation at your earliest convenience. Please contact Congressman Leonard Farbstain at (202) 225-5635.

With sincere regards, we are,

Members of Congress: LEONARD FARBSTEIN, BERTRAM L. PODELL, JOSEPH P. ADDABO, ADAM C. POWELL, ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, PETER W. RODINO, JR., BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, JAMES H. SCHEUER, EDWARD I. KOCH, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, JOSEPH G. MINISH, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, SEYMOUR HALPERN, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES J. DELANEY, HENRY HELSTOCKI, MARIO BIAGGI, EDWARD J. PATTEN, and JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,  
New York, N.Y., November 26, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: This is in response to the invitation which you and a number of your fellow Members of Congress extended to Mr. E. N. Cole, President, and to me to be present at hearings in New York City regarding the impact of the automobile on the air of the metropolitan area. We share your deep concern with the problem of air pollution.

As discussed with you by our representatives, Messrs. Hilder, Magill and Hall, our corporation is under certain inhibitions regarding this subject as a result of pending litigation. However, within the general guidelines discussed by them with you, General Motors is certainly desirous of cooperating with you and presenting our views with respect to this important subject.

Therefore, I have requested Dr. Paul F. Chenea, vice president in charge of our Research Laboratories, to be present on December 8 and make a statement on behalf of

General Motors. Dr. Chenea is fully qualified to discuss the subject not only from a technical standpoint but from the viewpoint of policy as well. He will be accompanied by Dr. Fred Bowditch, Director, Emission Control.

Let me reassure you and those Congressmen associated with you in this matter that General Motors efforts for progress in this area carry a very high priority.

Sincerely,

J. M. ROCHE.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,  
Washington, D.C., December 5, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBSTEIN: In conversations I have had recently with you and Mr. Levin, you have suggested that the testimony of the General Motors witness at the hearing in New York, December 8, be a "response" or "rebuttal" to the remarks of other witnesses. While I believe I have made it clear to you and Mr. Levin that the GM witness will address himself to the information your invitation requested us to present rather than respond to the remarks of other witnesses, I feel that it is important to reiterate this point in order to clear up any possibility of misunderstanding.

In your November 7 letter of invitation to General Motors you stated you were anxious "to become acquainted with what your company is doing, or plans to do in the future, to overcome the adverse effects on the atmosphere of pollution from automobiles." More specifically, you asked for comments on the steps we are taking "for the improvement of the internal combustion engine and the exploration and development of alternative means of propulsion." In our appearance we intend to try to present as much information on this subject as time permits.

In order to cover even a small part of that vast assignment in the time allotted to our testimony, it will be necessary for our witness to address himself to the points he considers most important. Accordingly, he intends to spend the time available presenting information on the subject matter of the hearing.

Let me assure you that General Motors hopes in this way to make a contribution to the understanding by your group and the public of the automotive emissions problems.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. MORRIS.

CHRYSLER CORP.,  
November 26, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: Mr. Lynn Townsend, Chairman of the Board of Chrysler Corporation has asked me to reply to the letter of November 17, 1969, regarding a proposed meeting in New York City concerning the problems of air pollution in the Metropolitan New York Area.

At the outset, let me assure you that the people at the highest policymaking level of Chrysler Corporation as well as our engineering and technical people are fully aware of their responsibilities to further reduce the level of the smog-contributing emissions currently found in passenger car exhaust.

I understand that Mr. C. M. Helnen, Chief Engineer for Emission Control and Chemical Development, has recently forwarded to you certain technical papers which, together with the references included, outline the extensive work that has been done on the problem of vehicle emission control over the last fifteen years.

To provide you with a current picture of Chrysler Corporation's intensive research activities in air pollution and the outlook for the future as our engineers see it, we would like to extend an invitation to you and the

other Congressmen who signed the letter to visit our laboratories in Detroit and to meet with our engineers at your convenience. If it is not possible for these gentlemen and lady to be in Detroit on the same date, we would be pleased to arrange for a series of such meetings to take place. We hope you will view this invitation to come to Detroit as an acceptable alternative to the opportunity you have offered us to appear in New York as the complexity of showing you in detail the work we are doing makes it necessary to stage any meaningful demonstration where the equipment is located.

In addition, as you no doubt know, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has announced that it plans to hold hearings on the subject of air pollution on or about December 8, 1969, and since this Committee has the statutory authority to conduct hearings on this subject, it appears probable that we will be called upon to furnish such information as can be furnished by hearings on a nationwide basis to this Committee of Congress.

Sincerely,

P. N. BUCKMINSTER.

FORD MOTOR CO.,

Washington, D.C., November 28, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: This will confirm my conversation with you earlier this week regarding representatives of Ford Motor Company meeting with you and some of your Congressional colleagues in New York City on December 8 to discuss the efforts for improvement we are making in the area of automotive emissions.

Arrangements have been made for Mr. H. L. Misch, Vice President-Engineering, to be present. As a Vice President of the Company with senior responsibility for all staff engineering activities, Mr. Misch is fully familiar with our policies relating to automotive emissions. We expect that he will be accompanied by one or more other representatives of our Company.

I shall await your advice as to whether we should proceed with these arrangements.

Sincerely,

R. W. MARKLEY, Jr.

FORD MOTOR CO.,

Washington, D.C., December 1, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBSTEIN: This will confirm our conversation today and advise that my letter of November 28 was intended to embrace the concept that Mr. Misch is able and authorized to speak to company policy in the area of automotive emissions.

Sincerely,

R. W. MARKLEY, Jr.

(On October 20, 1969, the following letter was sent to the major automobile manufacturers by Congressman FARBSTEIN. The only substantive response, sent by Ford Motor Co. follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: On July 31st I introduced H.R. 13225, a bill to help combat more effectively the air pollution resultant from the ever increasing use of motor vehicles. A copy of this legislation is enclosed.

The purpose of this bill, and of additional legislation now being drafted, is to (1) encourage the development of alternatives to the internal combustion engine, (2) improve fuels used in the internal combustion engine in order to meet more stringent emission control levels, and (3) ensure that the

control devices on 1968 and 1969 model year vehicles, for which owners have paid nearly two-thirds of a billion dollars, are operating in conformity with Federal emission standards.

So that I may have the most current and comprehensive information available in this area, I am requesting the advice and opinion of manufacturers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines both in the United States and abroad. I hope that your company will be kind enough to reply to the following questionnaire which represents items in which I have particular interest.

Please be assured that the information provided will be considered confidential and will not be attributed to your particular company unless you authorize its use. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
Member of Congress.

Name of Company \_\_\_\_\_

Headquarters Address \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Title of Official \_\_\_\_\_

1. What is the major thrust of your company's activities to reduce automobile air pollution?

2. How much has your company spent for research and/or engineering to reduce emissions from new motor vehicle engines for the 1968, 1969, 1970 model years?

3. Did you spend any funds for new vehicle engine research and engineering for your 1968, 1969, 1970 models? If so, how much did you spend (by years)?

4. What proportion of this money, if any, went for the following (by year):

(a) Development of vehicles utilizing alternative power sources such as steam (vapor), electric, turbine or other. (What is the pertinent data regarding the size, horsepower, weight, speed, range, and comparative performance of each of the foregoing?)

(b) More effective emission control devices or systems on the internal combustion engine currently in use. (Please include information on cost and performance pursuant to Federal emission standards.)

(c) Improvement or refinement in the combustion characteristics of the internal combustion engine through basic engine modification or the use of improved or alternative fuels such as unleaded gasoline, LPG, natural gas or any other fuel in adequate supply.

5. Do you intend, in the near future, to be able to meet the emission requirements set forth in H.R. 13225? If so, approximately when and upon what technological advances do you expect to rely?

6. Has your company initiated any program to ensure that the emission control equipment you install will operate effectively after the car has operated for several thousand miles? If so, up to what mileage (Please include comprehensive data generated by or available to your company on vehicles tested under Federal test procedures with less than 50,000 miles of operation in public use.)

7. What programs does your company have for training service personnel in the repair and upkeep of emission control equipment? Could you supply me with drafts of your instructions to these personnel?

8. May this reply be publicly attributed to you and/or your company?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Please return to: Congressman Leonard Farbstein, U.S. House of Representatives, 2455 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

FORD MOTOR CO.

Dearborn, Mich., December 9, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: Thank you for your letter of October 20, 1969, in which

you raise several questions in connection with Ford's activities in connection with the control of automotive emissions. I have prepared a comprehensive summary of Ford's activities past, present, and future in vehicle emission control, a copy of which I have enclosed with this letter. This summary, together with the testimony given by Mr. H. L. Misch, Ford Vice President-Engineering, at your hearing in New York City, seems to me to comply with your request. However, if additional information is needed, please let me know.

Sincerely,

D. A. JENSEN,  
Director, Automotive Emissions Office.

Name of Company: Ford Motor Company.  
Headquarters Address: American Road,  
Dearborn, Michigan 48121.

Name and Title of Official: D. A. Jensen,  
Director, Automotive Emissions Office.

1. What is the major thrust of your company's activities to reduce automobile air pollution?

These are numerous. See pages 3 through 6 of the Summary.

2. How much has your company spent for research and/or engineering to reduce emissions from new motor vehicle engines for the 1968, 1969, 1970 model years?

As indicated starting on page 3, almost every segment of the company is involved in vehicle emissions.

3. Did you spend any funds for new vehicle engine research and engineering for your 1968, 1969, 1970 models? If so, how much did you spend (by years)?

Yes, and the extent of this work is evidenced on pages 3 to 6.

4. What proportion of this money, if any, went for the following (by year):

(a) Development of vehicles utilizing alternative power sources such as steam (vapor), electric, turbine or other. (What is the pertinent data regarding the size, horsepower, weight, speed, range, and comparative performance of each of the foregoing?)

(b) More effective emission control devices or systems on the internal combustion engine currently in use. (Please include information on cost and performance pursuant to Federal emission standards.)

(c) Improvement or refinement in the combustion characteristics of the internal combustion engine through basic engine modification or the use of improved or alternative fuels such as unleaded gasoline, LPG, natural gas or any other fuel in adequate supply.

Our accounting system does not break down our efforts in the categories you mention, but considerable engineering development work was spent on each of the above categories as indicated by the summary. If you wish to visit Detroit, I'll be glad to show you exactly what we are doing in respect to a), b), and c).

5. Do you intend, in the near future, to be able to meet the emission requirements set forth in H.R. 13225? If so, approximately when and upon what technological advances do you expect to rely?

See page 5 of the Summary.

6. Has your company initiated any program to ensure that the emission control equipment you install will operate effectively after the car has operated for several thousand miles? If so, up to what mileage? (Please include comprehensive data generated by or available to your company on vehicles tested under generated test procedures with less than 50,000 miles of operation in public use.)

See page 4 of the Summary.

7. What programs does your company have for training service personnel in the repair and upkeep of emission control equipment? Could you supply me with drafts of your instructions to these personnel?

I'm sending under separate cover copies of

Ford Motor Company's Training Handbook 5000 on "Vehicle Emission Control Systems".

8. May this reply be publicly attributed to you and/or your company?

Yes.

Please return to: Congressman Leonard Farbstein, U.S. House of Representatives, 2455 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

#### SUMMARY OF FORD MOTOR COMPANY'S ROLE IN CONTROL OF MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSIONS

##### INTRODUCTION TO A PROBLEM

In the early fifties when it was first recognized that the automobile played a role in the formation of photochemical smog in Los Angeles, Ford immediately initiated extensive research efforts in a number of fields. Up until 1960 there were the following accomplishments in each of these as follows:

##### 1. Instrumentation

The use of nondispersive infrared techniques to measure extremely small parts per million concentrations of contaminants from the exhaust were pioneered by Ford Motor Company. This was only one important step in our cooperative effort with Los Angeles County to first find out how to measure emissions so we could do the engineering job of reducing them to acceptable levels.

##### 2. Test procedures

Since emissions from vehicles varied tremendously based on the vehicle's operating mode, it became essential to determine the "average" trip and the "average" emissions of vehicles in the Los Angeles area. Ford played a major cooperative role working with California to establish these facts which even today form the basis for the test procedure utilized by California and the Department of HEW. The formal adoption by California of exhaust emission test procedures in May of 1961 signaled the opening of an era when auto manufacturers and others could apply their engineering efforts to definitive targets to solve the problem.

##### 3. Control techniques

Initially, it appeared that a device controlling the deceleration driving mode would be sufficient to reduce hydrocarbon emissions so that the required level of air quality could be attained in Los Angeles. We had engineered workable effective deceleration devices when industry data led California authorities to conclude that this was relatively unimportant in the total smog picture.

Thereafter, we worked on controls for almost all driving modes. Among many other exhaust emission control systems we developed a catalyst (vanadium pentoxide) which was effective in controlling the hydrocarbon emissions which contributed to photochemical smog in Los Angeles. It was not designed to be effective in control of carbon monoxide in order to minimize high temperature material problems. We were initiating production studies of this catalyst device when California required the control of carbon monoxide emissions. As a result, we redirected our efforts toward solutions capable of controlling both hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide. Manifold thermal reactor development started in 1958 to back up the catalytic system development. Through new research and measurement methods, it was determined that crankcase "blow-by" was responsible for 20% of the total hydrocarbon emissions from an automobile. Utilizing crankcase fume recirculation systems designed earlier for other purposes, we engineered crankcase control systems for voluntary installation on California cars in the fall of 1960 (1961 models).

In the ensuing years, Ford experimented with numerous exhaust control systems utilizing not only our own research efforts but also those available from others. Specifically, we made significant advances in thermal

reactor systems and complex catalyst control methods.

In preparation for the introduction of exhaust controls in California for 1966 models, we reviewed our engineering research and adopted a variation of our thermal reactor. The result was Ford's Thermactor system, consisting of an air pump supplying oxidizing air at the exhaust ports of the engine (in the exhaust manifold) to help consume polluting contaminants. This crash program met California standards and formed the basis for the numerous improvements in exhaust controls since the fall of 1965. When you realize that 37 other new changes (in addition to the air pump) were required in the automobile powertrain to effectuate this control, you can recognize the engineering ingenuity and skill which evidenced itself in the "new" exhaust controls that have been produced since 1966 models in California.

Subsequently, we perfected an engine modification system that we call IMCO—Improved Combustion. IMCO has, for the most part, replaced Thermactor as Ford's method of exhaust control. These controls were extended to heavy duty gasoline powered trucks in California on 1969 models and nationwide on 1970 models.

The 1967 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act required the control of emissions from all 1968 model passenger cars. Subsequently, controls for evaporative emissions from the fuel tank and the carburetor were enacted—on 1970 models in California and on 1971 models nationwide. Final work is now in process to control emissions of oxides of nitrogen from 1971 models to be sold in California and the control of diesel smoke from new engines will become effective on January 1, 1970.

Virtually every segment of the Company is now involved in emissions control. Those who design engines, build carburetors, work on transmissions, electronic engineers; the chassis engineers; those involved in the fuel system; the auto service specialists; quality control experts; the body designers; and the advanced scientists, and many more—all now intimately concerned with vehicle emissions as a part of their job.

The advancements that have been made in exhaust controls have reduced exhaust emissions steadily each year as these moved from California to national controls in 1968 models and on up to the present. Field surveillance has shown continued steady improvement and improved durability in emission controls for Ford vehicles although the government standards were not revised downward until 1970.

Relative to the point when vehicles were not equipped with pollution controls, the regulated levels in 1971 on a nationwide basis will represent an 80% reduction in hydrocarbon controls and a 70% reduction in carbon monoxide.

Quite apart from government requirements, Ford started a comprehensive quality control program to monitor emission controls. A sample of vehicles are checked each day to ensure the integrity of our production vehicles. Ford has an elaborate pressurized room where 100% of our carburetors are "flowed" and checked to be certain they are within necessary emission control tolerances. Idle adjustments are set at the factory and plastic idle adjustment limiters are installed to help maintain emission characteristics of our cars when they are in the hands of our customers. We also issue basic instructions in our manuals and on decals in the engine compartment to aid mechanics for proper engine adjustment.

These are all done voluntarily by Ford Motor Company without government direction and they have been instigated in the last few years because of our interest in improving emission characteristics of our vehicles, not only in production but in the field.

Numerous segments of Ford Motor Company are working for the near-term and far-term future low emission or emission "free" vehicle. One important endeavor is the Inter-Industry Emission Control (IIEC) Program. This is a cooperative effort which began in April, 1967, with Ford as the project manager. It includes six oil companies and four foreign car manufacturers cooperating.<sup>1</sup> The goals of this program are to reduce emissions to:

65 ppm HC equivalent to .82 grams per mile HC.

.3% CO equivalent to 7.1 grams per mile CO.

175 ppm NO<sub>x</sub> equivalent to .68 grams per mile NO<sub>x</sub>.

This is the IIEC Program definition of a "smog free" vehicle and represents a 90 to 97% emission reduction from the level of pre-control vehicles. The cooperating parties of the IIEC contribute their support both technically and financially in an effort to find the optimum combination of hardware and fuel.

These objectives have been achieved in the laboratory by means of various approaches. Today, "concept" cars are on the test track to determine whether these approaches are feasible in respect to durability and performance. After much preliminary research and culling of a host of alternatives, IIEC work is now concentrated on four basic ways of achieving the project goals.

There are other promising development efforts at Ford Motor Company. We have publicly announced our intention to produce the turbine truck commercially in the early 1970's. Turbine trucks are running daily and have been as we prepare for production. This alternate power source has excellent potential for extremely low hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions. Application of gas turbine to passenger cars is still a bit down the road, however.

Ford also is doing research into electricity, steam, and other alternate power sources and has done extensive development work on the stratified charge concept.

California has adopted stringent vehicle emission requirements up through the 1974 model year. They are designed to reduce vehicle emissions to a level which would result in the level of air quality established by the California Air Resources Board on September 17, 1969. We, at Ford, intend to meet those more stringent 1974 standards.

We hope that the foregoing summary serves to prove the point that, since the first identification of the automobile as a source of air pollution, Ford has been engaged in a continuous effort to eliminate objectionable emissions from the automobile. A part of the job of almost every Ford engineer is related to emissions. We have found it more important to generate this company-wide "drive" permeating our effort than to try to decide if a given engineer or scientist spent 10% of his time on emissions one day versus 90% another, or none the next. We want to utilize, as efficiently as possible, all of the Company's available technology and use our "know how" in numerous fields related to automotive mechanical and chemical engineering. We believe that, by so doing, the day of the smogless motor vehicle will be hastened.

#### SENATE PASSES H.R. 2—INDEPENDENT FEDERAL CREDIT UNION AGENCY BILL

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

<sup>1</sup> Participating U.S. oil companies are American, Atlantic Richfield, Marathon, Mobil, Sohio and Sun. Three Japanese auto manufacturers—Mitsubishi, Nissan and Toyo Kogyo—joined the program in July, as did the Italian automaker, Fiat.

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate by a vote of 73 to 15, passed H.R. 2, legislation which would provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions. The legislation had previously been approved in the House on July 28, 1969, by an overwhelming vote of 356 to 10.

Today, I have asked for a conference on the legislation so as to work out the final details on the creation of this new agency. There are only a few differences between the House and Senate versions of the legislation and I do not anticipate any problems in working out the differences. In fact, it is my hope that the conferees can meet very shortly to complete action on the legislation.

Although there are a number of technical differences between the two bills, there are only three basic differences.

The House version provides for a Board of Governors to give direction to the National Credit Union Administration. The Board of Governors would set policy to be carried out by the Administrator of the agency. The Senate version vests the power for setting policy with the Administrator of the agency and creates an Advisory Board to advise the Administrator.

The House version further provides that in selecting Board members, the President "shall receive and give special consideration to the nominations submitted by credit union organizations which are representative of a majority of credit unions located in the region for which a Board member is to be appointed." Also, "the persons so appointed as Board members shall be selected on the basis of established records of distinguished service in the credit union movement." The Senate version contains no procedure for submission or consideration of nominations. The Senate version does provide, however, that "in making appointments to the Board, the President shall consider, along with other relevant criteria, the experience of the person to be appointed in the credit union movement."

The final major difference concerns the authority of the Administrator versus the Advisory Board or Board of Governors. The House version requires the Board of Governors to submit an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress including recommendations for legislative enactments and "other action as in the judgment of the Board are necessary and appropriate to carry out its recommendations." The Senate version does not contain a provision for a report to Congress by the Board.

The creation of the National Credit Union Administration will be the biggest step taken by Federal credit unions since the Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934. No longer will the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, the agency which presently supervises Federal credit unions, be buried in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Credit unions will have their own spokesman who will not be shackled by bureaucratic restrictions.

Credit union members throughout the country have worked hard to obtain the goal of their own supervisory agency. They made an outstanding case for the legislation and they worked hard to provide Congress with all of the information needed to pass the legislation.

The establishment of the National Credit Union Administration will be fitting tribute to credit union members and volunteers who have worked so hard and for so many years to make credit unions the great institutions that they are today.

#### GAO REPORT ON INTEREST RATE CRITERIA FOR FINANCING FEDERAL POWER PROGRAM

(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, the second session of the 91st Congress opened with one ray of sunshine—the Comptroller General's report, dated January 13, 1970, exposing the ridiculously inadequate interest rates Federal agencies have been using in determining the cost of financing Federal electric power programs. Let us all hope this report is a harbinger of a new era where honesty, credibility, and respectability will prevail for Federal programs in the 1970's. This report by the prestigious General Accounting Office is particularly encouraging and reassuring to me because I have been exclaiming for years that these projects do not repay their cost to the taxpayers. In fact I introduced legislation starting in 1962 to correct this problem but nothing was done. Last year I introduced two bills, H.R. 661 and an amended version, H.R. 13107, to establish a uniform and realistic policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric power projects.

In the words of the GAO:

The interest rate criteria used by Federal agencies in determining the cost of financing the Federal power program result in the use of interest rates that are not representative of the cost of funds borrowed by the Treasury during the period of construction of a power project.

The GAO undertook its review of this matter because its continuing reviews of Federal power agencies noted "variations in the interest rates applicable to the individual projects constructed by the agencies." The GAO found that a significant amount of information on interest rates was available from its annual audits of the financial statements of the Federal Columbia River Power System. Accordingly, it used this system as an example "to show that the Government's cost of financing the Federal power program has been significantly understated because of the use of interest rates below the cost of Treasury borrowing."

The report goes on to point out, however, that this condition is not unique to the Federal Columbia River power system and is applicable to other power systems in the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior.

The GAO report referred to the fact that costs to construct, operate, and

maintain the facilities of the Federal power program are financed by appropriations from the Federal Government, except for the power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Since fiscal year 1961 the TVA power program has been financed by its power revenues and by the sale of revenue bonds and notes on the private money market where true, cost-of-money, interest rates prevail.

Despite the TVA example in paying the true cost-of-money, interest rates used in accounting for the repayment of Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation power projects have ranged generally from 2½ to 3¼ percent. During the past year power bonds issued by TVA have resulted in net annual interest rates to that agency of about 8 percent.

With respect to the Federal investment in the power facilities of the TVA, the 1959 TVA Revenue Bond Act required specific annual repayments of capital and interest on the appropriation investment based on the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its total marketable public obligations as of the beginning of the fiscal year. As of June 30, 1969, this rate was 5.232 percent. We all know that the Government is presently paying more than 8-percent interest on its current borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, the GAO believes the Secretary of the Treasury should have the responsibility of "prescribing annually an interest rate to be used in determining the interest costs to be capitalized as part of the Government's investment in power projects," and that this rate should "take into consideration the average market yield, during the year in which the investment is made, on the outstanding marketable obligations which the Secretary considers to be most representative of the cost to the Treasury of borrowing money to construct the power projects." The GAO said it believes further that the annual interest rates should be computed on the basis of a composite of the average market yields used in computing the interest costs capitalized during the construction of the project. This is important, for the cost of financing the Federal power program is a significant portion of the total cost of the program.

The GAO stated that use of an average interest rate on long-term Treasury obligations outstanding at the time initial construction funds were requested for a project as a basis for computing the interest costs as part of the Government's investment in the projects, actually does not represent the cost of Treasury borrowing during the period of construction. The report refers to the use of a 2½ percent interest rate on the John Day Dam, for example, as contrasted to the then average market yield of 3¼ percent on Treasury securities with comparable maturities.

Some further background of this point will help illustrate the economics and financial inequities inherent in the present agency practices. In 1965, the Congress, in the Water Resources Planning Act, established the Water Re-



sources Council. Among the responsibilities assigned to the Council were the establishment, with the approval of the President, or principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans, and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related and resource projects. Except for its authority over the "evaluation" of projects, its responsibilities were limited to matters concerning the planning and formulation of projects. Many of us had high hopes that this agency would provide constructive leadership in the planning and formulation of Federal projects. Unfortunately it has, with minor exceptions, been completely inoperative and largely a failure. While it did finally, on December 24, 1968, issue a rule amending the interest rate formula contained in Senate Document 97 to base the interest rates formula on yields rather than on coupon rates, as the GAO points out, the rate applies only to plan formulation and evaluation used to secure authorization of a project and not to repayment. Furthermore, although establishing a much improved formula for determining interest rates, the Water Resources Council ignored it and established a lesser interest rate than would have been required by the formula if it had been applied to the Treasury securities at the time. The GAO report specifically refers to my bill H.R. 661 and quotes a section on interest rates which was subsequently amended in H.R. 13107.

In 1967 and 1968, the Subcommittee on Economy and Government of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on the interest rates used by Federal agencies in evaluating the feasibility of proposed Federal projects. A number of witnesses including officials of the Federal Government testified that the market yield on Treasury obligations is the only true measure of the cost of Treasury borrowing rather than the interest rate formula proposed in Senate Document 97. For that matter the Secretary of the Treasury has consistently objected to the artificial interest rates used in determining the costs of financing Federal power programs. In a letter dated November 17, 1964, commenting on the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, the Secretary of the Treasury advised the Secretary of the Interior:

The Treasury Department has for some time been quite concerned about the appropriateness of the interest rate formula presently used for the cost-benefit and reimbursement calculations for water and related land resource development projects.

He referred to the inclusion of the formula in Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, second session, and pointed out:

The Treasury Department was not consulted in regard to the interest rate formula in Senate Document 97, and we have felt impelled to urge on a number of occasions that an early reconsideration be undertaken.

He continued:

We feel it is imperative to move toward adoption of a more appropriate interest rate in order to provide for a more accurate portrayal of project costs and more equitable cost sharing arrangements.

It is an anomaly that even after such repeated comments of the Secretaries of the Treasury in both Democratic and Republican administrations it was not until 1968 that a small increase in the interest rate used was directed by the Water Resources Council.

As I have indicated above, the interest rate prescribed by the Water Resources Council does not apply to the repayment of the Federal cost of projects. Nevertheless, it is obvious that to have any meaning project plan formulation and repayment of cost must be directly related. Furthermore, the interest rate used affects not only the costs but the benefits used in justification of such projects. In hearings by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations with respect to appropriations for the Federal Power Commission the following colloquy took place:

Senator ELLENDER. If you fix the benefits for electric power at 2.75 mills and electricity actually is sold at 2.25 mills, do you think that is a good yardstick to use to determine what the benefit-to-cost ratio should be?

Mr. WHITE [Chairman of the Federal Power Commission]. It certainly would not sound like it, Senator. . . . I think the actual rate paid for the electricity should be used in the benefit-to-cost ratio determination.

Of course, interest rates must be adjusted to actual conditions as they are at the time the financing is provided for the project, rather than using obsolete figures which may have been applicable some years before when the original justification material was being prepared.

The GAO submitted its draft of this report on interest rate criteria to a number of agencies concerned for comment. The Corps of Engineers pointed out that the interest rates used in its evaluations have been in accordance with the coupon formula prescribed by administrative and legislative authority. The Department of the Interior responded that the interest rate policy for Federal power programs had been established in the context of other considerations and that "to the extent intended by Congress total program costs are recovered." Interior referred to the subsidized rates applicable to the rural electrification loan program and said that the Federal power program should not be singled out as the only activity to which a criteria of recovery of entire costs on the Federal investment should apply. For its part the Treasury Department noted that as a matter of longstanding policy it has recommended the use of current market yields on outstanding Government obligations of comparable maturity as the best measure of the cost to the Government of financing an activity. This formula, it stated, provides a current measure of the "minimum" cost of money in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the findings of the GAO report, but I am sadly disappointed with its lack of recommendations. Despite the fact that it found the interest costs capitalized as part of the Government's investment have been "significantly" understated, GAO merely reports the matter to the Congress without recommendation. I am concerned that such an excellent report may be left to languish on a shelf rather

than be the basis for the correction of an entirely unjustified practice. The report does not even indicate that its findings will be considered in reporting on future audits of the Federal power programs. It states only that the "interest rate criteria used by Federal agencies in determining the costs of financing the Federal power program should be changed" but ends up making no recommendation to this effect.

It is interesting to note that the agency specifically established to assist in the development of a region, the Tennessee Valley Authority, more than 10 years ago was required not only to seek future financing of power facilities in the open money market, but also to repay the investment made by the Federal Government over a period of years prior thereto with interest equal to the average rate paid by the Federal Government on its securities. As stated above, that rate currently is 5.232 percent. The Congress decided not only that all future facilities should be financed either from the private money market or from internal TVA sources, but also that current, high-cost interest rates be used on investments made decades ago when interest rates and yields were far lower than they were at the time the revised requirements were enacted. It is strange that the people outside the TVA area should have more favorable treatment than those in what was then an underdeveloped area for which TVA was specifically created.

With respect to the greatly subsidized 2-percent REA electric loan program, it should also be noted that both Republican and Democratic administrations have proposed increases in such rates. Furthermore, the rural electric cooperatives, during this past year, have established a separate independent financing institution outside of the Government to help finance the expansion of their systems.

I have always understood that the General Accounting Office, as an agency in the legislative branch, was created to assist the Congress in providing legislative control over the receipts, disbursement, and applications of public funds. It has the responsibility to assure that expenditures are made in accordance with law and that the administration of programs meets the requirements of statute. In its audit responsibility it has an obligation to report to the Congress information obtained in the audits.

Furthermore, existing law requires generally that rate schedules for Federal power projects be drawn having regard to the recovery by the Federal Government of the cost of producing and transmitting electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated of power, over a reasonable period of years. This is to be done in conformance with sound business principles. Variations in this language appear throughout the statutes but the basic concept is common to them all.

In the many years of authorizing power projects, one of the primary considerations of the Congress has always been the question of whether the costs to the Federal Government would be repaid. This is of primary interest to the Congress and, I am convinced, of primary

interest to the people of the United States. In fact, until 1966 the GAO, in its audit reports on Federal electric power systems provided information on this subject.

Since then, however, it has been concerned primarily with accounting principles. In its September 1966 audit report on the Columbia River Federal Power System, the GAO stated:

The financial statements are presented on a cost accounting basis and do not purport to show financial results in terms of repayment of the investment in the commercial power program, either cumulatively or for the fiscal year, on the basis of the repayment administratively established by the Department pursuant to law.

While it would be expected that the Federal Columbia River Power System, as well as other power marketing agencies of the Federal Government, would keep and maintain financial records in accordance with sound business accounting principles, and any failure to do so would be reported to Congress, it would seem to me that the Congress is more interested in knowing whether the power systems are meeting their repayment requirements in accordance with law. I am, accordingly, pleased that the GAO is now concerning itself with basic, broad policy considerations, as well as with statutory requirements.

I realize that present law leaves much to be desired as to the specific standards and terms of amortization which are required for repayment of the Federal investment in power projects outside of the TVA area. I also believe that the great mass of the public has been misled in thinking that the cost of these projects are being repaid to the taxpayer. Regardless of any past needs for power development, it would seem that any clear-minded person, at this stage of development of our country, and in light of the tremendous technological advances that have taken place, would feel that continued subsidization of the Federal power program is neither needed nor desirable. There simply is no need for it now. We can no longer afford this luxury.

The question of whether Federal power projects should repay their cost to the taxpayer is a matter of public policy. It is not something to be left to determination by administrative whim. I realize that certain agency personnel will argue in favor of continuation of past practice to protect their vested interests. But, decisions on policy issues are not within their assigned responsibility. It is for this and other significant reasons heretofore enumerated that I have introduced legislation to establish a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric power projects. I cannot overemphasize that on matters of this kind GAO has an even greater, overriding responsibility to ascertain and make reports to the Congress concerning the compliance of Federal agencies with the basic policies and decisions of the Congress than it has to report routine accounting findings.

I highly commend the GAO on its recent report and seek its endorsement and support in the Congress of my legislation which would resolve this issue in a manner which will be fair and in the best interests of all the people. It makes no sense whatsoever to continue the present

inequitable, varied, and unjustified practices. I also look forward to full disclosure by GAO in its future audit reports of failures by Federal electric power systems to repay their actual costs to the Government.

#### THE NATION'S LAW SCHOOLS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL DECADE—PARTIAL RESULTS, NO. 2 OF AN INFORMAL SURVEY

(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, this is the second report on results of the informal survey I conducted among the deans of the Nation's law schools concerning environment-related curriculum. As I mentioned in my first report, the response has been extremely gratifying and enlightening. Most responses show a deepening awareness of the responsibility of the law schools to prepare future attorneys for involvement in suits affecting the quality of life.

On the basis of recent news stories about current suits dealing with environmental problems, one can see a pattern developing in many communities across the land where the only recourse available to the public to prevent or rectify environmental pollution is through the courts. This is a time-consuming process fraught with unusual difficulties; not the least of which is the general lack of knowledge about the environment as it relates to our legal system.

My survey shows that most law schools recognize that new ground needs to be tilled and that with time, a body of environmental law may be established. Considering the critical necessity of cleaning up the environment, combined with the public's rising expectations and desire to effect such protection, I can only say that whatever is done now to prepare future legal environmentalists is extremely important to man's future.

I have again taken representative and pertinent sections of the letters from the deans and reproduced them below to give our colleagues an overview of the extent of the commitment to protecting our environment I have found throughout the Nation's law schools.

Associate Prof. David P. Bryden, of the University of Minnesota Law School, reported on the course content in four traditional courses. He mentioned that the law and agricultural economics seminar for this year is devoted entirely to pesticides.

Dean Edward C. Halbach, Jr., of the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, also noted the traditional courses and added that professors from his school, and one member of the law faculty from Stanford, UCLA, and the University of California, Davis, are making plans for a joint program of research, public service and education relating to the legal and policy problems in the field of environment. He added:

I sincerely hope that imaginative steps will be taken in the Federal government to stimulate and assist a wide variety of law-related but inter-disciplinary work on environmental problems.

Associate Dean Charles W. Mentkowski, of Marquette University, sent a detailed outline of the Law School's plans in this area of curriculum. Dean Mentkowski said:

Plans have been and are currently being made to offer a course in the fall semester of 1970 on Legal Solutions to Environmental Pollution Problems. The course is envisioned as concerning both the legal implications of governmental control and investigation of possible private rights of action to keep the water, air, and forest unpolluted. It will be an interdisciplinary offering to an extent with aid from professors of Chemistry, Biology, and Engineering:

From the Northwestern University School of Law, Prof. Anthony A. D'Amato listed the courses currently being given at Northwestern and added:

I hope that your informal survey helps create a sense of urgency about such curricular offerings in law schools. As a member of a Northwestern University committee investigating environment-related courses here, I have found that although many courses have long dealt with aspects of environmental problems, wholly new offerings are severely needed to cope with interdisciplinary ecological findings that have recently surfaced in public consciousness.

While some members of our faculty share my personal concern that what is at stake in the "environment" issue is nothing less than the survival of the human race in an increasingly polluted and exploited world, there are others who have not been sufficiently exposed to the warnings of scientists and the findings of ecologists to yet share this degree of concern. To some extent, interest for new environment courses will come as a result of student pressure. But time is short, and I would personally appreciate all efforts that may be exerted by persons in a position of authority, such as yourself, to indicate your level of concern to each and every faculty member of our leading law schools.

Prof. James E. Krier of the University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law, outlined a number of interesting environment seminar programs in which UCLA students are currently involved. Concerning the future, he says:

Our plans for the immediate future include seminars in natural resources, conservation, and environmental law. But this is not the limit of our commitment. Many of the most fascinating facets of environmental problems as they bear on legal institutions are best illustrated within the framework of the more traditional courses . . . Several of my colleagues draw upon problems of environmental quality for analysis in those courses. This is, I think, a most valuable and relevant approach.

I know our colleagues will be particularly interested to learn of a new book on "environmental law" which is scheduled for publication late in 1971. I learned of the book from Mrs. Eva H. Hanks, associate dean of the Rutgers University Law School. Mrs. Hanks is a coauthor with her husband, John L. Hanks, of the Columbia Law School, and Prof. A. Dan Tarlock of the Indiana School of Law, of a casebook on environmental law. Considering the growing number of suits dealing with such problems, the compilation of cases is bound to add significantly to the legal profession's ability to cope with these community problems.

Dean Harold G. Wren of the Lewis and Clark College School of Law reported that a new course in "environment and the law" will be added to the

regular law school curriculum during the 1970-71 academic year. He also noted that the faculty of the Northwestern School of Law will publish a legal periodical entitled "environmental law" which will emphasize all aspects of man as related to his environment through the law and legal process. The first issue of the publication is due this spring.

Dean Don W. Sears of the University of Colorado School of Law noted:

In the specific area of environmental quality control, we are now offering a seminar devoted exclusively to this subject. In addition, we have an environmental intern program which has been made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation. Each year, twelve of our students have an opportunity to participate in the program which consists of spring and fall seminars and an intervening ten-week summer research period. During the summer the students work on research projects in conjunction with an agency at the federal, state, or local level having some responsibility for the quality of the environment.

The Center for Interdisciplinary Study of Public Law at the University of Miami reports the development of a comprehensive program directed to the pressing environmental problems facing the Nation. Prof. Leonard J. Emmerglick stated in his letter:

We are developing a three-part program; one area is directed to legal research to identify substantive principles and procedures to deal with the abuse and misuse of the environment; another part of the program will take the form of a course on environmental law which will be taught by a team of teachers; and, the third part is an action program looking to the making of such contributions as is appropriate in the work of creating needful legislation and supporting the testing of new legal principles in the courts.

Prof. John Mixon, of the University of Houston, Bates College of Law, indicated in his response the "environment" content in some of the traditional courses and added:

Both as a school and as individual faculty members, we share your concern with the up-grading of our national environmental quality. It is likely that our offerings in these fields will be significantly increased over the next few years and that inter-departmental cooperation will also increase.

From the School of Law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Prof. Thomas J. Schoenbaum detailed the school's activities in the environmental area. He suggested to the faculty that a new course devoted solely to environmental law be instituted and reports that the course will be started during the next academic year. Describing the course, he said:

My idea is to discard the traditional categories of natural resource law and to conduct a course that would cover selected current problems in the areas of water pollution, air pollution, conservation, planning, zoning, land and water use, and pesticide control.

#### AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ARE CATCHING ENVIRONMENT FEVER

(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, this morning the Wall Street Journal informs us that many of the Nation's largest firms are cranking up their printing presses to inform Members of Congress and the public of their efforts toward cleaning up the environment. I know there are those who will scoff at these efforts as public relations gimmicks, but for myself, I welcome the new emphasis industry is making toward informing the public of environmental pollution abatement programs.

One of the brochures which has already been circulated is particularly well done and I want to bring it to the attention of our colleagues. "Keep It Clean: Highlights of Bethlehem's Pollution Control Program," from the Bethlehem Steel Corp., goes beyond just being informative—it holds out promise of bigger and better industry effort for the future. The partial text of the booklet is reproduced below along with the text of the corporation's great advertisement which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

With reference to "effort" in the direction of environmental cleanup, I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on the President's magnificent announcement made yesterday concerning the elimination of pollution in Federal Government installations. Truly, this action is a "giant leap for mankind" and the administration is to be congratulated and commended for having the courage of its convictions about the role of leadership in the battle to save our environment.

Certainly, similar statements have been made by previous administrations but President Nixon has given substance to his order. First, a deadline for the cleanup of Government pollution has been irrevocably established. Second, the Bureau of the Budget has been instructed to insure that the funds provided for the cleanup will not be diverted to other uses. In short, the President's order has "teeth," and that is a breakthrough of significant proportions.

Heretofore, the Federal Government has been one of the Nation's worst polluters; that "example" is going to be changed under this administration. Combining the Government's leadership in cleaning up its own house with the new industry awareness of its responsibility, I would say we are well launched in the environmental decade.

The material referred to follows:

[From Keep It Clean, Bethlehem Steel Corp.]

#### THE AIR WE BREATHE

Americans throw about 200 million tons of contaminants into the air each year. This fouling of the air causes an estimated \$13 billion worth of property damage annually, in addition to creating health hazards under certain adverse meteorological conditions.

The uncontrolled discharges from smokestacks, the pollutants rising from streets and highways, the eyeburning smoke from municipal dumps and incinerators . . . can add up to a lot of smog.

#### WHO'S TO BLAME?

In the search for a villain, an aroused public often points an accusing finger at industrial smokestacks. They are much more easily

noticed than the exhaust pipe of your own car, a household chimney, or an outdoor barbecue grill. However, manufacturing industries account for only about 16.5 per cent of air pollutants, according to the U.S. Public Health Service.

Federal Government sources estimate that about one-third of the man-made substances in the air can be attributed to the manufacturing, public transportation, and power-generating industries. The remaining two-thirds comes from the general population.

Fortunately, increasing national and local concern with air pollution is reflected in more stringent regulations by all levels of government. Cities, for example, are placing more restrictions on open burning. And many states are cracking down on industries and utilities that exceed the permissible maximum in emission of smoke and fumes. Automobile manufacturers are making progress in developing pollution control systems of increasing efficiency in response to growing concern over car and truck exhaust gases.

But, each of us, as an individual, shares in the cause and effects of pollution. We also share the responsibility for its control. Whether you are a backyard trash burner, a manufacturer, a journalist, a teacher, or a legislator, part of the burden to control environmental contamination is yours.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 4, 1970]

#### WHAT IN THE WORLD DOES A FORESTER DO AT BETHLEHEM STEEL?

Bethlehem Steel owns about 100,000 acres of forest land, most of it over or adjacent to our iron ore and coal mines. And because of mining methods used many years ago, some of these properties had gradually become eyesores. That is why we took our first step toward scientific control and restoration of woodlands more than 40 years ago.

Our program was formalized in 1958, when a registered consulting forester was appointed chief of our Forestry Division. Today, Bethlehem foresters perform reclamation planting, and cruise our timberlands, planning improvements and directing the workers who do the cutting and planting. Some highlights of their work:

In the past ten years they have planted over two million seedling trees at our properties in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

At Mine No. 44, near Idamay, West Virginia, our foresters converted a barren coal tailings basin and harsh culm banks into lush acres ankle-high in bluegrass, fescue, lespedeza, and rye grass.

In open fields surrounding our mines near Ebsenburg, Pa., some 60,000 pine seedlings have been planted.

Every fall and winter our foresters travel through 40,000 acres of timberland in Kentucky and about 35,000 acres in West Virginia, marking trees ready for cutting. Thinning the timber improves the quality of the remaining trees and accelerates their growth.

Our foresters regularly provide guidance to conservation groups in our plant and mining communities. For example, several years ago a fire destroyed 3,000 acres of timber in the City of Bethlehem's watershed. Bethlehem Steel foresters directed a restoration program that included hydro-seeding with grass, planting 600,000 coniferous seedlings, salvaging salable timber, and initiating a scientific timber-management program.

Hundreds of acres of previously ugly terrain in various locations have been transformed into flowering fields and verdant slopes, pulsing with game and other wildlife. Battalions of evergreens march up hillsides, ending erosion forever. Hedgerows of trees and shrubs screen industrial installations from the passing eye.

At Bethlehem we are engaged in many things besides the manufacture of steel—

thoughtful land management is just one of them.

BETHLEHEM STEEL.

### THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a peoples' phenomenon in Asia, which for some inscrutable reason has escaped the press of our country, though not those of other continents, is the work and effectiveness of the World Anti-Communist League, with headquarters in Seoul, Korea. WACL, as it is known internationally, crystallizes on the popular level the profound anti-communism of the free Asian peoples and is also supported by active anti-Communists throughout the free world, including those of our own country.

The Third Conference of WACL was held this past December in Bangkok, Thailand. It was a highly successful conference, widely reported throughout the Far East. Contributing to the success of the conference were some of the declarations, addresses, and reports. To indicate how both governmental and private supporters, both Asian and American anti-Communists, evaluate the paramount international problems confronting the free world, I commend the following to the careful reading of my colleagues as well as our private citizens: First, the message of President Park Chung Hee of the Republic of Korea; second, the declaration of WACL; third, the address by WACL's chairman, Dr. Phan Huy Quat of Vietnam; fourth, the address by His Excellency General Jesus Vargas, Secretary General of SEATO; fifth, and address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, along with a report on the work of the National Captive Nations Committee; sixth, an address by Dr. Ku Chen-kang of China, linking the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League to WACL and; seventh, three significant resolutions on the Brezhnev doctrine, 1970 Captive Nations Week, and the forthcoming Lenin Centennial:

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Delegates, and Ladies and Gentlemen, today marks the opening of the third annual conference of the World Anti-Communist League, symbol of the solidarity of the free men of the world. Our purpose is to defend freedom against continuous communist threats, and to hasten the liberation of captive nations now under communist tyranny.

During the past three years, notable success has been achieved in containing communism through the close cooperation of WACL member nations. I want to express my sincere thanks for your dedicated efforts and achievements. They will surely be recorded in the history of the World.

In the face of the cherished dream of all peoples for peace, communist acts of aggression are on the increase and atrocities continue to grow more and more cruel.

The ruthless manner in which the Soviets and their Allied Warsaw Pact Forces rode roughshod over the liberation movement in Czechoslovakia in the summer of last year remains vivid in our memories. Today, a year and three months after that fateful event, the cries of the Czechs as they seek to re-

cover their sovereignty still reverberate across the world. Although two years have been spent working towards a ceasefire in Vietnam through the Paris Peace Talks, that goal has not yet been attained. Communist North Korea daily shows increasing belligerence toward the rest of the world. Coming on the heels of their illegal seizure of the US intelligence ship Pueblo last January, their downing of the US EC-121 while it was on a reconnaissance mission over open seas off the eastern coast of Korea on April 15th this year, augmented already aroused worldwide anger.

During the past 16 years since the armistice agreement ended the Korean War in 1953, we have continually attempted to negotiate with the communists, but they have violated the armistice agreement countless times by infiltrating secret agents and guerrillas into our country with the sole purpose of creating anarchy. But each time such intrusions occur, our people decisively repel the enemy. Through bitter experience, we have learned how to thwart communist aggression.

At this point I would like to emphasize that we must never accept compromise with the communists, because such compromise can only lead toward the communist goal of communization of the whole world. Now, more than ever, we must have strong solidarity among free peoples if we are to preserve freedom and to achieve liberation of captive peoples still under the communist yoke.

I earnestly hope this conference will be successful in stimulating the growth of freedom throughout the world, and I wish the World Anti-Communist League continued success in its efforts on behalf of enlightenment and encouragement of the enslaved peoples of communist countries. To all the delegates and their respective governments, I wish Godspeed.

December 3rd, 1969.

PARK CHUNG HEE,  
President, Republic of Korea.

### DECLARATION OF THE THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

The World Anti-Communist League, meeting at its Third Annual Conference in Bangkok, Thailand on December 3-6, 1969, with an attendance of 180 delegates and observers from 54 member- and observer-units, has taken another big forward stride in its endeavor to establish a joint international anti-Communist front by rallying freedom-loving forces under the banner of a crusade for freedom.

With a new decade about to begin, the WACL is doubly aware of its responsibility in the face of rapidly-changing times. The tremendous achievements in the field of scientific creation and material production, and especially the epoch-making significance of the recent successful landing on the moon, point to the possibility that the 1970's will be an era of true freedom for mankind. However, the evils of communism, the terror of slave labour and the menace of Communist aggression still threaten peace and freedom in the world.

The WACL reaffirms its conviction that it must continue its unremitting effort to wipe out Communism, destroy the slave labour system and counter all attempts at aggression until a total victory is attained by all the freedom-loving people of the world.

The WACL firmly believes that to treat the evil power of Communism as compatible with decency is contrary to all principles of justice. All endeavours to reach constructive results through negotiations with Communist aggressors are doomed to failure. The WACL wishes to solemnly remind those peoples of the free world, currently negotiating with the Communists, of their dedication to freedom and that they must forever be vigilant against double talk by the Communists.

To the free world peace-negotiators now in

Paris, the WACL wishes to state solemnly that the talks must not be allowed to jeopardize the independence and freedom of the republic of Vietnam.

To the government of the United States of America, the WACL must emphasize that, unless the Communists show concrete signs of sincerity, there should not be any premature withdrawal of U.S. combat units from Vietnam such would weaken the posture of the United States of America and its allies.

In this connection, it is noted that the United States government has agreed to return Okinawa to Japan by 1972 and that, consequently certain American combat units would be withdrawn from the Island. In view of this, the WACL also must emphasize that sufficient measures should be taken to safeguard the security of the Republic of Korea and other adjacent areas still threatened by Communist aggression.

The WACL wishes to warn advocates of appeasement against unthinkingly giving aid and comfort to Communist designs on human freedom. Lamentably, there have been many cases of young people being exploited and utilized by the Communists to serve their own ends. The WACL calls on the youth of the world to stand bravely and resolutely on the side of freedom and join in the fight for democracy and justice.

The WACL must state that the international Communists are still bent on expansion, infiltration and subversion in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas. Such aggression poses the greatest menace to the security and peace of the world.

For this reason, the WACL is of the opinion that efforts must be stepped up to build an international anti-Communist front, to unite all the freedom fighters of the world and to check Communist atrocities. All the free peoples of the world must support the East European and Asian peoples, still languishing under Communist rule, in their fight to regain freedom. Positive assistance must be given for the liberation of these peoples and also in countering any future Communist attempts at aggression, rooting out at the same time the evil influence of Communist ideology of whatever brand.

The WACL renews its support of the liberation fight of Ukraine, Caucasian nations, Byelorussia, Hungary, Baltic States, Turkistan, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and all others against Russian imperialism and Communism, which has violated their national independence and human rights.

The WACL has decided to hold its fourth annual conference on September 21, 1970 in Tokyo, Japan.

Turmoil is ahead in the 1970's. The WACL pledges to start the new decade with determination and courage in order to make the 1970's a decade of decisive victory for freedom.

The WACL takes this opportunity to express its heartfelt felicitations to His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand on his birthday on December 5, 1969. The WACL is convinced that Thailand has an infinitely bright future as a great free nation.

SPEECH BY DR. PHAN HUY QUAT, WACL  
COUNCIL CHAIRMAN

(Delivered at the opening ceremony of the Third WACL Conference in Bangkok, December 1969)

Excellencies, Honorable Delegates, Distinguished Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen, this afternoon, the WACL Secretary General will present to the Conference a detailed report on the activities of the League in 1969, but I would like to take advantage of this tribune to inform you about some highlights of our activities during the past year.

First of all, I should like to announce that the WACL Norway and Bolivia Chapters have been set up, thanks to the untiring efforts of

Messrs. Jelstad and Candia, who attended last year the Second WACL General Conference and had the opportunity of witnessing the Communist brutality and treachery in Vietnam. Groundwork has been also laid for the formation of WACL Chapters in the United States and in France. To Messrs. Jelstad and Candia and all those who have actively worked for the expansion of the League, I request you to give a big applause (pause).

It is my earnest hope that next year similar chapters will be formed and admitted to the League in compliance with WACL regulations.

Next, I should like to report the resolution adopted at the 2nd WACL Conference to send a mission to Latin America, Africa and other countries could not be implemented by the WACL Executive Board. Our Honorary Chairman, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang had been tied up with his duty as a ROC assemblyman and the fact-changing situation in Vietnam had prevented myself from adhering to the program schedule by the League, as I always wished.

As you all know, the world situation has been changing at a rapid rate. Symptoms of disintegration of the Communist bloc have become more and more manifest. Early this year, bloody clashes between Soviet and Red Chinese units broke out along Sino-Soviet borders. It is plain to all that Mao's China and the Soviet Union could never patch up their quarrels. The prolonged conflict has rendered both Moscow and Peking leaders unable to hold their grips on their satellites like in the past. Communist countries in Eastern Europe show obedience to the Soviet Union only under the threat of the force of arms, to wit, the case of Czechoslovakia. Yugoslavia and Rumania continue to oppose Moscow's tyrannical and oppressive policies toward Warsaw countries. Disunity and dissensions prevail among Communist ranks everywhere. In North Vietnam, since Ho Chi Minh's death, the regime has been experiencing a severe leadership crisis.

In Eastern Europe, the danger of disintegration looms particularly great, because the unprecedented economic development and prosperity enjoyed by the European Common Market member countries have lured Eastern European countries away from the Soviet orbit. This clearly constitutes a serious threat to the Soviet interests.

Now, the Soviet Union looks with apprehension at the role of the Federal Republic of Germany in the development of European economy and the possible British entry into the European Common Market, which would boost the power of the Free Europe vis-a-vis the Warsaw bloc. Soviet leaders also fear General de Gaulle's successors in France would return to French earlier stance to consolidate the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and thereby enhancing the position of the Free World, especially the United States in Europe. This situation explains in a forceful manner Soviet policy as spelled out in a speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the United Nations General Assembly, in which he laid great emphasis on the "special" importance of Europe with regard to the Soviet Union.

Undeniably, the Soviet leadership in the Communist bloc has been weakened. But, on the other hand, we should not overlook the fact that the Soviet Union has been picking up influence in the Third World, especially in Middle East countries. Recently, Soviet Communist Party Secretary General Leonid I. Brezhnev, also urged the formation of a system of collective security for South East Asia and the Pacific.

The expansion efforts of the Soviet Union should cause us some concern. In fact, in this area, the Soviet position has surpassed that of the United States and the Free World. It can be safely said that the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and the Yemen Republic

have fallen into the Soviet orbit. As for the remaining Arab countries, regardless of their political regimes, autocratic or democratic, except the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union has maintained diplomatic relations with them all.

The Soviet Union has provided not only military, but also economic aid to Syria and Iraq, especially for the development of oil fields and industrial projects. In Iran, U.S. influence has been neutralized by the Soviet Union. Iran has signed an agreement granting the Soviet Union the rights to participate in the development of oil fields on the Iranian soil. Most significant in Soviet-Iranian relations has been the treaty signed on Feb. 9, 1967 for the exchange of military hardware valued at 110 million U.S. dollars. Under the treaty provisions, the Soviet Union supplied Iran with tanks, army trucks, and anti-aircraft weapons in exchange for light commodities. Thus, Iran was the first nation-member of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) to accept military aid from the Soviet Union.

We should also draw our attention to the Soviet bid to strengthen its political and military influence in the Middle East by helping these countries build air and sea ports. Since 1958, the Soviet Union has embarked on the construction of the Hodeida harbor, located on the Red Sea shore, for Yemen, and the modernization of the Conakry airport for Guinea. Soviet presence in the Aqaba and the Persian Gulf has been firmly established. The Soviet Union's aim in extending its influence over a number of passes, air and sea ports has been to establish military bases for any eventual need in the future. To the Kremlin leaders, the establishment of base such as these would probably reap greater benefits and cost them less money than equipping and training local armies.

Coupled with the above-mentioned efforts, the Soviet Navy has been thrusting deep into the Mediterranean and, to some extent, into the Indian Ocean.

In the Mediterranean, for instance, about 30 to 50 warships have been dispatched to the area as a display of Soviet support to the Arabs. The warships anchored at these ports served to deter any Israeli attempt to attack Arab ports. Besides, the Soviet Union would like to see the influence of the U.S. 6th Fleet reduced in this part of the world.

I should like to call your attention to the growing strength of some Communist parties in a number of European countries. Should these parties seize the reins of government in the Mediterranean, the Soviet Union with its existing influence in scores of Arab countries on the other side, would control an immense area of Europe and Africa, the world balance of forces would be shattered and we would witness a resurgence of strong nationalist sentiments. World War III would break out and mankind would be subjected to a nuclear holocaust.

I do hope such dreadful prospect will serve as a perventive for short-sighted statesmen and intellectuals.

We now come to South East Asia, a region Red China has unceasingly sought to conquer in the last two decades, either through military or political means. The Soviet Union is trying to move in to gain a foothold in that area. The Soviet Union has assisted Communist North Vietnam in carrying out its aggressive designs against the Republic of Vietnam. Recently, at the World Communist Conference held in Moscow last June 7, Brezhnev also called for the establishment of a system of collective security for Asia. Shortly after this meeting, Soviet diplomatic representatives in Asian countries have been summoned home for consultations, Soviet activities in this area undoubtedly aimed at making deep inroads or at least replacing U.S. influence.

An appraisal of Red China will reveal that,

although confronted by many domestic difficulties, militarily weak and politically isolated by the Soviet Union as well as the Free World, she remains a grave threat to the security of South East Asia. In this region, Red China will continue to lend support to the so-called "revolutionary" or "people's wars of liberation," such as the kind of war being waged in Vietnam by Communist Hanoi regime. Pro-Communist and neutralist slogans are wooed and encouraged by Red China.

It was also for that same purpose that Lin Piao reiterated the five principles for peaceful coexistence at the Chinese Communist Party's National Congress held last April. A two-pronged policy of proclaiming revolution and advocating peace seems to produce effect on some naive and unsophisticated people.

In summing up the situation in Communist countries, I would like to emphasize the fact that, in spite of division within the Communist bloc and the Sino-Soviet conflict, both Moscow and Peking are pursuing the same objectives: to infiltrate and invade other countries, to destroy freedom and democracy, and to trample upon human dignity.

The Free World, on the other hand, has not worked out appropriate policies for joint action in the face of Communists' weakness in order to force them to accept peace. On the contrary, many free nations and a number of religious leaders have chosen to advocate an appeasement policy and more concessions to the Communists. Some groups in the United States have even gone further with their defeatist spirit. American public opinion among the academic circles has been partly poisoned by Communist deceitful propaganda. But I am convinced that, endowed with the democratic heritage and the pride of a nation having sent its men to the moon, a great majority of Americans will awaken to the Communist danger and repair the damage caused by a handful of anti-war critics. Whether she likes it or not, the United States must always assume the responsibilities of the leading nation in the Free World. For only the scientific capability, the industrial power and faith in liberty of the American nation can effectively check the Red tide, encourage the captive peoples under the Communist yoke to rise up and fight for freedom and democracy in order to secure peace for mankind, not a peace in slavery but a peace assuring the interests of all nations.

I am confident such peace prospect will come to us. But to acquire that kind of peace, the Free World should, at least for several decades, maintain and form new defense alliances and developed countries should devote a great amount of their material resources to the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

I sincerely believe that the most effective political formula to resist against Communism for developing countries is to carry out social revolution and to eradicate social evils left behind by their former colonial masters. Only such a revolution would truly restore the people's confidence in their government and deprive the Communists of the issues for their malicious propaganda. It is also imperative and pressing for nations in each region to establish regional associations for development, trade, cultural educational and technical exchange. These organizations would greatly contribute to the development of countries and also constitute an effective weapon against international Communism.

In my viewpoint, the anti-Communist struggle is a long and arduous task. For this reason, I am inclined to think that we must actively create condition conducive to the emergence of a new class of young leaders, who will carry on and complete the noble duty of restoring freedom, peace and fraternity.

Before closing, in my capacity as Chair-

man of the WACL I beg to express my deep gratitude to His Majesty the King and His Excellency the Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Thailand for their invaluable assistance in the organization of the Third WACL Conference.

In the hope that the Conference will score brilliant achievements, I solemnly turn over the Chairmanship of the League to my distinguished successor, Gen. Praphan Kulapitichit of Thailand.

Thank you.

#### ASIAN UNITY: A PRECONDITION TO PEACE AND FREEDOM

(Text of the keynote address delivered by His Excellency General Jesus Vargas, Secretary-General of SEATO, at the opening of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League Conference, Bangkok, 6 December 1969)

My Fellow Freedom Fighters: My task this morning is for me a very pleasant one, for two reasons. Firstly, it brings me together with fellow craftsmen, many of whom I have had the good fortune of knowing in the past decade or so in the course of their own devoted pursuit of peace and freedom in this part of the world; and secondly, I am to dwell on a subject which is not only very close to my heart but is one with which I am closely involved in my present occupation.

I realize that the task before me is an important one, and that what I say this morning is intended to set both the pace and the tone of the proceedings of this important assemblage during the next two days.

I am deeply honoured, and I am most grateful for this very rare opportunity of being associated all at one time with so many and so devoted and distinguished fighters for freedom.

My friends, you convene at a time when many forces at work in this troubled region, some old and some relatively new, are rapidly changing the face of Asia. You are gathered at a truly crucial time and, therefore, your conference is most opportune. For I can recall no period in the history of Asia that has witnessed so profound a change in such a short time and in which there has been so much at stake for so many people than this, our age.

The contemporary scene has witnessed a fantastic growth of nationalism among Asians. Nationalism, as a propelling force for progress, is imperative. The danger lies in the fact that it is the Communist *modus operandi* to subvert and exploit, for their own sinister ends, the legitimate national aspirations of a people by equating those aspirations with anti-Westernism or anti-Internationalism.

For some countries, the fast changing face of Asia has provided the climate or cause to adopt a policy of non-alignment. For a nation's neutrality to endure and to be valid, it must be able to count on absolute guarantees of non-aggression from all countries on either side of the ideological conflict; in Asia and the West Pacific, such a guarantee must come from, among others, no less than Communist China, which has yet to show that it can keep its word. Since, as a general rule, Communist subversion has progressed the fastest and thrived the best in neutral countries, the present trend towards neutrality is indeed a negative factor in the effort to counter Communist subversion and insurgency in this Area.

The events of recent years have also revealed a distinct trend, to my mind a very healthy one, towards regionalism among Asians—a trend clearly demonstrated by the formation of such political groupings as ASEAN, ASPAC and others. Indeed, the Asians are taking bold and unprecedented steps in the direction of self-help and mutual assistance among their fellows, impelled mainly by a new realization that the prob-

lems of Asia are primarily for the Asians to solve. These new political organizations, whose objectives are almost purely economic, cultural and political, have thrown into bold relief the unique character of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization as the only defensive alliance in this troubled area designed to meet Communist aggression in all its ugly forms. In relation to those groups, SEATO has helped provide the conditions of peace and security so vital to meaningful progress.

Perhaps the most disquieting development to free Asians is the tendency of one-time enthusiastic, powerful and determined allies to turn to the home front and concentrate on domestic problems.

Mainly for political and economic reasons, the great powers are gradually pulling out of the Asian scene, and in effect switching to a policy of near isolationism. First, the Dutch. After Dien Bien Phu, France's presence in this part of the world has been limited to that which was necessary to tend her residual interests in the region. This includes her continuing membership in SEATO where, for the present, she continues to participate actively in non-military endeavours. The United Kingdom, while reassuring its SEATO allies and its Commonwealth partners that it will abide by its treaty commitments, has decided to withdraw all its military forces East of the Suez Canal, except the garrison in Hong Kong, by 31 December 1971. This precipitate military withdrawal perforce adversely affects the Free World posture of defence in Asia.

The Americans' own announced programme of de-escalation of the Vietnam War, which envisages the disengagement of fairly sizable bodies of troops from the combat zone, has been viewed with no little apprehension by the free peoples of Asia. In a separate exercise, the United States, in line with a new policy of retrenchment, has made substantial cuts in its troop strength elsewhere in South-East Asia.

One cannot really readily accept the prospect of total unilateral American withdrawal from Asia and the Western Pacific. I have always maintained that it is clearly in the interest of the American people, as it is in the interest of Asians, that the Communists are kept in effective check in this part of the world. Besides, there are those—Asians and non-Asians alike—who believe, not without reason, that the present troubles of Asia, in more ways than one, are the net result of the delicate interplay of Big Power politics in the Area. If this is so, then the Big Powers, America included, have more than just a moral obligation to maintain a stabilizing presence in this part of the world.

The tendency of the Big Powers either to disengage from the troubles of Asia or to reduce the extent of their commitments to the security of the region could lead to a security vacuum which the Communists would be only too happy to fill. These Big Power decisions have had the immediate effect of jolting Free Asians to the inevitable conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that they could easily be let down by their powerful friends and allies. These developments have also raised very serious doubts in the minds of the people of the Area about the very validity of treaty commitments. I hope to God that these doubts, unsettling as they are and striking as they do at the credibility of the Big Powers, do not metamorphose into a wholesale collapse of free Asians' confidence in the sincerity and in the leadership of those Powers.

Major changes in the face of Asia have also taken place and continue to do so as a direct result of the programmes of expanding their influence of the two biggest Communist powers, the Soviet Union and Communist China. Although each has pursued its programme in divergent ways, the objectives of both have been geared to eventual Commu-

nist domination of the world. In fact, one cannot really overlook the long-term possibility that, despite the present animosity between the Soviet and Communist Chinese regimes, their differences may somehow be resolved. This could come about either by conciliatory negotiations or by the accession to power within Communist China, in succession to Mao Tse-tung and his entourage, of a group that recognized the mutual advantages of ending the Sino-Soviet dispute. Should such a reconciliation occur, the nations of Asia could indeed find themselves totally subsumed in an area of imperious Communism.

Events in Asia during the past few years give no encouragement to the hope that Communist China's attitude towards her South-East Asian neighbours will be modified to any appreciable degree in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, an appraisal of affairs within Communist China provides clear indications that its intransigent foreign policy will continue unchanged and that, in keeping with Peking's sustained support of so-called "Wars of National Liberation" during the past few years, it would pursue with even greater vigour its support of subversion and insurgency within the borders of the free countries of Asia.

We all know that the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party held in June this year, was used to re-establish the control of the Party over every aspect of the national life, to reaffirm the mandate of Mao and his supporters and to remove from positions of responsibility those who were in any way opposed to his theories.

The foreign policy outlined to the Congress by Lin Biao, the designated heir to Mao, holds out no hope that Communist China will seek to develop closer and more friendly relationships with its South-East Asian neighbours. One notes with great concern, in fact, that Lin pledged his country's continuing support for the "revolutionary struggle" in foreign countries.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has given clear evidence that it regards Communist China's policy in Asia as a direct challenge to its own position as the world's major Communist power and as a threat to the Soviet interpretation of Communist ideology.

Over the years, the Soviet Union has been making cautious but far-sighted steps to establish its influence in South-East Asia. It is apparent that there is today a widespread pattern of expansion of Soviet influence in this area generally, from Ceylon to Malaysia. Russia has set up diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with many countries in the region, including Malaysia and Singapore. It has also made tentative overtures in the cultural field with staunchly anti-Communist countries such as the Philippines. Acting through North Vietnam, the Soviet Union has made certain preliminary moves to establish diplomatic relations with Nationalist China. Similar attempts have also been made in respect of Japan. Considering the new "forward" policy of the USSR, these diplomatic initiatives are not as incredible as they would seem at first blush. It was, significantly, in May this year shortly after the Communist Chinese Ninth Party Congress, that the Sino-Soviet dispute was openly extended into this Area. An authoritative article in *Izvestia*, the official Soviet newspaper, expressed concern at Peking's "definite designs on a number of countries" in this part of the world and suggested that the situation called for "the laying of the foundation of collective security". The same theme was taken up by Mr. Brezhnev, Chairman of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at the Conference of World Communist Parties held in Moscow in June.

The Soviet proposal for "a collective security system in Asia" was well-timed, from the Russian point of view. Firstly, any pro-

posal that offered the prospect of containing Communist China aggression was likely to appear attractive to those countries which were the declared targets of that aggression. Secondly, the receptiveness of regional governments to such a concept could be substantial in the light of the announced British withdrawal and, additionally, in the light of recent modifications in American policies in the Area. Thirdly, there has been in South-East Asia a growing appreciation that regional co-operation, certainly in economic matters and possibly in defence, holds definite benefits for the individual countries of the region. Fourthly, the preliminary actions of the Soviet Union have been characterized by utmost "correctness"; great care has been taken to limit them to legitimate spheres that bring mutual benefits, and to avoid creating the impression that their objective is a long-term propagation of the Soviet brand of Communism. Finally, there has been a growing feeling in the Area that a cautious dialogue with the Communist powers must be achieved in some way if regional security is to be attained.

Although the proposal has not as yet been set out in any detail, the USSR appears to have in mind an arrangement whereby all foreign military bases would be excluded from the Area, all Asian countries, irrespective of their political complexion, would guarantee one another's security and frontiers, and emphasis would be placed on economic co-operation and the peaceful resolution of local disputes.

The regional Governments may well see in the Soviet concept certain benefits to their own interests, especially in the short term. The Soviet Union may be expected to exploit this by making advantageous offers of economic aid and trading partnerships, as it has successfully done in some countries, and by encouraging regional economic co-operation, which would be consistent with its long-term objectives to extend its sphere of influence.

The long-term implications, however, need to be appraised with the utmost circumspection. In the first place, any increase of Soviet influence would undoubtedly spur Communist China on to stepping up its support of subversion and insurgency, and thus accentuate the present major threat to the stability of the region. Peking has already condemned the scheme as an effort to set up "an Anti-China military alliance". In addition, there is the inherent danger that acceptance of the scheme would lead to political subservience to the world's major Communist power, for a dominant role in economic matters is conducive to the development of an equally dominant role in political affairs. In short, the Soviet concept contains the very real danger that, in time, the regional countries may find themselves subjected to rigid external political domination which denies them the right to determine even their own domestic policies. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the Communist objective still is to erode Western influence and ultimately supplant duly-constituted governments with Communist regimes.

The oft-repeated but entirely distinct proposal for some kind of a security alliance of free Asian countries has, understandably, attracted even more attention in recent months. Several national leaders, spurred on to a determined search for suitable interim or alternative defense arrangements, and recognizing that they have inevitably been tossed into the whirlpool of Big Power domestic politics, have expressed some support, in varying degrees, for the idea. To free Asians, this search for stop-gap solutions or alternatives is a question of survival.

Before I go into the merits and demerits of the proposal, let us look into the new American Pacific strategy which has given rise to the idea itself. On the basis of recent

statement made by Asian leaders and of certain recent international developments, it would seem that the new American formula for Asia and the Pacific is as follows: greater Asian involvement in Asian defence, no wholesale American withdrawal, and certainly no dropping of commitments already entered into, more selective American intervention on behalf of and in alliance with selected Asian countries, and above all, increased reliance on Japan.

What, exactly, are the prospects for active Japanese participation in the defence of Asia? However cautiously, Japan is emerging as the chief ally of the United States in the Far East and, its Constitution notwithstanding, one cannot help but assume that in due course Japan will, once again, be playing a military role abroad. That country has so far been forced by internal political pressures to adopt a policy of "low pressure", but it would be most unrealistic indeed to assume that it will remain a passive member of the society of nations. Certain factors of overriding consideration are likely to compel her before long to change this policy. The hostile forces around her, her geographic size and location, her need for trade—these, and many other factors, would all seem to dictate that she must develop military, naval and air power to guard her booming economy.

This appears also to indicate that no all-Asian security pact would be of any real moment without the membership and the active participation of Japan. Yet, it is not difficult to recognize that Japan cannot change its policies and build up its military might to the proportions of an established military power literally overnight.

There are other difficulties in the way of a full-dress all-Asian Pact at this time. Before a developing country can become a useful member of any alliance in which there is no established world power, it must first attain a certain minimum standard of economic and social development. Japan is a case in point. If it has today one of the world's most stable national economies, it is because, in the crucial two decades following the second World War, it did not need to dissipate its energies and wealth on the development and maintenance of defence forces, spending annually for defence barely two percent of its Gross National Product.

I believe that a formal Asian security alliance would be well worth all the time, all the energy and all the expense involved in its formation, if the main threat to the Area were overt aggression. This is no longer the case, as you know; the main threat which faces us is Communist subversion and insurgency. I doubt very much that, after Vietnam, the Communists will ever attempt any overt aggression of a similar magnitude in the foreseeable future.

What is needed immediately, it seems, is not a formal alliance which would take time to establish and to whip up into a going concern, but some practical and fairly elaborate and binding arrangement whereby effective collaboration among all the free countries of Asia could be carried out in combatting the particular threat of Communist covert aggression. Such a system of effective down-to-earth collaboration could, naturally, constitute the groundwork and provide the foundation for the establishment, at the appropriate time, of an all-Asian military alliance as such.

We in SEATO, without being oblivious to the requirements of military preparedness against overt Communist aggression, have set up a Counter-subversion-and-insurgency Centre, in a necessary re-direction of the efforts of the Alliance. The activities of the Centre have so far been confined to its Members, although, in keeping with the present nature and extent of the threat of Communist subversion, we are attempting to generate some interest in those activities among non-Members. I realize that a far

bigger endeavour in this direction, encompassing the affairs and catering to the interests of all free Asian countries faced with Communist subversion and insurgency, is possible; and this should be pursued promptly and vigorously.

With a set-up such as I have just mentioned, and with the Big Powers committed under the Manila Pact to the security of the region, thus providing the requisite Big Power shield and the necessary backing, very little else would be needed to make the machinery for Free World defence in this Area truly responsive to its many peculiar problems.

Let us face it. The Communists are a persistent lot, and, I dare say, are winning in many ways. They know where they want to go and they are steadily getting there. In South-East Asia during the past year or so, there has been a marked, and therefore very disquieting, deterioration in the subversive and insurgent situation. View this against the truism that no country in the region is today without a Communist Party, legitimate or clandestine, and further, that no endemic Communist Party, either established or incipient, is known ever to have veered from the well-known Communist aim of undermining free Governments for the eventual seizure of national power, and you have a very sad but realistic picture, indeed.

On the other hand, the free countries of Asia have had to fend each to his own, quite often haphazardly, and, in some case, wrangling with one another in the process.

I submit that the need of free Asians at this time is solidarity in the face of an enemy who is determined to deal with them and to topple them one by one. I suggest that the action to take, in the wake of diminishing free world Big Power involvement in the affairs of Asia, is for the Asians themselves to stand up and be counted. I suggest that, in the universal effort to ensure world peace, to protect the God-given rights and the dignity of man, and to assure the very survival of mankind, you of the World Anti-Communist League and of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League can, and should, help lead the way. I submit that, with the Chapters of the World Anti-Communist League, of which you are an integral part, spread everywhere, and with your own machinery in your respective countries, you are advantageously placed and particularly equipped to spearhead this crucial movement. I suggest that, in so far as this region is concerned, the order of the day is for Asians to close ranks and, as one, to come to grips with the enemy and beat him at his own game.

Then, and only then, can peace and freedom in this potentially most explosive part of the world be assured for the enduring benefit of all mankind.

#### ENSLAVED PEOPLES UNDER COMMUNISM

(Address delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Professor of Georgetown University, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, USA, and President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, before the World Anti-Communist League, Bangkok, Thailand on December 4, 1969)

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Observers and Guests, I am deeply honored by the privilege you've extended me in affording this opportunity to speak about the enslaved peoples under communism. In the greatest measure the enslaved peoples are captive nations, and in theory and action communism is but a mythology shielding the worst form of totalitarianism and imperio-colonialism in the history of mankind. The more we concentrate on the approximately one billion souls in the captive nations, the more we can appreciate the pressing need of unity and solidarity for freedom, not only among the still free nations of the so-called noncommunist world

but also, and equally important, with the one-third of humanity in the captive nations.

Make no mistake about it, this World Anti-Communist League, with fertile and vigorous Asian origin, has developed into an essential instrument focused upon the huge family of captive nations as the natural and formidable ally for world freedom and peaceful global community of independent and sovereign nations. To be sure, much remains to be done, but those whose freedom is in immediate danger and under the shadow of constant totalitarian threat are in the best experiential position to positively advance the supreme cause of world freedom in order to preserve their freedom and indirectly that of numerous other members of the Free World geographically removed from the battlelines of freedom and thus myopically indulgent in their domestic complacencies. Leadership in truth and moral fortitude is an enduring power in itself, capable of attracting and magnetizing every other form of power in the Free World.

There is an old Spanish proverb that warns, "A handful of common sense is worth a bushel of learning." When, in this post-World War II period, Red totalitarian aggression has been so blunt and obvious as in the cases of China, Korea, and Vietnam, one cannot but begin to wonder about the common sense of otherwise many learned citizens of the Free World. We are almost forced to acknowledge that there is nothing worse than a learned and educated fool; and we have our dose of this species in the United States as no doubt you have in your respective countries. We can perhaps forgive them for being unable to perceive the subtle and indirect aggressions undertaken by both Peking and Moscow in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, not to mention the United States itself, but it is plainly unforgivable in these clearly crass and overt cases.

Yet, with a modicum of common sense and not too much required learning, the average citizen of the Free World can think all this through in terms of the steady aggregation of captive nations since the early 20's; and fifty years of proliferated Red totalitarian and imperial rule are but a minute in historical time. Without oversimplification but with the guiding thread of essentiality, all he need do on a global map is to first encircle in red the Russian area encompassing Moscow and Leningrad, and then in concentric form the non-Russian area from Byelorussia and Ukraine to Azerbaijan to the old Far Eastern Republic, then the Baltic states, then Central-South Europe over to North Korea, mainland China and North Vietnam, finishing for the moment with a red spot covering the island of Cuba. This is the expansive Red Empire, which began in Moscow and in terms of ultimate, determining power today rests on Moscow for its survival.

As President Nixon recently stated, the non-negotiable issue in South Vietnam is the right of national self-determination and independence of the free Vietnamese. What he unfortunately did not say, and which explains much more, is that the United States cannot honorably afford again the addition of another free nation to the long list of captive nations. Too many patriotic and knowledgeable Americans still recall the sell-out at Yalta and elsewhere of several East European nations by the Harrimans and other diplomatic undertakers. And you can rest assured that if the present Moscow-Havana-Peking-Hanoi propaganda assault upon the U.S. leads to any serious internal disturbances, the reaction following World War II will look like a stroll in the park. The domino theory, which has been accurately but narrowly applied to this quarter of the world, will reach its full bloom of historical application to all the captive nations since 1917.

That this occasion will necessarily arise, sooner or later, I have absolutely no doubt. The sprawling pattern of Red psycho-political warfare, as seen here in Asia, in the Middle East, in Latin America and in the United States makes it as certain as the sun rising and setting tomorrow. In preparation for this occasion as well as in coping with our immediate problems, it behooves us to workably grasp the organic concept of the captive nations, understand the dominant trends in the Red Empire, appreciate "the bind" in which the Free World finds itself, and develop a solution to this bind, short of a general shooting war or abject surrender.

#### THE CONCEPT

Remember always, where necessity pinches, boldness is prudence. But to exercise prudent boldness demands also a guiding concept. Despite the worldwide publicity that was given to the U.S. Captive Nations Week Resolution ten years ago and the annual reports on it since, it is amazing how relatively few in the Free World comprehend the concept. Oh, Moscow, Peking and the Red satraps perceived its significance quickly and vehemently. The continuing responses to my current work, *The Vulnerable Russians*, show a grave deficiency on this score in the Free World. To offset this somewhat, two months ago I managed to have another resolution sponsored and passed in the U.S. Congress, providing for the publication of a House of Representatives Document on the Captive Nations Movement. This forthcoming publication, made possible through the efforts of Representatives Daniel E. Flood and Edward J. Derwinski, should aid immeasurably in the advancement of the basic captive nations concept.

The U.S. Congressional Captive Nations Week Resolution defines the broad concept of the captive nations clearly and succinctly. The captive nations are those that in the past fifty years have been overtaken and subjugated by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and its several totalitarian offsprings. Quite plainly, how all of the Red present came to be what it is, regardless of rifts and squabbles, is the answer as to who are the captive nations. To enumerate them accurately and historically, one must begin in 1917, not in the 1940's or later. The first international wars and aggression waged by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism under the deceptive guise of communism were against newly independent states and nations like Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and several others that are now imprisoned in the Soviet Union. The second wave of this imperialist aggression reduced Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania to captivity in the early 40's; and the third wave in the later 40's enslaved a whole new group into the growing family of captive nations, such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania and so forth. Inspired, assisted and trained offsprings of this Red tradition of conquest and domination of peoples dropped the totalitarian curtain about the peoples of Yugoslavia, mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba in this and the decade after.

If the domino process has ever been at work, it certainly and unquestionably has been in the methodical Red conquest and aggregation of captive nations. If one fails to understand this process, executed largely and basically through the whole panoply of psycho-political warfare techniques, he then does not know the history of Eurasia these past fifty years. Any appreciation of the fundamental distinction between the captive nations—the exploited peoples themselves—and the Red totalitarian states is completely lost on him. It is this working distinction, implicit in the very concept of the captive nations, that has cast profound fear in the professional propagandists of the Red states. More, an inability to see this organic process of politico-military conquest from 1917 to the

present beclouds also the important truth as to the chief enemy of the Free World.

Yes, I'm well aware that many of my dear Asian friends honestly disagree with the logical and factual determination of the Soviet Union—more precisely Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism—as this chief enemy. In one sense they are not wrong when their immediate danger of a proximate and aggressive Red China is properly and justly weighed. No matter where, sheer survival for freedom is an incomparable, conditioning force. Moreover, the collapse of Red China would spell the beginning of the end of the Red Empire. Nevertheless, at the moment there is a more general truth affixed to the global framework which we must face with equal awareness and perspective. And that is the primacy of the Soviet Russian enemy. In the broader global framework and on the basis of historical evolution itself, let us not forget the fundamental Soviet Russian contributions that have been made to the training, economic and military equipment, and the apparatus of the so-called communists on mainland China, to the formation and equipment of the North Korean army and the tragic Korean war that ensued, and to the totalitarian and mini-imperialist Hanoi regime, an aid which has protracted the Vietnam war more than any other Red totalitarian factor.

Concerning the war in Vietnam, which really involves three fundamental factors—they are, the seventeen million captives in North Vietnam, the aggression by totalitarian Hanoi backed essentially by Russian Moscow, and the valiant endeavor of the patriotic and nationalist South Vietnamese not to be forced behind the Red totalitarian curtain—this simple conflict could have been over three or four years ago if it hadn't been for the circumstantial combination of sophisticated Soviet Russian aid and America's complete misconduct of the war. This war has produced more pseudo-rationalist nonsense than any war in this century.

In making this charge, believe me, I am not siding with the human boils and carbuncles of American society, for even the healthiest of organisms are capable of such poisonous excesses. The virtual and overt traitors of freedom in the U.S., meaning specifically the professional pacifists, the melodramatic and poor imitations of mid-19th century Bakuninists and Blanquists, who ignorantly spout Marxism, the ridiculously bearded Trotskyists, the basically ignorant and scant minority of students, and many naive clerics and so-called liberals, always pawns for the professional Red revolutionary who manipulated this species in the 30's and is repeating it now, are of course political warfare fodder for Hanoi, Peking, Havana and Moscow. Like the Russians, they protesteth "peace" or mir too much, and we cannot but wonder what piece they seek.

Nevertheless, we in America have so far failed in coping with what some call revolutionary warfare and what is really Russian-developed psycho-political warfare as applied in Vietnam. The so-called and miscalled Vietnamization of the war in Vietnam could have been accomplished years ago, in fact during the Eisenhower period. What was required was a psycho-political warfare concept extending into North Vietnam and buttressed by American armed logistics. With American military withdrawal from Vietnam, its application should be seriously considered in a new context of Asianization of the war with the presence of not only more Korean divisions but also Free Chinese and other Asian divisions. Regrettably, we Americans still don't understand this psycho-political warfare, which today extends even to the terrain of the United States itself. If any one is to be charged with a specific irresponsibility in the United States for this institutional incapacity, it is Senator Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee. He and the ever-blundering Harrimans have for years



opposed and sat on the Freedom Academy measures in the U.S. Congress which are purposed to equip Americans and their allies in the ways and means of this type of warfare. This is by no means an unfounded charge; it can be easily documented and justified. Its tragedy is that it involves other peoples, including the captive people of North Vietnam and all others in the extensive Red Empire.

#### NATIONALISM IN THE CAPTIVE WORLD

By the very nature of realities prevailing in the captive world, conditions of psychopolitical warfare are always extensive and omnipresent. It has been truly said, "In a free country there is much clamor with little suffering; in a despotic state there is little complaint, but much grievance." In the Soviet Union, which Alexander Solzhenitsyn has accurately described as a "sick society," the dozen and more captive nations are being subjected to a new wave of political repressions, cultural genocide, religious oppression, imperio-colonialist economic exploitation, revived MVD operations, and concentration camp consignments. All this and more in the sweep of Russian consolidating moves for Moscow's expanding Cold War operations in Asia, the Middle East, and the Western Hemisphere.

In mainland China, North Korea and North Vietnam the captive peoples are under the worst conditions of totalitarian tyranny, economic privation, and dehumanization left in the train of a grotesque "cultural revolution," guerrilla war activities on the Korean peninsula, and a war of aggression by Hanoi. In captive Cuba similar forms of Red exploitation of the people prevail as that unhappy island is being rapidly transformed into a Russian base for continental political warfare. And in Central Europe the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia last year confirmed again the oppressions and imperio-colonialism imposed on the captive peoples in that area.

Among the numerous forces at work for freedom in the captive world, the most dominant is the indomitable force of nationalism. This natural force means national self-determination and independence, economic freedom and opportunity, cultural progress and a respectful place in a peaceful community of independent nations. Expressed in many ways, this persistent force is rampant in the Soviet Union; it is manifested daily in Central Europe; it permeates all of Asia; it is the basis for Cuban resistance and hope. As the record well shows, nationalism is the greatest insurmountable obstacle to Red totalitarianism and Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

#### "THE BIND"

Whether viewed from the East or the West, efforts to wean less powerful Red states from the direct or indirect control and influence of the powerful Soviet Russian center will come to naught so long as this center is afforded psycho-political sanctuary within the substrate empire of the Soviet Union. This truth is the clear lesson of the Czechoslovakian tragedy. The free governments in the West clearly found themselves in a bind. And they will continue to be in this bind unless a radical shift is made in policy toward the captive nations within the USSR.

The Brezhnev doctrine further substantiates this truth. In essence, a contemporary version of traditional Russian imperialism, this doctrine can be applied by Moscow to any Red state in the West or in the East including mainland China; even to ostensibly socialist states in the Free World, all for the goal of insuring the security of the mythical commonwealth of socialist states. This doctrine is in itself a confession of intent and also weakness. The fundamental weakness is represented by the existence and struggles of the captive nations.

#### PROBLEMS AND THE SOLUTION

An old French adage teaches us, "the weakness of the enemy forms a part of our own

strength." The captive nations in the aggregate constitute the foremost weakness of the totalitarian Red Empire. As such, they are one of the most essential parts of our Free World strength. The more we concentrate on the captive nations, the more we intensify the weakness, the insecurity and the doom of all Red governments. But to advance along this sure road toward world freedom and the avoidance of a general hot war, citizens of the Free World must scotch certain misconceptions and wishful thoughts.

The first misconception is about the captive nations themselves. The captive nations concept must be clearly understood. The family of captive nations extends from Central Europe into the Soviet Union out to Asia and over to Cuba. Second, it is a species of wishful thinking to believe that any genuine detente is possible with the vast Red Empire. The dynamics of history, greased with the victories of Red totalitarianism and the worldwide network of Red psychopolitical warfare, simply do not favor this. Wishful, too, is the misleading notion of spheres of influence, a sideline of the containment policy. It not only compromises principle with its accommodationism but also is unrealistic and self-defeating. Our enemies don't pour billions of investment into Cold War operations for physical exercise and self-enjoyment.

Contrary to absurdities witnessed in some places of the Free World, including the United States, the youth, the workers and the intellectuals in the captive world know what it means to be deprived of freedom. With their grasp of the real and true values of human existence, these captives of Red totalitarianism are today freedom's most trusted allies; tomorrow they shall be its sternest guardians.

The eventual solution of the titanic struggle in this century rests not only with military arms, but rather with the effective linkage of the forces of freedom in the non-Red world with those of all the captive nations, particularly those in the huge concentration camp called the Soviet Union. The forging of this link with the truly genuine NLF's and their tremendous legions behind all three Red curtains can only be effected through the means of psycho-political penetrations that are indispensable to the deterrence of a hot general war. The captive nations are our formidable allies, and had we sensibly tapped this resource in North Vietnam, the war there would have been over long ago.

Fortitude, it has been said, is the mean between fear and rashness. To fight adequately for freedom means to constantly display fortitude in will, determination and honor. The captive nations ceaselessly show this fortitude. Free men can't afford to do less. Free men must not blind themselves to this truth of politico-cultural survival: The only guaranteeing way to preserve our freedom—the freedom of the still Free World; national, cultural and personal—is for all of us to unceasingly labor and fight for the expansion of freedom throughout the entire Red Empire and its captive world. In the end, you and I, the free and the captive, cannot but win for freedom, justice and a genuine international peace.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, U.S.A.

(Presented by Dr. Lev E. Dobrainsky, Chairman of NCNC to Third WACL Conference, Bangkok, Thailand)

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates and Observers, it is with the profoundest gratitude toward the host chapter of Thailand that I have the honor to submit this report on the salient activities undertaken this past year by the U.S. National Captive Nations Committee in the furtherance of our mutual cause of the defeat of imperialist Red totalitarianisms, expanded World Freedom and

independence of all the captive nations. As in all preceding years, our report to this Third WACL Conference is not an ideological dissertation but rather a concise, business-like statement of the peak achievements, projects and continuous action of NCNC since the successful Second Conference in Saigon. Though transient events and developments in the United States seem to run against our goals and objectives, let me assure you that with basic certitude our persistent action is constantly attuned to the long haul of certain victory because our message is treasured in the hearts of one-third of humanity and rest firmly on the ultimate honor of the remaining two-thirds in the Free World. This still being the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, I will restrict my main points to ten.

The precise report is as follows:

(1) Soon after our return from the last WACL-DPAAC Conferences in Saigon, arrangements were made for discussions of the conferences and Vietnam on two radio and TV stations in Miami, Florida, which extend to and are heard in Cuba. Let us not forget that the megalomaniacal Castro has exuded a special affinity for Hanoi and Pyongyang. On WIOD and WKAT in Miami, discussions up to three hours covered the Second and 14th Conferences, the valiant fight of the Republic of Vietnam for survival, and the reasons for American support of Free Vietnam. A transcript of the WIOD program was sent to the office of President Thieu in Saigon.

(2) China's Freedom Day in January is a highly important commemoration which NCNC participates in. In addition to expressing our annual greetings on the occasion, we urge our groups to fittingly support the event in their respective communities so that the continuous free Chinese fight for the liberation of mainland China and the incalculable and enormous psycho-political symbol of freedom on the island be constantly in the foreground of American interest. Moreover, NCNC sees it that the event is properly recognized by our friends in the U.S. Congress and that reports and addresses on the occasion are prominently published in the *Congressional Record*. The crucial importance of a completely Free China to the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations hardly needs stating.

(3) It was NCNC's pleasurable privilege to receive WACL's Freedom Center delegation at the beginning of April in Washington, D.C. Led by the distinguished Secretary General, Dr. José Hernandez, the delegation was received at a luncheon hosted by NCNC in the Rayburn Building of the House of Representatives. A press conference preceded the luncheon, and reports were carried by several newspapers. The luncheon, toastmastered by the Honorable Edward J. Derwinski, was attended by a dozen Senators and Representatives. As the gods would have it, the untimely death of former President Eisenhower affected the promised attendance of a dozen more legislators, including the late Senator Dirksen.

(4) As in every preceding year of a full decade, NCNC stepped up in mid-spring its national preparation and coordination of the annual Captive Nations Week. The 1969 Week was commemorated as the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which, as you know, the U.S. Congress passed in July, 1959. The burdensome and costly details of launching this annual Week are known only to a few, even commencing with the effort directed at the White House for an effective Presidential Proclamation of the Week. Nonetheless, the 1969 Week proved to be another huge success. President Nixon issued his proclamation, Governors followed from Alaska to Florida, New Hampshire to Hawaii, Mayors of all major cities did likewise, and our committees in all sections of the country conducted their respective

activities effectively. Radio Moscow and other Red media expressed their contempt.

(5) An added function of NCNC this year produced the singular highlight of the 1969 Week. And this was the privileged opportunity we treasured in honoring Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, First Chairman of WACL and President of the Chinese Chapter. In Arizona, under the leadership of Mr. Walter Chopi-wsky and his NCNC branch, Dr. Ku received full exposure throughout the State and beyond. In the Nation's capital, at a capacity reception and dinner hosted by NCNC in the University Club, it was our indescribable honor to honor Dr. Ku and present him the Eisenhower Captive Nations Award. Ten Senators and Congressmen received medals on this memorable occasion. Again, as the gods would have it, the first Apollo shot coincided with this event, but, nevertheless, the turnout was magnificent. Dr. Ku's successful itinerary extended to our groups in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York and Los Angeles.

(6) NCNC regularly assumes the responsibility of having newspaper, documentary and other printed coverage of the Week's activities, both in the United States and abroad, published in the U.S. national annals, namely the *Congressional Record*. In July, August and September, the *Record* was replete for the historical record with these reports. Beyond our groups in the U.S., once again the Republic of China was outstanding by this measure in implementing the resolution on captive nations passed at the conferences in Saigon.

(7) Through the initiative and efforts of NCNC, another resolution on the captive nations was passed by the U.S. Congress on September 24. The resolution called for the publication of an official House Document commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution and the Captive Nations Movement. The significant resolution was sponsored by the Honorables Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania and Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois.

(8) Under the directives of this passed legislation, NCNC, working in coordination with the Joint Committee on Printing in the U.S. Congress, has in the past two months contributed to the preparation of the document. The initial quantity of 10,000 copies will be available this month. Those who have significantly implemented WACL's resolution on Captive Nations Week will receive copies of this document. The issuance of a Captive Nations stamp by the Republic of Korea is an outstanding and unforgettable event referred to in the work.

(9) NCNC has participated in current negotiations for the eventual and much-needed formation of a WACL Chapter in the United States. That such a chapter is indispensable to our mutual cause is beyond any question of doubt. Our problem in the United States is the multiplicity and variety of anti-communist organizations. Prudence and discretion are uppermost in the pursuit of this pressing goal. What eventually develops must—I reiterate, must—be a solid basis for an effective and crucial chapter organization. NCNC does not adhere to paper organizations, lacking in following and programmatic capacity; nor does it wish to incite an internal conflict among and between anti-communist organizations. The complexity of the issue is great; our determination to resolve it is, I assure you, preserving.

(10) Finally, NCNC has unwaveringly pursued its conviction that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives is of pressing and essential moment to all of our mutual struggles for a full, educational accounting of the oppressions, genocide, terrorism, tyranny, and Hitlerianism of the Red Totalitarian regimes. Such an official committee in the U.S. Congress would provide a central thrust for anti-communism not only in the United States

but throughout the Free World. It would accomplish in a year what thousands of well-documented books couldn't do in two or three decades. It would undertake a case-by-case methodology and produce data that even the illiterate would sense its crucial importance to the world struggle. Negotiations on this vital issue are being pursued by NCNC with the utmost determination.

This is my report, Mr. Chairman. We are thoroughly confident of the road we are paving. The Republic of Vietnam is another national, independent entity that the Free World cannot afford to sacrifice. Should my Government do so, our captive nations thesis and list will be enlarged more than ever. Pray God, this will not transpire. In the event that this further tragedy is consummated, we are prepared. Again, I pray God it will not happen. It certainly need not happen.

ADDRESS BY CHIEF DELEGATE KU CHENG-KANG

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates and Distinguished Guests, following the 3rd WACL Conference, the 15th APACL Conference is solemnly unveiled in Bangkok.

Indeed, in its fifteen years of sustained struggles, APACL has made major contributions in elevating the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist consciousness and in promoting Anti-Communist solidarity of Asian Nations. Its continuous efforts to enlarge Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist solidarity into the solidarity of peoples throughout the world gave birth to the World's Anti-Communist League (WACL) three years ago. This marks one singular achievement of the APACL in uniting freedom forces of the entire world.

As you know, presently there are three international Anti-Communist organizations in Asia. One is the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League (APACL) which is the union of purely people's Anti-Communist forces in various countries. Another is the Asian-Pacific Council (ASPAC) which is a cooperative agency among the governments of Asia's free nations. The third is the Asian Parliamentarians' Union (APU) which is the union of the Parliaments of the various countries. Parliament always acts as the bridge between people and government. In fact, the emergence of ASPAC and APU was the result of what APACL had been urging and pushing.

In promoting the establishment of ASPAC, APACL has always fought for the establishment of an Asian-Pacific regional security organization. When the 5th APACL Conference was held in Seoul in 1959, APACL passed an important resolution on "Urging Leaders in the Governments of Asian Anti-Communist Nations to Confer and Establish an Organization for Anti-Communist Cooperation." Subsequently, APACL delegates undertook action in their respective countries. In Jan. 1961, the Four-Nation Foreign Ministers' Conference was held in Manila. Attended only by the foreign ministers of the Republic of China, Korea, Vietnam and the Philippines. The composition and substance of the conference could not satisfy objective requirements. By 1964 when 10th APACL Conference was held in Taipei, the resolution on "Urging Asia's Free Nations to Establish a Collective Security Organization" was passed. Members of APACL expended more efforts to promote the realization of this mission. When the Nine-Nation Foreign Ministers' Conference was convened in Seoul in June, 1966, events gradually developed to establish the Asian-Pacific Council.

As to the Asian Parliamentarians' Union (APU), it was organized in 1965 in Japan by such people as Nobusuke Kishi and Saburo Chida who were either leaders of the APACL movement in Japan or responsible officials of APACL Japan Chapter. I myself also took part in organizing the APU. Many of the APU delegates have associated with APACL for sometime. Indeed, APACL has produced results in promoting understanding and cooperation between free nations in Asia. Dur-

ing the latter part of last month, I presided over the 5th APU conference in Taipei which reaped fruitful results.

During the past 15 years, APACL has continued to grow and develop, but we are not satisfied with our gains. The current world situation and the Asian situation compel us to make further struggles to expedite the formation of a really strong and effective Asian-Pacific regional security organization.

At this time, I wish to make the following observations:

First, I have also believed that we Asian nations should have the spirit of self-strengthening and self-salvation and use our own strength for our common survival. Now that the new Asian policy of the United States expects that we Asian Nations protect our security and freedom with our own strength, we should devote ourselves to the realization of this objective. By 1971, Britain will withdraw her forces from the Far East. Therefore, we should urge the completion of the ground work preparatory to the establishment of Asian-Pacific regional security organization sometime next year to fill the gap in the military posture of the free world camp, and make an important contribution to usher in the '70's of the 20th century.

Secondly, I feel that the Asian-Pacific regional security organization can be established through strengthening the present Asian-Pacific Council. If the first course of action is adopted, other free nations in the Asian-Pacific region must, of course, be invited, including the United States. Meanwhile, the present ASPAC efforts which are limited to cultural exchange and economic mutual assistance should be developed into firm political and military cooperation.

Thirdly, I consider that, in the face of Asian Communist aggression threats and the current Asian situation, Asian peoples will awaken sooner or later and find the need to establish mutual defense forces at an early date and will not delay the fulfillment of this important historical mission. We must not be satisfied with the achievements scored in the economic field. If security cannot be safeguarded, free and happy life may go out at all time. Similarly, we must not be intimidated by the superficial forces of the Asian Communists. Fact reveals to us that Asian Communist rule has its serious inherent vulnerability. So long as Asian nations unite, they have every assurance of deterring Communist aggression. Therefore, we fervently hope that Asian governmental leaders will cast away all doubts and give to this objective first priority in their current national policies.

Fourthly, prior to or after the formation of an Asian-Pacific regional security organization. The Vietnam situation will be the first primary challenge to our employment of mutual defense strength. Regardless of the circumstances, Asia's free nations should actively support the government of the Republic of Vietnam in its struggles to fight for the independence and freedom of Vietnam. The Vietnamese Communists must not be permitted to realize their ambition of annexing South Vietnam nor to realize their design of subverting Vietnam through formation of a "Coalition Government." We must not permit the crimes committed by Asian Communists in launching the war in Vietnam to be repeated in other Asian Countries.

At the opening of the 5th APU General Assembly held last month in Taipei, His Excellency Chiang Kai-shek, President of the Republic of China said: "Asia belongs to the Asians. Hence we Asians must rely on our strength in the pursuit of regional peace, security and prosperity . . . If the strength of these separate countries are combined, the result will be a massive cultural, political, economic and military force of justice sufficient to assure the peace and security of Asia and the world. An Asian epoch of freedom, security, prosperity and progress will be opened

up." I also urged in my addresses at that Assembly that the formation of an Asian-Pacific regional security organization should be expedited. Again, I am happy to present my advocacy and views to my colleagues in APACL. This is the topic of the struggle for which APACL has fought fifteen years. The current situation demands that we not remain in urging others, but take action. We are delighted to hear that the response to this advocacy is louder and louder. I sincerely hope that my fellow delegates will exert their influences to hasten the accomplishment of this great mission and set an important, historical milestone as Asia enters into the 1970's.

#### RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE "BREZHNEV DOCTRINE"

Whereas the Soviet Union has used the "Brezhnev Doctrine" as a tool for implementing Soviet Russian imperialism; and

Whereas the interventionist character of the "Brezhnev Doctrine" portends a climate of insecurity and uncertainties in which genuine peace would likely prove to be increasingly elusive; and

Whereas this doctrine tends to allow Soviet Russia to operate under the assumption that the countries between the borders of the Soviet Union and the Free World (including mainland China . . .), are its private preserve, and that such an acceptance of sphere of influence concept can have lasting effects in all parts of the world; and

Whereas the "Brezhnev Doctrine" was used to crush the struggle of Czechs and Slovaks for freedom, and to justify the shameless Soviet Russian military intervention in Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas the doctrine unequivocally violates both the spirit and content of the United Nations Charter;

The World Anti-Communist League strongly condemns the "Brezhnev Doctrine" and repudiates its implications; and

Appeals to the free governments and peoples of the world—

1. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the "Brezhnev Doctrine", including its implied recognition of spheres of influence and the *status quo* in East-Central Europe, Asia, Cuba, etc.

2. To initiate in the United Nations a serious examination of the doctrine in relation to the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

3. To reiterate their support for all nations and peoples, fighting for freedom and national independence;

4. To call at the United Nations, International conferences and other forums, for withdrawal of Soviet Russian troops from Czecho-Slovakia, and all other subjugated countries and for stopping subversion and military intervention everywhere.

OPERATIVE: WACL to send message to U Thant, condemning the doctrine as a violation of the UN Charter and calling for a UN debate on this serious issue. Member units of WACL should present this resolution to their governments and suggest that the national delegations and observers to the UN, and Embassies, be briefed about its contents.

The same briefing should be given to the member of the elected bodies of the various countries.

Endorsed by Prof Dobriusky.  
Presented by: Vosil Germejn.

#### RESOLUTION ON 1970 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

In view of the profound effects and impact made by the U.S. Captive Nations Week Resolution upon the totalitarian and imperio-colonialist rems of Red Moscow, Peking and minor satraps in the Red Empire; and

In view of the constant hope this resolution, which was passed by the U.S. Congress in July 1959, has symbolized and extended

to the one billion humans in all of the captive nations in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia and Cuba; and

In view of the consistent support given by both the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League and the World Anti-Communist League in the annual observance of Captive Nations Week; Therefore,

Now be it resolved that the Third Conference of WACL urges all of its chapters and affiliated organizations to prepare and participate in the 1970 Captive Nations Week, scheduled for the third week of July, and to send all published documents and data on the week's observance to the U.S. National Captive Nations Committee for inclusion in U.S. Congressional reports on the Captive nations movement.

Considering that the Kremlin is making plans to celebrate the Lenin Centennial in 1970 throughout the world with a view to inspiring communists and their fellow-travelers all over the world with optimism and courage:

Be it resolved that all member units organize counter-action in their respective countries by exposing the evil ideology of Lenin's teachings and the tyrannical rule and genocide that has ensued, and also to counteract steps taken by UNESCO and other Free World media to observe this event.

#### COMMUNIST UNCONVENTIONAL WARFARE—ASIA AND AFRICA

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the tremendous propaganda publicity given the Mylai hoax, much was made of charges that American soldiers may have shot women and children.

I said, at that time, that all of us who have seen war in a populated area know how difficult it is under combat conditions to make the split-second decision which may keep you alive. In an unconventional guerrilla war, where the enemy is not a uniformed and disciplined military force, the enemy is everybody until you learn differently.

A recent newsclipping tells the story of the Air Force doctor who treated a young Vietnamese girl crippled in the premature explosion of the plastic bomb she was constructing for his assassination.

In the same paper, on the same date, is the newsclipping indicating that the report made on conditions in conquered Biafra by a team of international observers is too sensitive to publish.

Apparently, British, Canadian, and Swedish officers lack the experience to understand what the Nigerian dictator and we in Washington know full well—that looting and rape are the normal results where a primitive majority is not constrained.

The pertinent clippings are included in my remarks, as follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 31, 1970]

#### VIETCONG GIRL AIDED BY DOCTOR SHE TRIED TO KILL

SAIGON.—A U.S. Air Force doctor treated a young Vietnamese girl whose hands had been blown off, then learned later she was wounded while fusing a bomb to kill him.

The Air Force said the girl's aunt brought her to Capt. Jerold D. Albright of Haven, Kan., at the Ca Mau province hospital in the southern Mekong Delta.

Her hands had been blown off at the wrists. Albright cleaned the wounds, stopped the bleeding and bandaged the stumps of her arms.

Later the girl told officials she was helping her aunt, a Viet Cong, build a bomb from plastic explosive when it went off. The bomb was to be placed under the seat of the doctor's jeep, she said.

"If the Viet Cong are so interested in getting rid of me, it must mean our medical efforts in this area are helping turn the local population against the VC," Albright said. "It also indicates to me that even the enemy has confidence in our medical care."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 31, 1970]

#### FOUR-NATION BIAFRA REPORT "TOO SENSITIVE" TO REVEAL

LAGOS, NIGERIA.—A team of international observers returning from its third trip to former Biafra since the end of the civil war could saddle the Nigerian government with a major crisis, diplomatic sources said today.

The sources said a report prepared by a group of military observers from four nations on the plight of 1 million hungry Ibos was too sensitive to publish.

Publication of the results of the survey by the joint team from Britain, Canada, Sweden and Poland probably would lead to its ouster, the sources said. Eventual publication of their conclusions is inevitable, the sources said.

#### SECRET REPORT

A secret interim report by the group, they said, describing looting and raping by Nigerian troops has infuriated Nigerian authorities.

According to the sources, Federal Communications Commissioner Aminu Kano has told the group to "pack up and go" and Nigerian chief of state Gen. Yakubu Gowon has been angered by the report.

The observers are reported to be sharply divided in expressed opinions. A dissenting minority report submitted by Polish members of the team is much less critical of the central government.

The team has spent 17 months in the country, traveling between Nigeria proper and the secessionist states comprising Biafra.

#### REPORT BY POLE ORDERED

The sources said that Polish Col. Jozef Biernacki has been ordered to prepare a report that will not embarrass the Soviet-backed federal government in any way.

They said the central government wants the group to report on relief work but the Canadians claim they are not qualified to oversee relief operations and wish to withdraw as soon as possible.

The federal government yesterday reorganized its national rehabilitation commission to speed handling of relief supplies entering the country.

An official announcement said relief supplies would be allowed into Nigeria duty free. But it also said visas would be issued only to foreign relief workers sponsored by the Nigerian director of relief operations or his aides.

#### WHEN NAACP DESTROYS PUBLIC SCHOOL, WHO PAYS?

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an editorial by a newspaper which quite apparently supports the desegregation of the public schools, a timetable of the NAACP-instituted school litigation in its community, and letters to the editor from a Negro mother and another citizen are

unfortunately quite typical of the situation in the South today.

The question raised is quite fair, and deadly serious. For whose benefit did this organization—which claims to represent Negroes, but has never had a black leader—promote this litigation and destroy the public schools of this community?

A clue may be found in a comment by one of the local "Reverends" who is the head of the local NAACP chapter that if the court does not move promptly, their "New York lawyers" will act.

The clippings are included in my remarks, as follow:

[From the Fort Myers News-Press, Jan. 16, 1970]

#### AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE NAACP

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has the opportunity now to perform the greatest service it has ever done for Negro school children of Lee County. It can do this by petitioning the U.S. District Court to adhere to the timetable which the court itself previously set calling for the integration of the Franklin Park Elementary School next fall and not to advance the time to Feb. 1.

A court order to desegregate Franklin Park by Feb. 1 would indeed create the chaos that school officials apprehend—chaos of which the 740 Negro children now attending Franklin Park would be the hapless victims. It would be a physical impossibility to integrate Franklin Park by busing some 600 white children to it—and some 600 Negro children from it to other schools—to achieve the required racial balance starting in February. It would be physically impossible because there simply are no busses with which to do it; there is no money for buying the additional busses, and even if there were it would take some months to get delivery of them.

So, if the court decreed that Franklin Park could no longer be operated with its present all-Negro enrollment, the school would have to be closed. Then the parents of its 740 pupils would have to apply for their admission at elementary schools elsewhere which already are overcrowded, with their lower grades on double session. No more than a handful could be accommodated, and the parents of those who were would have to arrange some transportation of their own to get them there for there would be no buses for them. The inescapable result would be that the students now attending Franklin Park would have their education broken off and would be unable to go to school for the rest of this year.

There is a strong and dire likelihood that the U.S. District Court will order Franklin Park to be integrated by Feb. 1 regardless of the consequences unless the NAACP petitions otherwise. Zealous Judge Ben Krentzman of Tampa has stated that he considers new rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, although given in other cases, to be "supervening case law," indicating that he considers them to require application in the Lee County case. The Supreme Court now has ordered full desegregation by Feb. 1 in the 14 school cases before it, two of which involved Alachua and Bay Counties in Florida—and Judge Krentzman has scheduled a new hearing for Jan. 26 for Lee and certain other counties under his jurisdiction.

The NAACP has a decisive voice in the matter because it is the real plaintiff in the case before Judge Krentzman. The case is styled "Blalock v. Board of Public Instruction of Lee County" but it was the NAACP that filed the case for John Blalock and other Negro parents and whose attorneys have handled it. The suit was filed in the fall of 1964 and the court's decree was issued in

early 1965 but the federal court has retained jurisdiction ever since. It is of some interest now to recall that the court's original order called for the Lee County schools to be desegregated by grades over a period of five years under a "freedom of choice" plan by which every student could attend either the school nearest his home or the nearest school in which his race was predominant—and that the NAACP agreed to it.

If the NAACP asks the district court now to invoke the Supreme Court's "supervening case law" and order the Lee County school desegregation completed by Feb. 1 with the integration then of Franklin Park, the court probably will do so. But if it does, the NAACP will bear a terrible responsibility for disrupting the education of its people.

On the other hand if the NAACP tells the court it is satisfied with the present decree ordering the integration completed by next fall and asks that the order be continued in force, it will be making no compromise of its principles, it will assure the orderly achievement of its aims, and it will show the mark of enlightened leadership.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 26, 1970]

#### SIX YEARS IN COURT

The Lee County school desegregation case has been in the U.S. District Court at Tampa for nearly six years. Here is the record:

Aug. 4, 1964—NAACP files suit on behalf of Negro parents for desegregation of Lee County Schools.

Aug. 28, 1964—School Board asks court to accept grade-a-year desegregation plan.

Oct. 22, 1964—School Board asks court for summary judgment in its favor.

Oct. 29, 1964—Court denies School Board's request for summary judgment and rejects grade-a-year plan.

Feb. 24, 1965—Court approves School Board's plan to desegregate schools in five years.

Aug. 30, 1965—Lee County schools "integrated" for first time with one Negro student at Elva Elementary and two at Edison Park Elementary.

July 26, 1966—NAACP sues School Board to speed up desegregation.

Aug. 29, 1966—All secondary schools except Alva desegregate and all elementary schools integrate first three grades.

Sept. 7, 1966—U.S. Dist. Judge Joseph Lieb allows Justice Department to join in NAACP suit against School Board.

March 2, 1967—School Board files freedom of choice plan to replace the five-year plan and proceeds with it.

Jan. 7, 1969—Justice Department files to have freedom of choice plan junked.

Feb. 12, 1969—Court orders School Board to file another plan to replace freedom of choice because all-Negro schools have continued.

May 7, 1969—Court orders all-Negro schools in Lee County except Franklin Park Elementary closed or integrated by fall.

June 9, 1969—Court denies School Board request to return to freedom of choice.

Aug. 12, 1969—Court approves plan for countywide seventh grade at two schools in Dunbar Heights and orders Franklin Park desegregated by next fall.

Dec. 18, 1969—Court orders School Board to report desegregation plan for Franklin Park.

Dec. 22, 1969—Court gives School Board go-ahead on planning for middle schools which would desegregate Franklin Park next fall.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 28, 1970]

#### NO NEED TO CHANGE

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS: My children attend Franklin Park Elementary School and they have been going there all of their school years. I didn't see any need in transferring

them when the freedom of choice law was passed, because to me a school is a school and I don't expect a teacher to put everything in my children's heads. I help them at home. I have encyclopedias and books that will help them. You cannot cheat a child out of an education if he has the ability to learn.

Another reason I didn't send them to a white school is because there are more white elementary schools to serve the needs of the white communities and it would have been difficult for me to choose one. There is no proof that my child is going to get a better education in a white school than he is in a black school. You can only be two things in life, a success or a failure, and I am sure you have some whites that fail.

Please don't get the wrong impression. I am not a separatist or anything of the sort. I am all for my freedom to go wherever I want but why pick on the small children.

We integrate every day of our lives. We have to, there are not many Negroes to hire us on jobs.

I am not going to let any NAACP leader tell me what's best for my children. I think I am a better judge of that. I know I cannot change the Supreme Court ruling but I would be happier with my small children going to a neighborhood school.

These people (the NAACP) are not thinking about the welfare of our children. Their only interest is getting a black child in a white school no matter what goes on afterward.

DISGUSTED MOTHER.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 27, 1970]

#### SUE NAACP

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS—

I can't understand why the NAACP can sue governors, sheriffs, mayors and any other good citizen-loving official. Let us all get together and sue the NAACP. Say for about one billion dollars, this could help the taxpayers money.

The NAACP should be sued for these costs. One—destruction of property, two—court costs for the protection of the parties who destroy, three—cost of extra police, National Guard, and four—trying to put fear in the general public mind.

I do hope that some day that all governors get together and take the power away from this dictating Supreme Court. Let us all have some part in our own government. Just write your congressman.

H. KRAMER.

#### WILLIAM E. TIMMONS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my warm congratulations to William E. Timmons on his appointment as assistant to the President for congressional relations.

This is a well-earned and well-deserved promotion. Many of us have known Bill Timmons because of his service with our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Brock), because of his active participation in the Young Republicans and in the campaigns of Richard Nixon for President in 1960 and 1968.

We know him and respect him. As deputy assistant for congressional relations with responsibility for the House of Representatives, Bill has done an outstanding job during the last year.

I know he will continue to do the same kind of a job in his new position. Although he also has had experience in the

other body, he understands and loves this House.

Of course we will all miss Bryce Harlow, who now holds the extremely important position of counselor to the President. His wise counsel will serve the President and our country well. And I know he will continue to be available to this body for advice and counsel.

In the meantime it is gratifying to know that he has a most worthy successor. I am looking forward to working with Bill Timmons in his new position.

#### GROWTH OF 4-H PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell this House about the continuing growth of a great program, 4-H. The 4-H has over 3½ million members nationwide. Right here in the District of Columbia, we have a new 4-H program attached to the Federal City College and out on Connecticut Avenue, the National 4-H Center is about to triple its youth educational capacity.

I am gratified to learn that American business is supporting the growth and development of 4-H in urban as well as rural areas. In fact, Howard C. Harder, chairman of CPC International, Inc., has recently formed the National 4-H Club Foundation Advisory Council to support 4-H.

Mrs. Richard M. Nixon and J. C. Penney, founder of the company which bears his name, are honorary cochairmen of the council.

The council's first goal is to expand the National 4-H Center at 7100 Connecticut Avenue here in Washington, D.C. 4-H members across the Nation have already pledged \$2 million to the building program. The business leaders on the council will raise the remaining \$6 million to complete the expansion project.

There are 150 leading American businessmen and women serving on the council. Working directly with Mr. Harder on the center expansion are: J. Paul Austin, president of the Coca-Cola Co.; Daniel S. Parker, chairman of the Parker Pen Co.; W. W. Keeler, chairman of the Phillips Petroleum Co.; Art and Jack Linkletter, chairman and president of Linkletter Enterprises, Inc.; and S. B. Penick, Jr., chairman of the S. B. Penick Co. Mills B. Lane, Jr., president of the Citizens & Southern National Bank is council treasurer. Russell B. Robins, executive vice president of the Jam Handy Organization, handles public relations.

The National 4-H Center expansion program will make it possible to train nearly 60,000 young people in citizenship and leadership programs each year. Right now the center can handle only 20,000 annually and thousands more must be turned away.

The work of Mr. Harder and his council is a fine example of what the business community is doing in behalf of our youth. This is particularly significant now that 50 percent of the 4-H membership is in our towns and cities. And, these young people are doing something about America's critical problems. Pollution

and nutrition education are two areas of concern for 4-H'ers.

I salute the members of the National 4-H Advisory Council in their effort to expand the National 4-H Center and I salute 4-H.

#### IN SUPPORT OF A MASS TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have decidedly mixed feelings about the mass transit legislation passed by the other body this week. The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), is to be congratulated for his leadership in getting legislation passed that gives some hope that the Congress and the Department of Transportation will improve the dismal record of the Federal Government concerning mass transit problems.

In the last 5 years, the Federal Government has spent approximately \$800 million on mass transit and approximately \$20 billion on highways. Since 1956, \$45 billion has thus far been spent on highway construction. The new mass transit legislation now authorizes the Federal Government to spend \$1.86 billion in the next 5 years. This is not what I consider to be a significant change in our transportation priorities.

I should point out that the new legislation tries to firm up the Federal commitment by giving 5-year contract authority to the Department of Transportation. This contract authority amounts to \$3.1 billion. However, only \$1.86 billion can be spent before fiscal year 1976. In the new budget, the administration has asked for only \$105 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1971. In addition, the Appropriations Committees of the Congress have not hesitated in the past to place limitations on the use of contract authority, or to cut it back.

I regret to say that this new legislation which will soon be before this House for consideration provides neither sufficient guarantees nor adequate funds needed to do the job for our cities in the 1970's. Consequently, the fight for a mass transit trust fund should continue.

At the present time, 105 of our colleagues support the trust fund concept which is a far more reliable financing mechanism than contract authority. One need only cite the highway trust fund to make that undeniably clear. Furthermore, the Federal Government must commit much more than \$3.1 billion in the next 5 years. Without the availability of sufficient funds and a system of assured long term financing, municipalities simply will not be able to develop plans and float bonds for projects of sufficient scope to have a substantial effect in modernizing local public transportation. Our trust fund bill would commit at least \$10 billion during the same 5-year period.

Let us face the fact that we have a mass transit crisis in our cities. And let us not create another credibility gap between promise and performance. I urge my colleagues to support trust fund legislation as the best means of meeting the mass transit crisis.

#### ENVIRONMENT IN DANGER OF COLLAPSE

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last November the Nation's most prominent scientists met in Boston. During that week America's attention was forcibly focused on its scientific community's concern over whether this Nation can survive the decade.

Leading spokesmen for every technical discipline competed with one another to tell us that our environment is in danger of collapse. Some predicted that human life will cease to exist in the next 30 years if we continue to pollute at the present rate. According to our scientists, the atmosphere will shortly become unbreathable, the land unproductive, the cities unlivable, and humanity, if it escapes from being driven insane by the rising levels of decibels, will eventually succumb to suffocation in its own garbage.

I suspect the November meeting in Boston served as the final catalyst. The horrendous problems created by our pollution of the environment have finally come to the forefront of the national conscience and are receiving the attention they deserve.

Californians, probably more than most Americans, have been painfully aware of the consequences of pollution. Our eyes have been smarting from smog, our beaches smeared with oil, and our landscape littered with auto graveyards.

Pollution is, of course, not confined to California. Other parts of the Nation, like politicians, have discovered the seriousness of environmental pollution. The voices of the experts on pollution—the ecologists, natural and social scientists—are finally sounding above the din of the many less significant issues and problems facing our society. We are listening, horrified. Their scientific facts seem more like science fiction. Increased emphysema, dead trees on the west slope of California's San Bernardino mountains, 48 billion bottles and 46 billion cans annually, and 200 million tons a year of poison pumped into the atmosphere is not fiction. The facts lead one to seriously ask—can we survive? The answer must be yes.

My personal concern over the effects of environmental pollution is long standing. Over the years, I have made repeated statements on the problems as I saw them, decrying our negligence in this vital area, drawing public attention to the problems, and offering possible approaches and solutions. Two years ago I was calling for the development of imaginative new programs and emphasizing the importance of an ecological approach to the environment, with man as the focal point.

My concern over this growing crisis has prompted me to introduce the following environmental quality and conservation legislation. In the first half of this 91st Congress alone, I introduced eight bills on pollution and conservation. They establish a revolving fund for the removal of oil discharged into navigable

waters; control oil pollution from vessels; augment funds for land acquisition for the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; control the granting of offshore drilling permits to oil companies; prevent the importation of fish and wildlife species endangered with extinction; establish a Council on Environmental Quality; create a research and development program on the marine and atmospheric environments; and organize a Youth Conservation Corps.

In the field of air pollution, I authored legislation to provide grants to develop alternatives to the internal combustion engine. Research is now being conducted on a widespread basis to develop these alternatives. In the field of water pollution, I served as a floor leader in the fight to raise the water quality appropriations from the \$200 million requested by President Nixon to the \$800 million finally appropriated.

However, I will not stand on my record alone. Instead I am introducing further legislation in the pollution field during this, the second session of the 91st Congress. Allow me to set out for you the problems as I see them today, my views on what we in the Congress should do, and what I as an individual legislator will do to deal with these overwhelming problems.

I do not wish to sound like an alarmist, but the condition of our environment has become critical—so critical as to threaten man's very survival on this planet. Some experts predict the extinction of advanced life on earth by the turn of the next century if present trends in pollution rates and population growth rates continue. No area of our environment remains unaffected, whether it be on the earth's surface where we live, below it where we mine and blast, or above it where we throw off noxious fumes.

Our Nation faces three major, closely related environmental problems. They are: First, pollution of the environment; second, overcrowding of our population into urban areas; and third, the deterioration of many areas—rural as well as urban.

Pollutants in the forms of solid, liquid, and gaseous matter alter the chemical and physical qualities of the environment. The automobile each year produces one-half of the pollutants fouling our air. Of the 200 million tons of waste expelled into the atmosphere annually, the automobile contributes 95 million tons. These poisons include carbon monoxide, sulphur oxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, and lead particles. Add sunlight and other elements and you have smog.

Pollutants may alter the environment in such a way as to upset the delicate balance of the ecology which supports human life. Pollution kills valuable marine life, such as phytoplankton which floats on water and produces 70 percent of our oxygen in the cyclical ecological process.

Noise pollution affects the nervous system of living things, and has adverse physiological as well as psychological effects. The average city dweller lives in an environment that is twice to three times as noisy as his country cousin.

Overcrowding is a major cause of pollution. As more and more of our people

live on less and less of our land, we find our cities packed, like sardines in cans. Our citizens live in crowded quarters, their waste products concentrated within or near the city. The factories which grow up to take advantage of the concentrated labor force further contaminate the urban area. In the process of the inevitable urban sprawl, open space vital for renewing oxygen in the air is eliminated. This literally denies urban dwellers "breathing room." Facilities have not and possibly cannot be built quickly enough to handle the problems created by concentration. Existing facilities and infrastructures are already taxed beyond their limits.

As sections of our country have grown at phenomenal rates, we have tended to abandon those areas which were exploited and could no longer support the economy with their natural resources. As a result, we find Appalachia depleted and scarred, the inner city abandoned to the physical decay of its buildings and the spiritual decay of its inhabitants, and large areas of rural America underutilized. In New York City alone, according to Mayor Lindsay, 500,000 occupied dwellings are unfit for occupancy, and 50 percent of all rental units are substandard. Our crowded ghetto areas have the highest crime and drug use rates of any in the country, which clearly indicates their social decay. We must look back at the deterioration of parts of our great land and assume the necessary responsibility to reverse that deterioration.

Before discussing the specific legislative proposals I intend to introduce, let me stress their importance in the context of a total ecological approach to everything we do relating to our environment. This includes our efforts to clean up the environment, and to right the wrongs we have perpetrated upon it in the past. We must consider all of the ecological ramifications of every approach we take, for only in such a context do our comments have relevance.

We must also face the fact that technology may not be able to satisfactorily solve all of our pollution problems, and that we may actually have to curtail and even cease certain pollution-causing activities, at least until satisfactory solutions are found. In testimony before the Senate committee on Tuesday, the head of Consolidated Edison of New York asked this question: "How many more generating stations can the environment tolerate?" He answered his question by saying that Americans may have to cut back on the use of electrical power in order to preserve the environment.

A total ecological approach to pollution problems requires a rational, coordinated administrative effort. Much of our success in the space program has been due to the centralization of responsibility and authority in a single agency, NASA. The Environmental Quality Council established in recently passed legislation is a step in the right direction. However, we really need a more definitive realignment of Federal environmental activities under a single agency with power equal to the task assigned. At the moment, the environmental effort is spread out among 13 different committees of Congress, 90 Federal

programs, over a dozen interagency committees, and over 2 dozen semi-government units.

In fact, with the President's budget cutbacks in space and defense, we must be careful not to lose the scientific problem-solving capability which already exists. We must carefully plan to redirect laboratories and technical capabilities to environmental problems. Unfortunately, some loss has already occurred in the name of economy. The present administration has completely dismantled the Radiological Defense Research Center in San Francisco, dissipating an impressive reservoir of scientific capabilities and expertise. We must take care to insure that the expertise existing in the high technology aerospace and defense industries is not lost. Rather, this problem-solving capability should be directed toward dealing with environmental pollution.

Only in the last 5 years has the Federal Government begun to deal with pollution through the enabling power of two major pieces of Federal legislation: The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1967 and the Air Pollution Prevention and Control Act of 1967. However, for a number of reasons governments at all levels have been unable to efficiently come to grips with the problem. Many times State and local governments lack the financial and manpower resources to enforce pollution standards. Quite often, too many agencies are involved. And more often than not, the law is confusing and unclear. But time is catching up with us. We need to do much more. We need to do so quickly. Today, I am introducing legislation which will help meet some of these needs.

I believe that every individual should be guaranteed the right to safe, healthful, productive and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings. It is axiomatic that no right can be effective unless there is an accompanying remedy aimed at insuring the owner of the right a means of defending it against infringement. At this time, a citizen's interest in a safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing environment is recognized by Federal law. However, a citizen has no means of vindicating his interest.

A measure I am introducing today would furnish the citizen with the ability to enforce his right in Federal court. In so doing, it recognizes the veracity of the assertion that a citizen's greatest civil right is his ability to sue in a court of law. Absent this right, all other rights are—at best—fragile because they exist only at the sufferance of those in power. Only when a citizen's right to vindicate his interest in a healthful environment is enshrined in law will that interest have any real meaning.

A second measure I am introducing deals with oil pollution. Two weeks ago, the Washington Post reported a major oil leak off Grand Isle, La. A 15-mile slick washed ashore, damaging beaches and destroying wildlife. Two coasts of the Nation have now been badly damaged by oil pollution.

On the west coast, the Santa Barbara Channel has been continually polluted since the major leak last year. The costs

of cleaning the channel have been high. Recreational facilities have been made unusable. Uncounted numbers of wild animals have been killed. The ecology of the area has been so badly damaged, strong measures must be taken to bring about recovery.

I am introducing legislation today which would ban offshore oil drilling in the channel. The bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw all licenses and refund all fees or exchange present oil leases for others. Drilling would only be allowed to relieve the pressure that causes eruptions.

The administration made a serious mistake by allowing full-scale drilling to continue. Its consistent inability to act in the face of mounting evidence has been most frustrating. Since the administration has demonstrated its incapacity, Congress must act.

I am also introducing two amendments to the Air Quality Act of 1967. Both amendments deal with auto emission standards.

The first amendment authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue auto emission standards for used cars. The Secretary will issue these standards when he issues standards for 1972 automobiles. The standards will apply to automobiles manufactured prior to 1968, the first year Federal standards became effective.

The second amendment requires the Secretary to issue Federal standards that are the same as California's requirements for emissions from new engines of 1975 cars.

California has just submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stringent new auto emission standards for 1975 cars. These standards cut in half the noxious chemicals emitted from present car exhausts.

When we first passed the Air Quality Act in 1967, Congress recognized California had major problems and, therefore, permitted it to set higher standards. I think we should recognize that although California has been willing to take stronger action, air pollution is just as serious in other parts of the Nation. California has demonstrated that strong air pollution standards can work and it should not be too much to expect that Federal standards, by 1975, be uniform throughout the Nation and as strong as possible. California should insist upon its 1975 standards being adopted nationwide; if for no other reason than the number of out-of-State cars that come into the State each year.

In the first 6 months of 1969, 8 million tourists visited southern California. Almost 45 percent of these tourists came in by car. This represents almost 2 million out-of-State cars, vehicles with less stringent emission requirements, in southern California within a 6-month period. Although we do not yet have statistics for July and August, we do know these are the peak tourist months in southern California. We can safely estimate there are at least 1 to 2 million out-of-State cars in the greater Los-Angeles-Orange County area during these 2 months—which also happen to be the peak smog months.

It is absurd to continue to emasculate

California's strong antipollution program. And that is exactly what happens when millions of vehicles with lower standards come into the State annually.

Congress last year took a strong stand in the area of water pollution. It appropriated \$800 million for water treatment facilities, the full amount authorized in the legislation, and four times what the President requested. The President threatened not to spend the funds at first, but has wisely decided to spend the entire amount. He has also proposed a new \$10 billion program. I am concerned however, that his proposals may be highly inflationary. He will ask the local communities to pay for at least 60 percent of the project cost of a treatment facility, which means that cities will have to float bonds to raise the needed capital. This will only increase the pressure on the extremely tight money market. Cities will have to further increase property taxes to pay the existing exorbitant interest rates, and these rates will only be forced higher by a potential \$6 billion in bond flotations.

Progress in water pollution can be made quickly since we are dealing with such a tangible resource. Inflationary pressures may slow the President's program down. The other alternative is to redirect Federal funds into the battle.

The Federal Government should consider paying for at least 80 percent of the water pollution fight. Local governments, depending entirely on property taxes, simply do not have the necessary resources to pay for such high-cost financing.

Another question must be answered in regard to building water treatment facilities. The President plans to require only that secondary treatment facilities be built. But strong evidence argues in favor of building tertiary treatment facilities, even though they are somewhat more costly. Secondary treatment plants do not kill many kinds of viruses. They also produce byproducts which can eventually lead to the death of wildlife. It seems pennywise and pound foolish not to go directly to tertiary treatment plants.

My mail, as I am sure must be the case with many of my colleagues, is filled with requests from constituents asking what they can personally do to combat pollution. Preserving the environment is a cause that deserves more than armchair concern. Many who were active in the protests of the 1960's intend to make the environment the issue of the 1970's.

I believe political leaders should encourage citizens to make a personal commitment. In my district, a number of local citizen action groups have come into being. Students, as they did in the 1960's, are taking the lead. Fullerton Junior College students have already had a number of symposia on the relevant issues. These meetings have generated widespread interest and direct action programs are planned. Teach-ins are planned on all the major campuses in my area.

In Garden Grove, Calif., a group called Stamp Out Smog is proving itself to be an excellent instrument of citizen action. Not only are they getting the issues before the public, but they are

facilitating information between concerned citizens and the maze of officialdom. Another group of local residents affiliated with the Comprehensive Health Plan Association of Orange County is studying ways to improve the area's immediate environment.

I suggest citizens interested in what they can do get directly in touch with local organizations such as the ones I mentioned above. I also suggest citizens continue to demand that preserving the environment be among those issues at the top of their legislator's agenda.

The job of righting our environmental wrongs will take many years and will require more than the building of bigger and better treatment plants or the replacement of the internal combustion engine. We must closely examine our values and our ethics and bring them in line with environmental reality if we are to restore ecological harmony. We must value air, water, and land as limited commodities and preserve them. We must realize our dependence upon the other forms of life with which we share the earth, and respect them. And finally, we have all the more reason to intensively study ourselves, in order to understand how we relate to our environment.

#### AMENDMENTS TO OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, no more urgent need faces Congress than to provide better Federal assistance to help release the Nation's neighborhoods and communities from the grip of crime.

President Nixon's crime proposals may provide additional Federal aids for this fight. But already those proposals have stimulated great controversy. Even if and when they are enacted, time will be required to implement them. In the meantime, Americans will continue to fall victim to crime—much of it street crime—in ever-increasing numbers, fearing more than ever to walk in their parks, to go out after dark, or even to traverse the hallways of their apartment buildings.

With the urgency of this problem in mind, I feel that we must pay particularly careful attention to Federal crime control assistance programs already on the books. These programs will have the most immediate impact on the crime situation.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act passed by Congress in 1968 established most of the crime control assistance programs currently in effect. The act provides funds to State and local agencies for planning and action against crime, administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the Department of Justice.

The bill I am introducing today, with 16 cosponsors, would provide a 3-year authorization totaling \$3 billion for these crime control assistance programs, and make other needed changes, particularly in the funding mechanisms. The overall purpose of this legislation is to insure that a great portion of available

funds reach local areas where they are most needed—high-crime areas, mostly in our larger cities. This legislation was originally introduced on the Senate side by Senator Hartke.

I am delighted that the following colleagues have joined me as cosponsors of this bill: EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat of Massachusetts; SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Democrat of New York; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat of New York; DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat of Minnesota; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican of New York; WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat of Maine; HENRY HELSTOSKI, Democrat of New Jersey; EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat of New York; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat of Pennsylvania; RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat of New York; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of New York; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat of Illinois; ROBERT A. ROE, Democrat of New Jersey; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat of New York; JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat of New York; and MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat of Arizona.

A number of other Members are introducing or plan to introduce identical legislation at my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, several careful studies of LEAA programs have been conducted by various groups. These studies cite, first, severe underrepresentation of city officials, citizens—as opposed to law-enforcement professionals—and minority groups on planning panels; second, dissipation of funds to create unnecessary additional administrative layers; third, excessive influence on planning by “law-and-order advocates led by State police-type functionalists;” and fourth, a tendency to use funds simply to “do more of the same.”

Under present law, 85 percent of LEAA's grant funds go to the States for redistribution. The remaining 15 percent are dispensed at the discretion of the LEAA officials. Forty percent of the funds allocated to the States for planning, and 75 percent of the funds for action grants, must be “passed through” to local units.

LEAA programs are the first to use a block-grant funding approach. There are those who categorically distrust and oppose block grants. I hold no such categorical views, though I find it unfortunate that we are experimenting with a new funding approach on such a vital set of programs. There is already evidence that LEAA programs are not directing adequate assistance funds to high-crime urban areas where they are most needed, as Congress intended. Based on the 1969 balance of planning and action funds, only 48 percent of total grant money allocated to the States was required to pass through to localities. And a preliminary survey of the States shows that only eight employ “incidence of crime” in given areas as a factor in distributing funds.

The bill we are introducing today would make several changes in the funding mechanisms of these programs to insure that more funds reach these high-crime areas. At the same time, it would retain much of the block-grant mechanism. Specifically, it would reduce to 50 percent the total funds going

directly to the States for redistribution, leaving the remaining 50 percent eligible to be allocated directly to high-crime localities at the discretion of Federal officials. In addition, however, each State's block-grant allocation will be increased by 20 percent—from discretionary funds—if Federal officials find that the State is dealing adequately with its urban and high-crime areas. Another 20-percent increase in a State's block grant would be made where the State contributes at least 50 percent of the non-Federal share of costs for federally assisted local crime-control programs.

The legislation also provides for increased funds for crime prevention, including improved lighting of high-crime areas and other measures to lower opportunities for crime.

Finally, it would authorize \$800 million for these programs in 1971—as compared to President Nixon's budget request for \$480 million; \$1 billion in 1972; and \$1.2 billion in 1973. Such a 3-year authorization is needed to stimulate local planning efforts and better assure a long-term Federal commitment.

I am pleased to note that this bill has the support and endorsement of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Those organizations share my concern with the problem of crime on the streets, and my belief that the changes in crime control assistance under the Safe Streets Act proposed by this legislation will do a great deal to get adequate, useful Federal assistance to local officials.

We simply cannot afford to waste scarce crime-control assistance resources on excess administrative baggage and unnecessary law-enforcement hardware for police in areas where crime is a much less serious problem than it is in most urban neighborhoods. We have to put this money in the hands of the men on the front lines of the fight against crime in the streets—the men who come in daily contact with the narcotics addicts and others who are responsible for the burgeoning crime rate. These men, for the most part, are the men on the beat in our big cities.

#### NIXON HAS ISSUED STRONG CHALLENGE

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's address was a refreshing departure from the usual state of the Union messages—both in its tone and in its vision.

It seemed to have a special character flowing from a conviction that the problems facing our country are not essentially those of quantity and dollars, but of quality and moral values. It was not a political scorecard nor a long shopping list for election year spending, but rather a blueprint for the seventies seeking to inspire our citizens in the traditional American spirit for a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, the President's message has been very well received in Michigan's

Sixth Congressional District as is indicated by editorials appearing in the State Journal of Lansing on January 23, 1970, and in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, January 25, and I insert them in the RECORD for the wider distribution that their views deserve:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Jan. 23, 1970]

#### NIXON HAS ISSUED STRONG CHALLENGE

President Nixon's State of the Union address Thursday could well go down in the record books as one of the sharpest and most effective presentations of its kind in many years.

It was relatively brief, concise and hit directly at the major issues facing this nation in the immediate future and the new decade of the seventies. Though there were few specifics, the President gave strong general guidelines on what he thinks should be done and called upon the Congress and Americans of all groups and ages to join forces in this effort.

In one major part of his talk he called for an immediate and all out fight against air and water pollution and said he will propose to Congress “the most comprehensive and costly program” in this field in the nation's history, starting with a \$10-billion clean waters program to put modern municipal waste treatment plants “in every place in America where they are needed.” At the same time he called for massive efforts to combat air pollution at all levels and development of new non-pollutant type automobile engines.

The chief executive placed heavy emphasis on the fight against crime and said he would double his request for federal aid to law enforcement in 1971. He pledged a continued fight against inflation and appealed for help from Congress through tighter spending policies.

On the inflation issue the President made a particularly important point when he noted that “it is tempting to blame someone else for inflation,” including business and labor unions. But he said a review of federal spending in the last 10 years shows that the government spent \$57 billion more than it took in in taxes and the American people paid the bill for that deficit.

In turn the President called for reform of the institutions of government and reversing the flow of power from Washington “back to the states and the people.”

He urged new programs to rebuild decaying inner cities and also to provide a new rural environment to stem the migration to urban areas and thus give the cities a chance to start on the road to recovery.

The President also again stressed the overdue need for total reform of our welfare system which he said “penalizes work, breaks up homes and robs recipients of dignity,” and urged action on his welfare reform proposal which was presented to Congress last year.

In a most significant portion of his talk, Mr. Nixon, calling for a decade without war, stressed again that his foreign policy will be one promoting peace and a complete revision of outdated approaches which have dominated U.S. foreign policy since World War II. The President clearly was reinforcing his Guam proposal of lowering American commitments on a worldwide basis and calling upon other nations to take a greater load in handling their own defense problems.

As one newsman noted, the President has seized the initiative on virtually all the major issues facing the nation, outlining goals and calling for action. Many of his proposals on various domestic issues are now before Congress awaiting action. The President has promised he will present many more this year.

No one can predict with certainty how a Democratically controlled Congress will re-



act to the Republican President's appeals in this election year. But Mr. Nixon has presented a courageous and bold message on the needs of the nation.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Jan. 25, 1970]

#### NIXON MESSAGE GOOD IF ACTION FOLLOWS

In his first formal State of the Union Message President Richard M. Nixon said most of the proper and expected things with respect to the nation's hopes for peace, for an improved environment, for control of crime and for the end to what he calls putting good money into bad programs.

The timing of the political processes is kind to a new President in that it gives him a year in office before he is required to report on the state of the nation—and to submit a budget of his own design. Thus does he speak against a background of experience in his job. By the same token, his listeners in the Congress and among the people have the background of his performance to better judge his words.

It must be said that the Nixon message contains no major surprises and no extravagant promises of actions or slogans which may, or may not, be translated into effective policy and action.

The aspects of the message dealing with the Vietnam war caused hardly a ripple. For the time being what President Nixon is doing with respect to that wearisome conflict is being accepted by a majority of the people. The advocates of a "get out now" policy still are heard, but the President's moves have deprived his critics of a burning issue—at least for the present. If his plans go awry he may well expect the Vietnam roof to fall in. Obviously he is conscious of the risk.

In his dramatic call for an improvement of the environment Mr. Nixon is riding a popular issue. This is one which is receiving attention on every hand. It looms large, for example, in Gov. William G. Milliken's programs for Michigan in 1970.

The ancient tale about the revolutionary who said, "There go the people. I am their leader. I must follow them," may apply to the President, to the governor and other persons in high places who have become conscious of what man is doing to his environment.

A certain irony is present in Mr. Nixon's promise to attempt to mobilize federal funds in the fight against pollution.

The promises have been made before. Much federal law dealing with clean water already is on the books. The effectiveness of the federal program, however, has been lessened by the failure of this and past administrations and the Congress to provide the appropriations to fund the programs.

States and local communities which have counted on federal help in financing sewage treatment plants and sewer system and other pollution control devices have been disappointed when they looked to Washington for the federal share of the money.

Much hypocrisy is to be found in the discussions of damage to the environment and efforts to curb it. Everyone admits that the problems exist. They are not so quick to agree on who or what is to blame or who is to pay the huge cost of making things right with nature.

The man who berates industry for polluting streams or the air may have a defective septic tank in his own backyard and may be fighting any effort to make him pay his share of the bill for installing a proper sewer system.

This same man may cheer Ralph Nader for his appropriate remarks about the failure of the automobile industry to get on with the job of curbing noxious emissions from internal combustion engines, but may burn

trash or leaves on his own property, or litter a beach or a roadside with bottles and other debris.

Still, the proposition that the 1970s is the decade of decision with respect to the environment must be considered valid. While the dire facts of pollution long have been known to the environmental scientists the great awakening among the people only now is taking place. The facts of the population explosion and the problems it brings finally are being recognized. It is only proper that the President of the United States and the governors of the several states sound the call to battle and provide the leadership in dealing with man's own threat to his existence.

His natural enemies largely have been conquered. Remaining is only man's worst enemy—himself.

In his recommendations in the area of crime control the President again may be following the people he leads. The crime issue loomed large in the political campaign which put Mr. Nixon in the White House.

The Congress was singularly reluctant to act on crime prevention bills in the 1969 session, a fact which the President emphasized in his address. Even with the pressure he hopes to put on Congress in search of action and the widespread concern among the people, positive action on anti-crime measures cannot be taken for granted.

The issue is so deeply involved in politics and bold moves are so certain to bump into fears that the cure will be worse than the disease that interminable debates on crime measures can be anticipated.

As in the case of the damage to the environment the threat of crime has reached such proportions that something has to be done. Richard Nixon said as much. The people will agree.

They also will buy his premise that far too many social and economic programs which have the noble purpose of improving American life (and thus attacking the crime problem at its roots) simply have proved to be misconceived, misdirected and almost totally ineffective. The classic assumptions with respect to the cures for social ills have to be re-examined because they have been found to be in error.

The failures of the past in the areas of welfare and social progress have been compounded because the answer to a given worsening situation has been to provide only more of the same kind of cure.

Social concepts and programs generate their own momentum. Turning them aside to make a new approach possible is extremely difficult. Not the least of the reasons is the stake that a massive bureaucracy acquires in perpetuating a given function, no matter how useless it may appear to be.

The President, however, has pledged to try new approaches and new ideas in the welfare system which has undergone little change in the past 30 years. The people can only hope that he succeeds.

The President touched many other bases in his State of the Union message. Being a political figure he put the best face possible on his first year's performance and outlined what he deems to be proper courses of action.

The message was notable, perhaps, for the avoidance of promises impossible to carry out. It was in keeping with his "low profile," "easy does it," "let's work together" approach which he has tried to make the hallmark of his administration.

To praise his words is easy. Performance rather than rhetoric, however, is the basis on which the people must judge their President.

His message can best be judged from the vantage point of this date in 1971.

#### CALLING ALL PHYSICIANS

(Mr. LANDGREBE asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, most of us are well aware of our Nation's critical shortage of physicians. Nowhere is this crisis more acute than in our Nation's rural areas.

Today, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues and, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the physicians of America, to the plight of one rural community which desperately needs a doctor.

The town of Wolcott, Ind., needs a physician. Its community leaders have been involved in an imaginative and vigorous campaign to lure a doctor to Wolcott for over a year. They even pulled a banner, reading "Wolcott Needs a Doctor," behind an airplane flying over last year's Purdue-Indiana football game. Another such banner flies over the main street of town, but to no avail.

Mr. Speaker, we must address ourselves to this problem, for Wolcott in my district is not alone in this dilemma. We must search for ways to encourage more young men and women to enter the medical profession.

But this is a long-term solution, and Wolcott needs a doctor now. While perhaps most young doctors are lured by the bright lights of the big cities, surely there is someone reading these remarks in the RECORD who would be interested in an old-fashioned family practice in a small but prosperous community.

Wolcott really has many attractions for the young physician or anyone else, for that matter. The town is small, with a population of 900 to 1,000 and the surrounding area has another 1,500 to 2,000 residents, but this total of 2,500 to 3,000 persons is a very sizable practice.

There are several excellent hospitals located within a 35-mile radius, including two major hospitals in the city of Lafayette, as well as three others in Rensselaer, Monticello, and Brook. Here a young doctor can meet and exchange ideas with many colleagues.

There are several nurses available in Wolcott to assist any doctor who comes to town. The community health organization has even rented a former doctor's office and is willing to remodel and furnish it.

In addition to its attractions to the medical profession, Wolcott offers the best of several worlds to just about anybody as a place to live. Its rural setting means cleaner air and almost no crime, as well as a more convenient and relaxed way of life.

But besides the benefits that would be offered by most rural towns, Wolcott can also list two major cities, a large university, a small college, and even a lake resort.

It is a 2-hour drive to either Chicago or Indianapolis from Wolcott, so a weekend in the city for shopping or entertainment is easily realized, without the many headaches of actually having to live there.

Purdue University, the birthplace of astronauts, is located less than 30 miles away in Lafayette. And St. Joseph's College, an excellent small school, is even closer in Rensselaer. Both schools make

many social and academic activities available to the community and also attract name talent to many musical and dramatic presentations.

Only 20 minutes of driving will take the young doctor and his family to the famous Twin Lakes resorts near Monticello. Lake Shafer and Lake Freeman have offered the finest in swimming, boating, fishing, water skiing, and entertainment for years.

Finally, there is the great intangible of Hoosier hospitality. Nobody is a stranger in Indiana, which has the friendliest people in the world.

Any physician interested in practicing in Wolcott can obtain more information by writing to the chairman of the Wolcott Health Organization—Mr. Robert Nordyke, Wolcott, Ind. 47995.

### OIL IMPORT CONTROLS

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year, I wrote the President of my deep concern about the persistent reports indicating that his Task Force on Oil Import Control was about to propose radical changes in this vital program. The President kindly acknowledged my letter and promised to give my views on this important subject every consideration.

I fear that the passage of 2 months has not allayed my concern over the recommendations of this committee. Because the prosperity of this industry is of concern to all Americans, because the very defense of this Nation is involved, I would like to make this letter available to every Member and urge them to be alert to what may be forthcoming.

At the same time, I would like to add here in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. F. D. Lortscher, president of Signal Oil & Gas Co., which appeared in the Oil Daily of February 2. He calls attention to what I sincerely believe is an alarming situation.

The above-mentioned material follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned wish to take this means of expressing to you our deep concern about the persistent reports indicating that the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control may propose radical changes in the oil import program. Most disturbing are reports that the present level of imports will be increased and that this action is to be taken for the purpose of forcing a reduction in the price of crude oil.

It is our firm conviction that an increase in the present level of imports would seriously jeopardize our national security and constitute a disservice to the consumers of both oil and natural gas. In this regard, the following considerations appear to us to be conclusively persuasive.

1. Imports of crude oil and refined products now equal more than one-third of total U.S. crude oil production. This already is a dangerous dependency, and under no circumstances should it be increased. For example, during the Middle East crisis of 1967, we were barely able to meet the emer-

gency requirements for domestic oil, even for a short duration. Since that time, our petroleum reserve position has deteriorated. Last year, for the first time in our history, crude oil producing capacity declined. In contrast, authoritative forecasts show that our requirements by 1980 will be some 30 percent greater than at present.

2. The Eastern States, including Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, are now dependent on foreign source petroleum for 40 percent of their requirements. Any further dependence of this important industrial area on uncertain foreign sources, which experience has indicated would be cut off in time of emergency, could result in critical shortages because domestic supplies and transportation facilities would no longer be available.

3. We already face a most critical natural gas supply problem. The Federal Power Commission and also officials in the Department of the Interior recently have publicly recognized the seriousness of the natural gas supply problem and have called for immediate remedial actions. Increased imports of oil would discourage and further depress the search for new gas fields and new oil fields—an inseparable activity.

4. All forms of energy are essential to national security. Increased oil imports adversely affect not only domestic supplies of oil and natural gas but also of coal and synthetics such as shale oil.

5. The use of low-cost imported oil appears at first glance to be attractive, and it might very well be so for the short term. But, to do so would put the Nation in a very vulnerable position for the long term. During the 1967 Middle East crisis, we were the victims of an embargo. It is obvious from previous experience that foreign oil will be cheap only so long as we are not dependent upon it for our needs and security.

6. There have been claims made that the present Mandatory Oil Import Program costs consumers billions of dollars annually. These claims are totally misleading because they are based upon the fallacious assumption that Middle East oil will remain cheap even after we are dependent upon it. Furthermore, these claims disregard the losses to our economy that would result from dismantling the domestic industry which generates billions of dollars annually in revenues to the economy and tax revenues throughout more than half our States which produce oil and gas.

7. Oil imports now constitute the largest commodity deficit item in our balance of trade, totaling \$2.6 billion annually. If the import level is increased, the serious balance of payments problem will be further aggravated.

8. The petroleum industry now markets more Btu's in the form of natural gas than in the form of liquid petroleum. The combined wellhead price of these two products on a crude oil equivalent basis, is less than \$1.90 per barrel. This is lower than the cost of imported oil or natural gas from any source of the world.

9. In 1957-59, the combined weighted wholesale price of the four principal petroleum products was \$3.99 a barrel. In the latest month, September 1969, these weighted product prices averaged \$3.90. Prices of petroleum are, therefore, lower today than in the 1957-59 price, while the wholesale price level for all commodities is up almost 14 percent. If price behavior of all other industries had been as favorable as the oil industry, there would be no problem of inflation today.

10. Recent discoveries in Alaska have been cited by some as providing security of supplies for the future. We think prudence requires caution as to (1) these preliminary

but optimistic estimates of reserves and (2) the cost to consumers in the other 49 states. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that our requirements are growing at a rapid rate; for example, during the past 10 years we found about 35 billion barrels of oil whereas during the next decade if we are to remain secure we must find about 60 billion barrels.

We are also very much concerned about the impact increased imports would have upon the economy of the oil producing states. The cost to the total U.S. economy would aggregate billions of dollars annually through reductions in state and local tax revenues; lower bonuses and rentals from Federal and state lands; losses in employment; and decreases in purchases of equipment, supplies and services from allied industries.

We wish to urge with all the persuasion and force at our command that in our opinion the Nation's security will be dangerously impaired if the level of imports is increased. We direct your attention particularly to the uncertain conditions in Libya and the Middle East which serve to remind us of the folly of becoming dependent upon these sources. In addition, we are firmly convinced that increased imports would bring about serious economic problems, including what we believe would be a crippling impact upon the already serious balance of payments problem.

Respectfully,

F. EDWARD HEBERT.  
HALE BOGGS.  
OTTO E. PASSMAN.  
JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.  
SPEEDY O. LONG.  
EDWIN W. EDWARDS.  
JOHN R. RARICK.  
PATRICK T. CAFFERY.

### STATEMENT BY F. D. LORTSCHER

The first thing to do when you're looking for an answer to a problem is to appoint a committee, a task force. That's just what we did. Of course you have to choose people who will look at the problem objectively.

Our Number 1 choice was Jesse who, among other duties, serves coffee to Signal's executives. Then Louise, our chief cook. Next we picked Pete, who runs our parking lot. We added Earl, he's in charge of building security. We had no choice but to use Grant who washes the windows and Pat who changes light bulbs. Of course, the committee needed Henry, our gardener. Finally, as Executive Director of the Task Force we appointed our friendly cafeteria cashier, Margaret.

We wanted people with no direct involvement in the issues to be weighed so they could remain detached.

There has been no official report from the Task Force yet, but there have been a couple of leaks from reliable sources. Several committee members are said to be recommending that oil companies give their products away, that additional profits are not necessary since all money is made through tax loopholes.

Another leak says they will recommend the closing of service stations in certain beach cities on the West Coast until the people in those towns can get back on their feet again.

There will be a reported demand from one member for an end to controls on Spanish Onions which he allegedly enjoys so much on his chill con carne. He believes that oil interests in Spain are behind an embargo.

Scores of company engineers, geologists and economists have testified before the committee, but it is said that their comments have been dismissed by five of the seven members. As one reportedly said, "I never thought much of the company anyway. I think the government should run all busi-

nesses. This is a good time to help me get my way."

Does what you've read so far sound incredible? Well, it is not as way out as it might seem. In fact it's quite similar to what's happening to the oil industry today. We must add here not to Signal Oil and Gas Company. That committee wasn't for real, but those people sure are, and they do a lot more on their jobs than the things we mentioned. If we didn't know them as well as we do and think as much of them as we do we wouldn't be able to kid them as we did.

But the point is, and we're sure those folks we mentioned understand, they have not had practical experience in the business end of petroleum. We think when you want an answer to a question you go to someone who knows the subject.

Recently, President Nixon appointed a Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls to look into the quota system, to make recommendations to him. This was all well and good. In fact, it was the American Petroleum Institute representing our industry who had asked the President to look into the matter!!! They wanted him to have a serious review undertaken on the system!

These are the men whose background gave them their "insight" into the problems in the field of petroleum. As Executive Director there was a professor from Harvard Law School. We always wondered how really interested he was in the "problem" as several times he indicated that he couldn't wait to get back to teaching.

The Task Force Chairman's background included an education at Princeton and a career steeped in Industrial Relations. Other members of the committee had the following professional backgrounds: a lawyer who studied at Colgate; an accountant who studied at Columbia; a banker who went to Rutgers; a Brigadier General who learned his economics at Oxford; a gentleman who succeeded his father when he died as a state senator and has been in politics ever since; and a man who quit school to go out and make a fortune in real estate and construction.

We do not mean to knock any of the backgrounds of these men. There's not a thing in the world wrong with them. They are all fine men, indeed all but one is a member of the President's Cabinet. But we do question their interest in petroleum and their understanding of its role in our country's and the free world's defense. Several had the reputation for being anti-oil to begin with.

We don't say they went in with their minds made up, but this Task Force certainly approached its work from a strange point of view. It openly hunted out ways to relax import controls. It was harsh in its language towards what it called "high domestic oil prices" and "its heavy costs to the nation." Yet this is the group that should in all fairness hand the President an accurate, balanced report with equitable and workable recommendations on which to base the nation's oil policy.

How is this report being put together? Our Harvard law professor, who knows nothing about the industry, put together a staff. The staff's knowledge of oil economics is limited to what they have read about the industry, mainly what academic critics have written on the basis of pure theory without any practical experience.

Since his staff is biased toward free trade and biased against the oil industry, it puts the industry in a fairly hopeless position. Sure papers were submitted to the staff, but the key cabinet members did not have time to read them. So the staff summarized the industry papers and passed summaries to the Task Force slanted to their own bias. We can't expect the Task Force to go back and read tons of original papers so they will probably do what the staff recommends.

Vice President Agnew recently criticized

the networks for what he said was the granting of preferential treatment to the politically Liberal point of view. It has certainly been true with the petroleum industry with Democratic Sens. Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, Edmund Muskie of Maine, William Proxmire of Wisconsin and John Pastore of Rhode Island as leading members of our vocal critics. Their faces and voices have constantly come into the nation's living rooms. We can remember Senator Pastore shouting, "The (oil import) system reeks and is ripe for change. The industry should know that this is a time for consumer revolt!"

Consumer revolt? Against an industry which has continually produced a superior product at no increase in consumer prices? Against an industry which has contributed so much to bettering our standard of living? Someone's got to be kidding! If you don't count the taxes put on gasoline, it costs five cents a gallon less than it did 45 years ago! We would be interested in learning of any other major industry which can match that record. (By the way, those taxes on motor fuel generate revenue at the rate of one million dollars an hour! The total for 1969 was around \$9 billion more than the revenue derived from any other commodity in this country!)

Five cents a gallon less . . . how does that compare with other prices and costs these days? Like, for instance, salaries of Senators. They recently voted themselves a raise in pay from \$30,000 to \$42,500 a year!!! That's more than a 41 percent increase. And what was it they said about inflation? About keeping wage increases to something like six percent? It seems their motto is "do as we say, not as we do." Yes, let's have a consumer revolt, but let's be fair and not cloud the issues with propaganda against just the petroleum industry, an industry which has contributed a great deal to the American way of life.

It's been said the oil industry is privileged, that it is, in essence, getting a government subsidy through oil import controls. That is not true but even if it were, how do we explain the fact that our government subsidized farmers to the tune of \$233 million last year? And that \$233 million was only the amount going to farmers who got payments of more than \$25,000 each!!! We haven't even included the "small" farmers.

We hear constant senatorial speeches about the nation's poor who have to go to bed at night hungry. Then why are we paying out these hundreds of millions of dollars to farmers not to plant crops? Why do we order tons of food thrown away each year? If the government really wants to help the people, why not knock out supports on every commodity. The facts are that most petroleum product prices are not more, but less than they were 45 years ago, with import controls which have contributed to the vitality of all branches of the petroleum industry.

It's time the oil industry fought back. The old image of the millionaire with money sticking out of his pockets, wearing a ten-gallon hat, standing by his oil wells went out of style 30 years ago, just as did the image of the railroad tycoon. But it is still being used by politicians who seemingly hope for government controls of business and prices. They seem to think this image makes good copy. The fact that it is not true today doesn't bother them one iota. It's not how you play the game as long as you win. The fact that petroleum companies had an average return on net worth for the past ten years less than that of all manufacturing companies doesn't seem to enter into the picture at all. Profits in petroleum are not excessive. In fact, they are under most other major industries.

Instead of passing on higher costs to consumers, they have been absorbed by the oil companies. How many other industries today can make that statement? Like we said,

it's time we shouted back. The President can afford to keep a "soft voice." His job is not at stake. Thousands of men and women in the oil industry don't have that same assurance. If the people of this nation were presented the facts, they'd be able to see through this political smokescreen.

The subject is immense, but we shall be as brief as possible, at least try to cover the major points on why we have an Oil Import Control Program and what will happen if it is tossed out. And one of the latest "leaks" is that the recommendation of the Presidential Task Force will be to scuttle it, to desert the ship, to let it sink. Before we drown let's look at what's happened.

Not too long after World War II, crude from the rich oil fields of South America and the Middle East began to come into the United States. It was a small amount at first, then with the jumbo tankers it really started to "pour" in.

The government and most of the petroleum industry were concerned. It wouldn't be long before these unlimited low-cost imports would economically force closure of two-thirds of the oil wells in the United States. Once they were shut-in, it would be impossible to return most of them to production. The result would be that at least one-third of America's crude oil reserves could be lost forever.

There was an even greater problem: the effect on the nation's security. Security is something we Americans think is worth keeping and fighting for. If the United States were to become dependent on foreign crude—as England, France, Germany and Japan are—this country could become vulnerable in many ways, in peace or war.

In July, 1954, President Eisenhower established an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources which recommended that in the interest of national defense and to insure "orderly industrial growth," imports of crude oil and petroleum products be limited to a fixed proportion of domestic crude oil production.

Three-fourths of the energy that powers and lubricates American industry came from petroleum hydrocarbons. Armies, navies, and industry succeed depending on the availability of oil. The threat to national security was obvious.

Then came the 1956 Suez Crisis. The canal was blocked cutting off supplies of vital petroleum. Overnight, Europe was thrown into panic. Only by a fantastic effort was the U.S. oil industry able to supply the oil and prevent even wilder military adventures from taking place in the Middle East.

Subsequent Congressional investigations, hearings by the Office of Defense Mobilization and study by the President's "Special Cabinet Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports" prompted the President in July, 1957, to establish a program of voluntary controls on the level of crude oil imports.

The Suez Crisis was an eye opener for a lot of people. It added weight to a growing problem. In February, 1959, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization advised the President that the level of oil imports was still adversely affecting domestic exploration and development, and therefore, threatening to impair the national security. As a result, President Eisenhower issued a Presidential Proclamation on March 10, 1959, establishing the Mandatory Oil Import Control Program.

That policy has been in effect to this day. It "limits oil imports to whatever amount is required to supplement domestic production, and still be able to foster growth of a strong domestic oil industry, capable of exploring for and developing new domestic reserves." Of our total supply today, about 22 percent is imported crude and products, mostly going to the East Coast.

Certainly the program gets more complicated than this, but a policy of controls has

enabled our nation to promote a strong viable domestic oil industry and has, thereby, avoided dependency on foreign oil supply. Under this policy the United States is flexible and can balance its requirements between domestic and foreign sources in order to maintain a viable domestic petroleum industry.

No other major industrial nation in the free world has this option. Only Russia has it in the Communist world. To determine whether or not the U.S. policy is correct, we need only ask ourselves what England and France or Germany or Japan would do if nature had given them this option. (It is interesting to note that Australia, which also has the option of choosing between domestic and foreign supplies, has adopted a control program very similar to that of the U.S.)

During the Kennedy-Johnson years, political tampering began in the administration of the oil import program. Special exemptions made the program a political football hurting the industry as a whole. This is why the majority of members of the petroleum industry went to the President and asked him to move the program administration back to the President, to study the problems so as to return the program back to what it was intended to be. The industry did not expect the President to turn the problem over to a group of men with no practical experience in the oil industry, to a group who had in the past spoken out openly against the petroleum industry. According to the Task Force "leaks" some of them would like to "cut out the entire control program!" Isn't that smart? You have a sore on one of your toes, so you cut off your foot? It makes about as much sense!!

While no single overseas producing country has a big enough share of total reserves to dominate the international world market, groups of oil producing countries with common interests do have large enough shares. In fact, it is the openly avowed aim of the members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Qatar, Abu Dhabi, Venezuela and Indonesia) to control the export market for crude oil. The main reason the control of market prices is yet to be achieved is that, so far, no individual country has been willing to give up producing income for the sake of the others. But without a strong U.S. petroleum industry to counter the potential market power of the OPEC group, it could in time act as a monopolistic entity at the expense of the consuming countries. This would include the entire free world and even the United States to a degree that we were overly dependent on oil from OPEC members to power our own economy. It is naive to think Mideast oil will remain cheap for very long. Then, of course, a move could be made by petroleum critics to nationalize the industry which may be what they wanted all along.

Some critics of oil shout, "You don't have to rely on oil from the Middle East. You can get it from Venezuela. It's the largest producer, with 17 percent of free world production, outside of North America. True, critics, but for how long? Venezuela has 4 percent of the world's reserves. The Middle East and North Africa have 86 percent! And shipments from both areas have been interrupted eight times since World War II.

Suppose the oil import control is abolished. What will happen? Any immediate savings to consumers would be wiped out in a few years by price increases. Once the U.S. became dependent on foreign sources, how long would prices stay low? If you have a monopoly do you keep prices as low as you can? That wouldn't make sense in today's economic world. At least not according to what those nations have planned!

By the early 1970's the United States could be dependent on foreign oil for 50 percent of its supply! . . . while the Soviet Union's naval force continues to sit in the

Mediterranean, continues to rearm Egyptian forces . . . yes, it makes a lot of sense for us to become dependent on the Middle East for our oil. We'd better wake up to the fact that if we cannot produce a substantial part of our own we're going to be in trouble!!!

Elimination of controls would cause domestic production to be seven million barrels per day lower in 1985 than production anticipated with a continuation of import controls.

Without controls, the number of wells drilled in search for new oil and gas supplies would be reduced by 85 percent or approximately 4,500 wells annually in the 1970-1985 period! Development wells would be cut by 50 percent or approximately 8,000 wells per year!!! The tax reform bill removed some risk-taking incentive. It would be ridiculous to pile drastic changes in our imports policy on top of this.

Elimination of controls would result in the premature abandonment of 185,000 small wells, representing 60 percent of the active wells in the U.S. in the early 1980's. Total completion would be off from 485,000 to 190,000. Expenditures for development drilling would be off by \$1.1 billion for 1976-1980. Discoveries after 1971 would become insignificant.

Without controls, it will worsen the country's balance of payments problems. The dollar outflow for oil would more than double by 1970 to nearly \$4 billion. The country's total deficit in balance of payments is now \$9.5 billion per year. And inflation, no matter what the Congress does, will grow even worse!

Without controls, the economies of oil producing states would be severely crippled. Labor forces would be cut—amounting to the elimination of as many as 165,000 workers—earnings would be off by \$1,650,000,000.

Without controls, future domestic oil reserves would be 55 percent below current projections by the year 1985.

Domestic crude prices might be cut by \$.80 to \$1.00 per barrel and U.S. crude oil producing capacity could drop by at least 8 percent per year. Lease bonuses to the various government bodies would be off drastically. So would the billions in taxes now paid to the government. Who's going to pick up the slack? The public. But who will care? They might save a penny or two a gallon on gasoline, but have their total tax bill upped many times their possible savings on gasoline purchases!

There's a side effect, too, a very important one. Natural gas supplies would be severely cut with a reduction in domestic exploration and drilling. Most gas is found while looking for oil. The cost of natural gas to consumers will go up and up and up and up! That's not a threat, it's a fact of life.

Since 1954 the Federal Power Commission has regulated the price of natural gas. The petroleum industry tried in every way to demonstrate that these regulations would work against the American people, not for them, that controls would limit new supplies.

But the FPC members had no practical background in the petroleum industry. They lacked knowledge, they lacked understanding, a situation very similar to what's happening today with the Oil Imports Task Force.

So, today, there is a shortage of natural gas. There will be some cold feet this winter because of the lack of foresight by a group of men who wouldn't listen to the petroleum industry's side to things. True, men on the FPC today say poor judgment was used in the past, but they may not be in time. There's a big time lag between discovery and delivery and lots of cold feet in between.

The American public can thank a former government "task force" for this. The question is will the American public allow an-

other task force to make even greater mistakes today with the oil imports program?

Sure the oil import control program has problems. The industry was the first to point that out. Certainly we ought to take a long hard look at the inequities that have developed. But let's not cut out the whole program because the last Secretary of the Interior "goofed." A firm decision should be made to phase out of the program those elements of favoritism which have allowed to creep in.

It is said a tariff system will be recommended to replace the quotas. Many inland refineries would be legislated out of business under such a system. True, it would bring in revenues to the government at first, but this must be weighed against job losses, price increases to consumers as inland refineries are eliminated, and in addition any revenues gained by the Treasury through tariff would undoubtedly be offset by revenue losses from federal lease sales and from losses in federal taxes paid by both coal and oil. (Yes, even the coal industry realizes full well that flooding the country with cheap foreign oil will render it less competitive.)

It's amazing though, the beating the oil industry has been taking recently. When we spoke of fighting back, we meant fighting in order to save one of the greatest industries in the world—not only in this current attack, but against future ones as well. The political destroyers will be there, believe us. They won't stop until they have either completely crippled the petroleum industry, or maybe nationalized it.

If the oil business goes on the rocks and our nation's defense is immobilized for lack of fuel, it won't take the public long to decide who put it there—not if the petroleum industry does its public relations job well. Above all we must not forget the matter of security. Certainly we recognize that the men on the Task Force are intelligent and dedicated, that they have developed data to support change. What we do question is their complete lack of practical knowledge and understanding of the petroleum industry. We simply point out that uncertainties exist. National security is too vital to have policy based on uncertainties.

The administration of the Oil Import Program should be moved as rapidly as possible toward an objective basis, fully justified by the requirements of national security. The key issue in this whole debate is the relationship that exists between dependable petroleum supplies and the economic and military security of this nation.

Elimination of import controls means dependence on foreign oil—and dependence on foreign oil will make America insecure. When the last word has been spoken, this is what we must remember.

We are optimistic about the survival of the oil industry should it just be given an even break by our national government. The oil industry needs an identifying symbol, similar to Reddy Kilowatt of the electric industry. We need a symbol that would be used by all of the oil companies—to help the man on the go realize what allows him to get there!

Our industry should work with various government bodies to formulate programs designed to end pollution. And these programs should make sense.

Our industry should also try to make some sense out of our marketing practices. We think the public feels they're often being used and misled.

Above all, the oil industry needs to unite in a strong and positive public relations campaign. We've got to go on the offensive. We've got to stop allowing ourselves to be put on the defensive all of the time. We're the only major industry which constantly finds itself in that position.

There's too much at stake, and we're not just talking about the companies that are

involved. We're talking about our country. This is our country, yours and mine. If we allow the very basics on which this country was born, to be destroyed, we might as well say goodbye to tomorrow. It sure won't be worth much.

But we've got a chance. It will take all of us pulling together, but the opportunity is there. We've got to make it work. Given half a break, we will, as we always have.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970**

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal 1970.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the gentleman that the committee has not reached complete agreement on this and I am wondering if asking for permission to bring a bill in now is not somewhat premature. It may be that we should wait until there is agreement on the bill in the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, before asking for this unanimous consent.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. It is true, as the gentleman from Ohio says, that we have no firm agreement as of this minute and we, actually, have no bill.

However, it is my hope, as the gentleman from Ohio knows, that we will meet at 2 o'clock and I was very much of the opinion and impression at noon today that at this meeting at 2 o'clock or shortly thereafter we will have some bill.

Mr. BOW. Well, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it would seem to me that from the discussions we have had in committee we may not be as close to agreement as the gentleman thinks.

We are also faced with this situation: I would ask the gentleman to consider that the minority may want to file minority views, and it will take time to prepare these minority views.

I therefore ask the gentleman if he would consider deferring this unanimous-consent request and not ask for it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think it ought to be said that there was an agreement in the subcommittee this morning that we would probably be able to reach a decision as to the content of the new Labor-HEW bill at the meeting at 2 o'clock today. It is on this account that we are now asking for permission until mid-

night tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the bill.

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman that I think there may have been agreement among the majority, but I believe the gentleman will agree with me that the minority were not as certain that we would reach agreement on the bill today. There is still the consideration of language that will have to be perfected.

Again, I say that a minority report will have to be filed. I would hope that I do not have to object to this unanimous-consent request and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would make this request for a later date.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MAHON. Well, is it the gentleman's proposal or suggestion that we abandon the plan to bring the bill before the House on Monday or Tuesday of next week and postpone consideration thereof until Monday the 16th or Tuesday the 17th?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this might be a more orderly procedure.

May I say to the gentleman that, even though the majority might bring the bill in, and on Tuesday we get into a question of consideration of the bill, there remains the question of how late we have to go. There are a number of amendments that might be offered, and we have passed a resolution here calling for an adjournment on Tuesday night.

I have serious doubts as to whether we can finish on Tuesday.

I would agree with the gentleman from Texas—and it is my suggestion—that the bill go over until the following week.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, then in view of this discussion I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight on Monday, February 16, to file a privileged report on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill for 1970.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

My Subcommittee on General Education has had a number of inquiries from around the country from school administrators who are trying to figure out the status of Federal education assistance. Here it is the first week of February. These administrators have observed us passing continuing resolutions since November. These administrators had every right in the world to plan their budgets at the local school levels in anticipation of funds that were to be forthcoming within the general framework of the continuing resolutions as amended. Then the appropriations were vetoed. Now additional time is being asked for here, until the 16th or 17th of February. Then when we pass the bill, it must go over to the other body, and I understand it is going to encounter some problems over there.

Mr. Speaker, I am inquiring who in this House is in a position to tell the school administrators what they can expect for the months of March, April, May, and part of June. Many of them are now borrowing money against those months. All over this country school administrators are borrowing money against funds that they had budgeted through June, or through the end of this semester, in anticipation of these Federal funds.

Now, if the formula is rewritten consistent with the President's veto all over this country there are going to be school districts that will either have to curtail their activities or shut their schools down earlier than they had expected because they are going to run out of funds.

I would be very happy to hear from those who might offer a solution to this problem.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), if he can give us some comprehensive answers that will guide these school administrators all over this country.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred that we could have completed action on the bill by the middle of February, but the various practicalities of the situation convinced me that it was a wiser course of action that we go along with the recommendation that we have a continuing resolution until the end of February for this year's HEW appropriation bill.

The resolution does expire on February 28, as I understand it. The House of Representatives will be acting in a more reasonable way in light of the fact that the subcommittee has not yet acted, and the full committee has not yet acted, by agreeing to some date certain, say, the week of February 16. That I believe is the wiser course of action.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have now asked until midnight on February 16 to have a report filed. That would, as far as I am concerned, mean to bring the bill up Tuesday on the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Am I correct in understanding that when that bill comes back to the floor, it will be presented as a completely new measure subject to full debate and full amendments?

I am trying to determine when this Nation's hard-working school administrators are going to receive some indication of the amount of Federal aid that will be available for the remainder of this school year.

I think this delay compounds the problem and it would seem to me we ought to try to proceed as quickly as possible. The House will be in session on Monday and Tuesday. If we act at that time, the measure will be sent to the other body. Perhaps then we can give these school administrators some sort of logical answer as to what this Congress intends to do in the way of Federal assistance to education.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman would have been in a much better position to make the argument that he is making now if he had made it on Monday when the continuing resolution came to the floor of the House. It would have made a great deal more sense than arguing that way today. I want the legislation approved as quickly as possible. I deplore the delay of 7 months. Congress has no excuse. Let us finish the job no later than February 28.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With all respect to my distinguished colleague, in all good faith, I had a right to expect that when we voted this additional continuing resolution last Monday that this House would move expeditiously to enable the school administrators of America to know what assistance would be available to them for the remainder of the school year. It now appears we are going to need the full 28 days of February, despite assurances made to us on Monday that this delay would not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood)?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill to be reported on Monday, February 16.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed the program for this week and, upon announcement of the program, we will ask to adjourn over to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, which is District Day, there are no District bills.

On Monday, we will call up the bill, S. 2214, to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders. It has an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

We will consider, on Tuesday, H.R. 3786, to authorize acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif. It has an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Following adjournment on Tuesday, of course, will come the Lincoln Birthday recess—February 10, 1970, to noon, Monday, February 16, 1970.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for an inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On the basis of the colloquy that we had and the request that was granted, can we anticipate that on Tuesday or Wednesday, February 17 or February 18, this appropriation bill will be on the floor for consideration?

Mr. ALBERT. Offhand, I would say that we would likely program it on the 17th or 18th. But we must consult with the committee and make that determination on the basis of events which occur between now and then.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. VANIK), for Thursday, February 5, 1970, through Tuesday, February 10, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. VANIK), for Thursday, February 5, 1970, on account of death in the family.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. VANIK), for Thursday, February 5, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN for Thursday, February 5, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, Thursday, February 5, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, Thursday, February 5, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, February 7, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 9 through the 25th, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FREY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ALBERT, for 1 hour, on Monday, February 9; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BENNETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.

Mr. NELSEN in three instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. RUTH in five instances.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. McCLURE.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

(The following Members at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California:)

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. GIAIMO in five instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. DAWSON in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. KOCH in five instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. FLYNT.

Mr. MIKVA in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3253. An act to provide that the Federal Office Building and United States Courthouse in Chicago, Illinois, shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Illinois, shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen

Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 3, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning February 13, 1970, and ending February 19, 1970, as "Mineral Industry Week".

H.J. Res. 1051. Joint resolution designating the week commencing February 1, 1970, as "International Clergy Week" in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 1072. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 9, 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:

1614. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held in Washington, D.C., on October 31 and November 1, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 91-220); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1615. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a special report on illegal expenditure of funds for construction of research facilities by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1616. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the cost and balance-of-payments advantages of replacing foreign-made buses with American-made buses abroad, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1617. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1618. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1619. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration

and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1620. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Economic Development Administration, pursuant to the provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### 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. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13582. A bill to amend title 5, 10, and 32, United States Code, to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of certain erroneous payments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-831). Referred to the Committee on 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. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 15698. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 15699. A bill to amend section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to certain survivors of deceased veterans who were rated 100 per centum disabled by reason of service-connected disabilities for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 15700. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BYRNE of Wisconsin, Mr. DORN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KYL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 15701. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 15702. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 15703. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any disabled individual who has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 15704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the So-

cial Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 15705. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15706. A bill to improve law enforcement in urban areas by making available funds to improve the effectiveness of police services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 15707. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 15708. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15709. A bill to increase the rates of pension and income limitations under the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 15710. An act to amend title 14 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary to control movement of vessels in navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 15711. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HARSEA, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 15712. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15713. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the level of annual income at which individuals may receive the minimum amount of compensation (if a parent) or pension payable under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15714. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches, and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 15715. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15716. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 15717. A bill to authorize the release of 40,200,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 15718. A bill to authorize the Secre-

tary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe standards governing the design of plastic bags and other commercial articles utilizing plastic sheeting with dangerous adhesive characteristics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for certain amounts set aside by a taxpayer for the higher education of prospective college students in his family, and a tax credit for certain amounts otherwise paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 15720. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 15721. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. CULVER, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. STEED, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HULL, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. McMILLAN):

H.R. 15722. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15723. A bill to provide relief from Dutch elm disease by amending the Forest Pest Control Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 15724. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that an appeal be made at any time with respect to a discontinuance of disability compensation and to permit, under certain circumstances, the retroactive award of such compensation for the period of such discontinuance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15725. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 15726. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, to restore to such section the provisions requiring proof of intent to deceive in connection with the use of the mails to obtain money or property by false pretenses, representations, or promises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 15727. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for a national powerplant siting study and a national powerplant siting plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15728. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. ADABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 15729. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, rent supplement, and low-income homeownership and rental housing assistance programs for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, including jobs in housing; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 15730. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 914; 30 U.S.C. sec. 352); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 15731. A bill to exclude from gross income the first \$250 of interest received on deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 15732. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15733. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percentum increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 15734. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge in California and/or adjacent Western States for the preservation of the California tule elk; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax incentives for saving by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 15736. A bill to authorize rural housing loans to lessees of nonfarm rural land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15737. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 15738. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 15739. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 15740. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 15741. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 15742. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the University of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 15743. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended; to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15744. A bill to provide for publication of a U.S. Treaty Code Annotated; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15745. A bill to prohibit the charging of entrance or admission fees for access to any recreational lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15746. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to associations of fishing vessel owners and operators organized to provide insurance against the damage or loss of fishing vessels or the injury or death of fishing crews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15747. A bill 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; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 15748. A bill to provide for the termination of mineral leases in the area of the Outer Continental Shelf seaward of the Santa Barbara State oil drilling sanctuary in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15749. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to require Federal emission standards for used motor vehicles; to require that Federal emission standards for new motor vehicles shall be the same as the emission standards adopted by the State of California for the calendar year 1975 and for each calendar year thereafter; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 15750. A bill to establish a national usury law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 15751. A bill to prohibit the involuntary busing of schoolchildren to adopt freedom of choice as a national policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 15752. A bill to permit the Secretary of Transportation to commence progress payments to a bridge owner upon ordering alteration of the bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15753. A bill to prohibit the introduction, transportation, or distribution in interstate commerce of gasoline containing lead; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15754. A bill to provide for the elimination of the use of lead in motor vehicle fuel and the installation of adequate anti-pollution devices on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 15755. A bill to facilitate the operations of foreign aircraft, pilots, ground crews, and radios in connection with the International Soaring Championships at Marfa, Tex., May 25, 1970, through July 6, 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15756. A bill to amend section 106 of title 4 of the United States Code relating to State taxation of the income of residents of another State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15757. A bill to amend the fair housing provisions of the act entitled "An act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



poses," to provide for accelerated payment of certain housing loans in cases of discrimination by the loan recipient; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 15758. A bill relating to taxation by a State of income received by nonresidents of that State for services performed in a Federal area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 1077. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Railways Congress Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on United States Participation in the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 498. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 499. Concurrent resolution, Paris peace conference on prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 500. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. DENNIS, and Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD):

H. Res. 823. Resolution to provide for record voting in the Committee on the Whole House upon the assent of one-fourth of the Members present; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. Res. 824. A resolution affirming U.S. policy calling for face-to-face negotiations between the governments of the nations involved in the Middle East crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, and Mr. MARSH):

H. Res. 825. Resolution calling for support of policy of direct face-to-face negotiations for peace between nations in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 826. Resolution to express the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 827. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Investigation of Pornographic Enterprises; to the Committee on Rules.

Maria Zahaniacz (nee Bojkiwska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15768. A bill for the relief of Katsu Asage Whetstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 15769. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to relinquish and quitclaim any title it may heretofore claim to certain lands situated in the county of San Bernardino, State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

279. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to overriding the presidential veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

280. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to agricultural labor-management relations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

281. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to continuing certain airline operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

282. Also, a memorial of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal welfare system, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

283. Also, a memorial of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to expanding the medicare program to include the permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

386. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the chairman, Realtors' Washington Committee, National Association of Real Estate Boards, Washington, D.C., relative to the residential mortgage market, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"CAPTAIN EASY" RETIRES—HELPED NATIONAL GOALS

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, Les Turner of Orlando, Fla., in the congressional district which I represent, has produced for 36 years the comic strip "Captain Easy." "Captain Easy" appears in more than 600 daily and Sunday newspapers across the country and has contributed greatly to better public understanding of national problems and goals. As the creator of the comic strip, Les Turner has used his mind and ability to make the national space program more understandable to all Americans. I congratulate Mr. Turner on his retirement, and also his associates, Bill Crooks and Jim Lawrence, who will continue the comic strip. I would like to place in the RECORD a portion of an article from the Orlando

Sentinel, Orlando, Fla., November 23, 1969:

LES TURNER, PRODUCER OF COMIC STRIP, RETIRES

Les Turner, artist-writer who has produced the "Captain Easy" comic strip since 1943, will retire next Sunday.

"Captain Easy," appearing in more than 600 daily and Sunday newspapers and distributed by Newspaper Enterprise Association, will continue to be produced by Turner's associate, Bill Crooks, and writer Jim Lawrence. Crooks has been working with Turner since 1945.

Turner started on the strip as an assistant in 1937. It was then carried in hundreds of newspapers as "Wash Tubbs" and its title was changed to Captain Easy in 1949.

Turner's already completed strips will continue to appear in newspapers until early 1970, being succeeded by Crooks' and Lawrence's work in mid-January.

During his many years with Wash Tubbs and Captain Easy, Turner brought many unique situations to the comic pages. He pioneered educational, sociological and scientific subjects in his strips and received praise from professionals in all fields for his accuracy and timeliness.

In one 1949 sequence, Turner's heroes helped an alcoholic win his fight to redeem himself through Alcoholics Anonymous. AA members praised Turner's understanding and his contribution to their efforts. One member wrote:

"I know of at least five hopeless alcoholics who have been saved through your comic strip."

A 1950 news bulletin of the Stanford Research Institute reproduced a strip in which Turner showed the use of the Poulter Seismic Method of Geophysical Exploration to discover oil deposits. Captain Easy had explained the technical marvel in language simple enough for the youngest of his readers.

Living in Orlando, Turner kept abreast of rocket and space developments and reported—and sometimes foretold—them in his comic strip. When the Army launched Jupiter II from Cape Canaveral March 5, 1958, Turner's story which appeared in newspapers that day showed a fictitious Cyclops rocket carrying the first man into space.

His accurate backgrounds and on-the-scene research continually gave readers dramatic stories as current as today.

A 1962 continuity explaining the Binary number system used in computers was requested in reprint by many schools because