

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, along a related line, of course, the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (Mr. Fong) will, I think, have some remarks with regard to the pending bill on which a vote is to be taken at 12:30 tomorrow. Although the acting majority leader, of course, cannot assure us, would it be the intention there would be some time in advance of the vote, which would be equally divided, perhaps, to discuss the bill tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think that can be arranged. How much time does the distinguished Senator think the Senator from Hawaii would want?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I imagine 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, without having had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the principal parties, I take the liberty of presenting the following unanimous-consent request:

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, there be 30 minutes of debate on the pending bill, the time to be equally divided between the able majority leader and the able minority leader, or their designees.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that anticipate that at that time Senate Joint Resolution 1 will have been displaced as the pending business for the day?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, not for the day. Just for that particular time, the half hour for debate, and the time which would be required for the rollcall, which has already been ordered.

May I say to the able Senator, I am just in no position to state, because I do not know, what the situation will be tomorrow with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 1. As it now stands, the Senator will recall that earlier today, under the unanimous-consent request, Senate Joint Resolution 1 was made the order of business for tomorrow following the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business. That order still stands.

Mr. ALLEN. Then after the disposition of this bill, would we go back, then, to Senate Joint Resolution 1?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I would suspect so, unless, prior to that time, arrangements have been agreed upon to set Senate Joint Resolution 1 aside for a longer period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that, following the statement by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) tomorrow, for which an order has already been granted, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There could very well be, depending on the hour at which the period for the transaction of routine morning business is concluded, some discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 1 prior to 12 o'clock, when the Senate will again return to the pending measure.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So, Mr. President, in recapitulation, the Senator from Massachusetts will speak for 15 minutes following the prayer and the disposal of any unobjected-to bills on the Legislative Calendar tomorrow morning. There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, and if that period for the transaction of routine morning business should close prior to 12 o'clock noon, Senate Joint Resolution 1, which is the unfinished business, will automatically come back before the Senate.

In any event, at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, time on the pornographic mail measure would begin running. There would be one-half hour of debate, and at the close of that period, the vote on the bill would occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is mindful also of the conference report on which there is a unanimous consent for a vote at 2 p.m.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. There will be a vote at 2 p.m. on the conference report, and this request was agreed to yesterday.

May I say to the Senator from Alabama that I hope we can make progress on various measures tomorrow.

Mr. ALLEN. I interpose no objection.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that. Hopefully, some time tomorrow the majority leader may be in a position to state what the situation will be with regard to future action on Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I know

that the majority leader is very hopeful of getting on with the conduct of business on the calendar awaiting action, while at the same time giving the junior Senator from Indiana an ample opportunity to expound upon the virtues of Senate Joint Resolution 1 before another cloture vote is reached.

Mr. ALLEN. The junior Senator from Alabama is anxious to hear the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Alabama will have some additional contributions to make with respect to that measure.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 23, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 22, 1970:

U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS

John Paul Stevens, of Illinois, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit, vice Elmer J. Schnackenberg, deceased.

Robert H. McWilliams, Jr. of Colorado, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 10th circuit, vice Jean S. Breitenstein, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Sam C. Pointer, Jr., of Alabama, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice a new position created under Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Walter K. Stapleton, of Delaware, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Delaware, vice Edwin D. Steel, Jr., retired.

Frank J. McGarr, of Illinois, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice a new position created under Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

David S. Dennison, Jr., of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1970, vice Philip Elman.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

David H. Stowe, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring July 1, 1973, vice Leverett Edwards, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 22, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let us come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need. Hebrews 4: 16.

O God and Father of us all, who hast taught us not only to think of ourselves but to think of others and to be concerned about them, we remember before Thee all who are burdened and oppressed, particularly our prisoners of war.

Comfort them with the sense of Thy presence, strengthen them for the ordeal they are facing, give them patience in their suffering, keep the hope of deliverance alive within them, and grant a happy issue out of all their affliction—a safe return to their loved ones.

Bless their families, weary and heavy laden, living in dark uncertainty yet still hoping and praying and working for the return of those they love with all their hearts.

May we here highly resolve to continue to do our best to seek the release of the

captives, the end of war, and the beginning of peace on earth: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE COL. FRANK BORMAN, SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT ON PRISONERS OF WAR

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

At 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper (Hon. William M. Miller) announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to conduct the special representative of the President on prisoners of war, Col. Frank Borman, U.S. Air Force retired, into the Chamber, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RIVERS; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE; the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DANIEL; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ADAIR; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. BROCK; and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ZION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore appoints on behalf of the Senate as members of the committee to escort Colonel Borman into the Chamber the following: the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD; the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT; and the Senator from Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced Col. Frank Borman, special representative of the President on prisoners of war.

Col. Frank Borman, special representative of the President on prisoners of war, accompanied by the committee of escort, entered the Chamber and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, this is indeed a solemn and historic occasion. In holding this joint meeting the Congress reflects the extraordinary sense of moral outrage held by the Ameri-

can people over the manner in which the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have treated prisoners of war. This sense of moral outrage is held without regard to partisanship or philosophy and is completely independent of one's views on policy about the conflict in Vietnam.

The treatment of American prisoners of war is neither a political nor a military question. It is fundamentally a moral question. The treatment of prisoners of war is also covered by the Geneva Conventions relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

I know I speak for every Member of the Congress of the United States and for a united Nation when I say that our hearts and minds have experienced immeasurable anguish over the plight of these brave men and intense resentment over their treatment; also that our hopes and prayers go to them and their loved ones in this their hour of travail.

It gives me, my distinguished colleagues, great pleasure to introduce Col. Frank Borman, the President's Representative on Prisoners of War, who has labored so long and diligently on this matter.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Colonel BORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and Members of the Congress, distinguished guests: few Americans in their lifetime have the opportunity to address this audience once. As some of you may remember, this will be my second time. I am deeply honored, as I am sure you know. The last time I was here, which was just last year, I was able to tell you about the voyage of Apollo 8, and I was able to report to you that it was an American success and a human triumph.

I have recently returned from a 25-day trip around the globe in furtherance of the cause of our prisoners of war, and I must tell you that I can only report American anguish and human tragedy.

It is very difficult to discuss the plight of the prisoners of any war without discussing the war itself, but I propose not to do that today, for two reasons:

First, it is quite obvious to any serious student of the intercourse of nations that our course in Southeast Asia cannot be influenced in any significant manner by the treatment or the cause of the prisoners. In other words, we cannot permit them to be political hostages.

Second, I think that the length of the incarceration of many of the men and certainly the conditions of imprisonment of all the men make the humanitarian aspect of this question a transcendent one, and it is certainly one that all Americans can unite behind, regardless of their opinion of the Vietnamese war.

I would ask you to undergo a little exercise that I found helpful on the trip as I tried to renew my faith every evening after a frustrating day. I tried to place myself mentally in the position of a prisoner in a North Vietnamese prison camp, and if you will indulge me for just a few moments, I would like you to place yourselves in that position just briefly, and as you formulate some of the questions and consider your surroundings, allow me to anticipate, if I may, a few of the things that you may be interested in.

First of all, I think you would be amazed to find that a great many of your fellow countrymen, in Government and out of Government, in the Congress, in the States, and even in the Armed Forces, are surprised to find that the Geneva Conventions on the Treatment of Prisoners of War apply to you.

I would like to read, if I may, from article 2 of this convention.

The present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties . . .

There is no question that the Geneva Conventions do apply to our prisoners in North Vietnam and in the other areas of Southeast Asia.

The next question that I am sure you must be considering, particularly if you have been there any length of time at all, is the question of war criminal charges that have been so blatantly and absurdly broadcast by the North Vietnamese and have indeed been rebroadcast and transmitted by many dissident groups within this country. I am told by many fellow returnees that this is one you are greeted with every morning.

I suppose particularly if you are a pilot—and most of you who are incarcerated in North Vietnam are pilots—you would find this a rather difficult charge to comprehend, because I am sure that many of you remember that as a result of a conscious policy of our Government to limit the destruction in North Vietnam to military targets, you were oftentimes forced to fly specified routes over the heaviest anti-aircraft concentrations in history. You were specifically ordered and desperately attempted to hit only military targets, and at times it seemed that even basic tactics, local tactics, were being sent from Washington in an effort to ascertain that you did not hit anything but the specified military targets.

I submit to you that the war criminal charge is utter rubbish and would not stand up in any reasonable court in any country in the world.

Next, I am sure that one of the questions that you would have is how many of your fellow countrymen share your fate. I have to report to you that I, unfortunately, cannot answer, because the North Vietnamese have never issued a formal and official list of any of their prisoners. Think about that, in the over 6 years that they held our prisoners, never once have they issued a formal list of the people that they hold, another obvious violation of the Geneva Convention.

I could tell you that there are about 1,500 U.S. citizens missing in Southeast Asia. We have received letters from 323 prisoners in North Vietnam, and one held by the Vietcong in South Vietnam. From propaganda broadcasts, pictures, and returnees, we have reason to believe that there are about 376 Americans incarcerated in North Vietnam, 78 in South Vietnam, and three in Laos, making a total of 457 that we know were at one time alive out of the 1,500 that are missing.

I would also have to report to you that some of your fellow prisoners have been

held longer than any other prisoners in the history of this country, some over 6 years.

What are the conditions of your imprisonment and your capture? By and large it is a similar story. After your capture you were probably beaten, dragged through villages, in some cases tortured.

If you have been a prisoner for any length of time, you have probably lost 45 to 60 pounds. Your food generally consists of two meals, one largely rice and squash soup and an evening meal of pig fat. It is designed barely to keep you alive, it appears, as is the medical care, destined to barely avert death rather than promote health.

I would also have to regret to tell you that we have documented cases of 19 of your fellow prisoners being murdered or allowed to die in South Vietnam, and just recently the North Vietnamese have spoken of five deaths in their prisons.

You might be interested to know, also that you are probably held in solitary confinement. Your recreation consists of two daily broadcasts in English by the Hanoi radio. Many of your fellow prisoners have resorted to mental gymnastics. One of them even constructed mentally a logarithm table. Another one was able to salvage bits of toilet paper and make himself a deck of cards and play solitaire until he was discovered and his deck of cards destroyed.

I am sure the questions that would influence you and concern you the most would be questions of your family, your loved ones, and your children at home. Again I would have an unfortunate answer. I could only report it has been a difficult time for them—first not knowing your fate and then this coupled with the usual problems of trying to be both mother and father to growing children, children who in many cases you have never even seen. But I could also report to you that they have fought for you with a wonderful spirit, with great dedication, and that they have done this without falling into an ever-ready trap of attacking their own Government for your incarceration.

I could also report to you, I think in a hopeful manner, that since May of 1969 your case has been before the people of the world. At that time the President made a conscious decision to publicize the plight of our prisoners in the hope that the forces of world opinion would do something to cause more humanitarian treatment and consideration of early release. I think this decision was right. And I could also report to you that I can confidently say that every member of the executive department, the Congress, and the overwhelming majority of Americans are working daily to insure that you do receive the humanitarian treatment that you deserve and for your early release.

Well, if I can bring you back to the Halls of Congress, I would like to report to you on the trip that I recently made in conjunction with Colonel Kegley, who is an expert on the prisoner situation from the Department of Defense. I want to emphasize that this is my report even

though I went as a special representative of the President, and I have written some notes here on yellow paper. I still have not reviewed this report with any member of the executive department, and it is essentially the same one that I presented to the President in San Clemente.

Colonel Kegley and I visited 14 countries. We went first to Moscow, Warsaw, Stockholm, Paris, Geneva, Belgrade, Algiers, Teheran, Delhi, Bangkok, Vientiane, Saigon, Hong Kong, and Tokyo. I wish I could tell you we were able to contact the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong directly. I can only say that we tried through third parties in three countries and we were unsuccessful. I wish I could tell you we were able to go to Hanoi—we were prepared to—to discuss the situation. I can tell you the closest we got was Vientiane, Laos. I can tell you that we found a vast amount of sympathy around the world. I can tell you that the North Vietnamese will receive new and additional entreaties from many of the countries that we visited, and I can tell you that I found, particularly in the International Red Cross, a very hopeful, I think, agency for dealing as a third party for the prisoners in Vietnam.

You are probably aware that even in the tension-wracked Middle East, the International Red Cross has been very, very successful in humanitarian aspects in dealing with prisoners. As a matter of fact, while I was in Geneva they were in the process of arranging the transfer of a downed Israel pilot who was being returned by the Egyptians after being severely wounded.

Of course, the problem is a little difficult in North Vietnam because as of this date the North Vietnamese have not even permitted a representative of the International Red Cross into the country, let alone into the prison camps.

I can also tell you that while I was in Vietnam I discussed the treatment of and visited the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong prisoners of war, and I can tell you that they are being conducted in keeping with the Geneva Conventions. There are some 36,000 prisoners held in South Vietnam between 8,000 and 9,000 of them North Vietnamese, although, as you know, the North Vietnamese have refused to admit that they even have soldiers in South Vietnam.

The camp was clean. The representatives of the International Red Cross, both at Geneva and on the site, are perfectly satisfied with the conditions of the prisoners held by the South Vietnamese. You probably know that just last July, in further compliance with the Geneva Conventions, the South Vietnamese released 62 wounded and disabled North Vietnamese prisoners north of the demarcation line.

Although it had no direct relationship to the prisoner-of-war situation, because of the huge amount of publicity that was accorded to the Con Son conditions, I thought it was imperative that I stopped and report back to the President and to you on the conditions that I found. I was very disturbed by some of the reaction in this country which essentially said, How can we be concerned about our pris-

oners when we are treating, or the South Vietnamese are treating prisoners of war from the other side so badly?

I can tell you there were only 29 prisoners of war in the Con Son Prison. They had all been convicted of felonies, murders and so on, in the ordinary prison camps and had been transferred to Con Son. None of them were in the so-called tiger cages. Though I visited the tiger cages at the time they were not occupied, in all candor I found a much less disturbed situation than I had been led to believe by the publicity that was accorded them by the media throughout the world.

I found for instance, that the tiger cages were not pits, but part of a 2-story building that, instead of a ceiling, had bars. It is true they were very small and, as I said, there were no people in them at the time. I could see where overcrowding and long incarceration in these cells would be very undesirable.

Nevertheless, I submit to you that this was a very much misrepresented case in the press of the world. I can also tell you that one of the blocks has now been destroyed and another is unoccupied.

Time after time, as we dealt with the governments around the world, I heard the comment that the North Vietnamese consider our prisoners their trump card in negotiations. In essence, based upon my trip, I would say that really, in addition to having political hostages in the Middle East, we have political hostages in Vietnam.

The releases that have been accorded—nine by the north and 23 in the south—have almost always been spaced properly and made with dissident groups in this country in an effort to extract the maximum amount of propaganda from the few releases that have been made.

I strongly urge that the peace groups within this country, if they are really interested in the majority of our prisoners, urge their contacts in North Vietnam to begin dealing with the International Red Cross, which is the proper and recognized authority for this purpose.

Finally, if I may, I would like to transmit to you some of the suggestions that I have as a result of this trip.

First, I think it is imperative that every American continue maximum effort to mobilize world opinion and world awareness of this problem.

Second, I think that we should again continue to try to convince the North Vietnamese of our sincerity in this purpose and of the requirement to separate the political question of peace in Vietnam and our disinterest in the humanitarian conditions of incarceration of our prisoners.

Third, I think it is important and it is a moral obligation of every Member of the Congress and every American to make certain that every effort is made to provide proper care and support for the families of prisoners that are left behind here in the States.

Finally, as I mentioned before, I think it is important that we continue to press for the use of the International Red

Cross in inspection of the prison camps in North Vietnam.

Finally, in closing, I would like just briefly to tell you, again in the words of, I think, a great patriot, of the kind of men who are incarcerated over there in North Vietnam. General MacArthur had a great and a long association with the American fighting man. I would like to quote from a speech he made just before he died, speaking of an American soldier:

Their story is known to all of you; it is the story of the American man-at-arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now—as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen.

I think that is accurate.

I would implore you, gentlemen, Members of Congress, who have so much else on your mind, striving with the daily problems of a great country—the problems of war, securing equal opportunity, social problems that beset this country—I request that all of you in some way, every day, remember the people, the U.S. citizens, who are prisoners, and I strongly beg you not to forsake your countrymen who have given so much for you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m., Col. Frank Borman, Special Representative of the President on Prisoners of War, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests, the members of the President's Cabinet, from the Chamber.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress hereby dissolved.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 2 o'clock p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PRISONERS OF WAR—IS IT OUR MOVE?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I can say, without contradiction, that every single Member of Congress joins in sympathy with the families of American prisoners of war or men missing in action. It would be ridiculous for anyone to assume otherwise.

Additionally, we do not need a joint session of Congress to prove that we strongly want the People's Republic of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to follow the provisions of the Geneva Convention relating to prisoners of war.

What, then, can be accomplished by today's joint session?

I do not anticipate that our rhetoric here today will be a great factor in influencing the thinking or the humanity of North Vietnamese officials. The only influence we can hope to have, then, is on those who are within our own Government or the governments of our allies who can effect steps that might aid these prisoners and their families.

In this respect we must bend all efforts to see that every demand that is made on behalf of American prisoners of war is also being met by the Republic of South Vietnam regarding prisoners from the armies of North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front. We have a great tendency to deny responsibility for these prisoners. It is my understanding that prisoners taken by American forces are turned over to the South Vietnamese forces and our concern too often seems to stop there. We know that the treatment we ask for American prisoners has not always been afforded to those prisoners held by South Vietnam.

I do not say that taking these steps to assure compliance with the Geneva treaty by South Vietnam would automatically bring North Vietnam into line. In fact, I do not believe it would, since North Vietnam is using these prisoners for political leverage.

At the same time, it is obviously necessary to make certain that our own ally is complying with the provisions of the Geneva Convention if we are going to seriously demand that North Vietnam follow suit.

Of course, the negotiating table is obviously the place where we are going to have to deal with North Vietnam in respect to the treatment and the release of American prisoners held by them. This was confirmed just a few days ago when their top negotiator in Paris included the prisoners of war as part of their price for U.S. withdrawal by July 1, 1971.

The only reports that I have seen concerning our Ambassador's reaction to this proposal indicated that he felt it contained nothing new, and he apparently was shrugging it off as being relatively meaningless.

I hope that this joint session can bring home the fact to the administration, the Department of State, and our negotiators in Paris, that we do not consider any proposal to negotiate the release of the prisoners in North Vietnam as unimportant. If we are not pre-

pared to meet the terms set down, we should discuss what our terms are. That is the purpose of negotiations.

Personally, I and many of my colleagues have already urged that we withdraw our troops by next July 1.

Are our negotiators prepared to discuss withdrawal under any terms—at any date?

The end of U.S. participation in this war is the key to the release of these prisoners of war. In my opinion, current plans for Vietnamization, with even drastically reduced direct support from the United States, will not spell the end to the suffering of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On September 18, 1970:

H.R. 13434. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Ariz., in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 90 and 122, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14097. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Citizen Bank of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 96, and for other purposes.

On September 18, 1970:

H.R. 13716. An act to improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard Reserve; and

H.R. 16416. An act to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes.

On September 19, 1970:

H.R. 14827. An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Sac and Fox Tribes of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 220, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 11953. An act to amend section 205 of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736), as amended;

H.R. 13543. An act to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat; and

H.R. 17795. An act to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

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

H.R. 13978. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds; and

H.R. 18260. An act to authorize the U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to preserve and enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance.

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

S. 3318. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes.

THE CONTINUING PROBLEM OF PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of American military personnel who are missing in action and presumed to be prisoners of war continues to be a tragic and painful one. Despite a tremendous effort by our Government and despite unstinted help from the International Red Cross and from many interested governments, the Communists have shown neither concern nor humane compassion toward prisoners or their families.

Although piecemeal lists have been leaked to groups in this country that the Communists consider sympathetic, there is no complete and comprehensive list available. One of the saddest statements that has been made in connection with this problem was by Frank Borman at a joint session of Congress when he stated that the best estimates show approximately 450 of the missing to be alive and in Communist hands. That means as many as a thousand of those missing must be presumed dead, and that two out of every three families who have been clinging to hope for the return of their husbands and fathers are doomed to disappointment.

This is a sad commentary on Communist injustice, but it should steel the resolve of the American people to stand by their principles and not yield to Communist demands or Communist persuasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 21, I was unavoidably detained at the White House and missed rollcall No. 310. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

VICE PRESIDENT KY URGED TO CANCEL PLANS TO SPEAK AT PRO-VIETNAM RALLY IN WASHINGTON

(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, the intention of South Vietnam's Vice President Ky to address a pro-Vietnam rally in Washington can only compound problems for President Nixon.

Since President Nixon already has

more than enough pressure on him, I urge that Mr. Ky cancel his plans to speak.

The United States has quite enough problems trying to unite its own people on a course of action in Vietnam while propping up the Thieu-Ky regime at the same time. The Vietnam war has caused us enough political, social, and economic problems here—including inflation and diversion of more than 100 billion badly needed dollars—without Vice President Ky gratuitously trying to pressure President Nixon.

I frankly resent this effort by Mr. Ky to muscle the administration and the Congress—especially since it falls on the heels of Mr. Thieu appearing on television here several weeks ago to lecture America on what it must do in Vietnam. Both Mr. Ky and the North Vietnamese should understand that American policy will be determined on the basis of our own national interest and not on the basis of carping by outsiders.

We have sacrificed a great deal to keep Thieu and Ky in power. If they in turn had spent more time tackling corruption and the lack of initiative in their own government, both the United States and South Vietnam would be much better off today.

With so-called friends like Mr. Ky, President Nixon does not need any enemies—certainly not now, when he is under considerable pressure from both the left and right concerning the war.

The last thing President Nixon needs is a political roadshow starring Nguyen Cao Ky.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MRS. ADA ROBERTSON

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this body may not be aware of the great loss recently suffered by Turner Robertson, the highly capable and dedicated chief page of the House.

It is my sad duty to report that his mother, Mrs. Ada Robertson, died on September 16, 1970, in Roanoke Rapids, N.C. The funeral service was conducted on September 18, 1970.

Blessed by a loving family, Mrs. Robertson is survived by her son, Turner, and also by Foster Robertson of Washington, D.C.; a daughter, Mrs. Chifton R. Heuay of Roanoke Rapids, N.C.; a sister, Mrs. Lillie Shearin of Warrenton, N.C.; four grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Robertson lived a long, happy, and productive life, attaining the advanced age of 86. She earned the respect and admiration of all who knew her and will be greatly missed by her family and those who regarded her as a valued friend.

Happy though our memories may be and bright though they may remain in our hearts and minds, it is sadly difficult for anyone to adjust to the loss of his mother.

But, I know that the memory of his mother's love, wisdom and understand-

ing, patience and courtesy, is something that Turner Robertson will always retain enshrined in his memory, and I am confident that these blessings will always bring him great comfort and satisfaction.

I am sure I speak for all Members of the House of Representatives when I express deep and profound sympathy for the irreplaceable loss suffered by Turner Robertson and his family. Our hearts go out to him and his loved ones at this time of sorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me express for those who serve on our side our deepest condolences on the death of the mother of Turner Robertson, and extend to the family our very best wishes in this hour of sadness.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I join the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina in this expression of sorrow on the part of the House over the death of the mother of one of our most faithful servants in the House.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his expression.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing deep concern at the bereavement suffered by our good and distinguished friend Turner Robertson and his family at the death of his mother. This is indeed a tragic time for all the family and, while words of sympathy can accomplish but little, there is a measure of comfort in the knowledge that friends share in the sorrow which is an inevitable part of these occasions.

ROLLCALL VOTES

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was participating in a Drake University student meeting on the subject "Social Responsiveness of Education" and later addressed the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities, so I missed some rollcall votes.

On rollcall No. 307, I would have voted "yea." This was on S. 2763, which would allow the GSA authority to purchase options on Government vehicles, the cost of which options would bring the price over the statutory limitation. Since such options could include pollution control devices, I believe passage of the bill is essential.

On rollcall No. 308, I would have voted "yea." This was on H.R. 14678 which increases penalties for illegal fishing in the 12-mile fishery zone around the coastal United States.

On rollcall No. 309, I would have voted "yea." This vote was on H.R. 15911 which increases non-service-connected pensions and also increases income limitations so that no veteran or his survivor would lose pension benefits as a result of

the social security increase which became effective on January 1, 1970. This bill also increases the income limitation under the old pension system. I strongly support this bill.

On rollcall No. 310, I would have voted "yea." The bill under consideration was H.R. 16710 which removes the termination date for the VA-guaranteed home loan program. It also authorizes the Administrator to guarantee loans on mobile homes and authorizes direct loans for specially adapted housing for quadriplegic and paraplegic veterans.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN COMPACT— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Public Law 89-605, as amended, I am pleased to transmit an interim report by the Secretary of the Interior which summarizes his progress in negotiations on a compact for the Hudson River Basin.

I share the Secretary of the Interior's concern over the need for coordinated comprehensive planning and action for the Hudson River Basin and strongly support the approach to negotiations provided for by Public Law 89-605, as amended. The involvement of the States and the Federal Government from the start of the negotiations has enabled both levels of government to have their respective voices heard in determining the most appropriate management solution for the complex problems of this important river basin. I am directing the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with his mission to reach an agreement with the States of New Jersey and New York.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 22, 1970.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 18127, PUBLIC WORKS-AEC AP- PROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 18127) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 17, 1970.)

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we bring you today the conference report on the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for 1971. The original House bill provided a total new obligational authority of \$5,236,808,000. The Senate bill provided \$5,258,965,000, an increase of \$21,887,000 over the House bill. In this conference report we recommend the appropriation of \$5,239,324,000, agreed to by the conferees, which is \$24,109,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant statement when you realize that we are bringing back a conference report \$24 million under the budget for public works, for water, pollution control, power, and the AEC. The major increase in the bill over 1970 is \$200 million for water pollution control construction grants. We have provided a total of \$1 billion for these grants, which, together with the carryover of unobligated balances, will provide a total program for waste treatment plants of \$1.4 billion. This is adequate to take care of the current needs.

The largest single item in the bill is the AEC, totaling \$2,282 million. This is \$80.24 million below the budget estimate.

The major decreases in the AEC budget include \$16.1 million made in the 1970 authorizing act; \$26 million based on delay in the demonstration plant program for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, and \$30 million based on the carryover of unobligated balances not anticipated in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a summary of the overall conference action, but again I repeat it is \$24 million under the budget.

Funds in the bill for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation funds are required primarily to finance contracts on projects that are under construction.

The bill includes nine budgeted items for planning and 18 unbudgeted items representing a total of only 27 new planning projects for the Corps of Engineers. This is much under the average for the past several years.

There are a total of 47 new construction starts contained in the conference report for the corps including 16 contained in the budget. This again is considerably less than the new starts approved during the period 1963-67 when they averaged 63 per year.

For the Bureau of Reclamation there are only five new construction starts including three unbudgeted.

Mr. Speaker, this is an austere bill considering the urgent needs to accelerate water pollution control, water qual-

ity control, power generation, flood control, and other water resources programs.

I might point out that in the Corps of Engineers program, for example, there is a current backlog of over 400 authorized projects that have never been started.

This backlog includes 169 projects which have not even been initiated for planning.

However, because of the need to exercise fiscal restraint at this time, we are recommending only the limited number of new planning and new construction starts representing the highest priority projects which should not be further delayed if essential benefits are to become available in time. Certainly, the committee hopes that at an early date our fiscal situation will permit a more adequate funding program for initiating planning and construction on projects in the backlog. In my opinion, higher priority must be given to the urgent water resources program, or we will be faced with a very costly, inefficient crash program in the years ahead to meet our essential water supply, water quality, power, and flood control requirements.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that this conference report is \$24 million under the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES), the distinguished ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report. It is my opinion that the House conferees have done a very fine job in bringing this bill back only \$2,516,000 over the bill as it passed the House.

I also feel that the Appropriations Committees on both sides of the Capitol have done a particularly good job in bringing in a bill which is below the budget in a year when, certainly, the fiscal situation of the country requires that we use restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say, however, that I sincerely hope the budgetary situation of the country will be such in the years to come that we can deal more adequately with the needs of the country for flood control, for water pollution control, for reclamation, and for all the other important subjects and areas which are covered in this bill. I regard this as a barely adequate bill. I wish we could have appropriated more money insofar as outlays are concerned for many of the projects included herein. We have not, except in a very few instances, appropriated up to the capability of the various agencies involved to expend funds in this particular fiscal year.

But again I repeat that in view of the situation which the country faces, I think it is a good bill, I think it is a statesman-like bill, and I support it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the comments that have been made. This con-

ference report represents a successful effort on behalf of the managers on the part of the House. However, I believe there are a few points that merit discussion.

The apparent modest increase in funds in this conference report over the amount of the bill as passed by the House reflects a number of changes accomplished primarily by shifting funds out of the Atomic Energy Commission into the other agencies that are represented in the bill.

I personally believe that the Senate reductions in the Atomic Energy Commission, except for those restored in the conference report, were sound. But it does detract from the satisfaction of bringing in a bill below the budget if one realizes that these cuts in the Atomic Energy Commission were used as the basis for increasing the amounts available for other agencies. This is particularly true with respect to the Corps of Engineers.

I am concerned that in doing this we may have permitted the Corps of Engineers to extend themselves beyond their available resources and manpower. However, I have been around here long enough to know that when one goes to conference the best one may be able to accomplish is to keep the increase over the House bill to a minimum. At least this has been achieved in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of the membership should also be aware that when we do come to amendment No. 4, the chairman of the subcommittee will move to recede and concur with the Senate amendment. This would have the effect of restoring the funds for the so-called Dickey-Lincoln project in New England which has been a source of considerable controversy in the past. I assume it will again be the source of controversy here today. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recede and concur would add some \$807,000 for planning for this highly controversial project. Because of this, I wanted all of my colleagues to be aware that this situation will occur on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recede and concur with respect to amendment No. 4.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Is this not the same project that the House has voted on six separate occasions prior to this time?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am uncertain whether it is six, five, or seven, but I know it has been voted on a number of times in the past few years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have a list of six votes in which the House has turned down this project, and it would seem to me that we should again turn it down.

May I ask the gentleman this question: When we come to that point in the proceedings you just described, I understand that a vote to turn this project down would be a vote of "no" against the motion to recede and concur. That is, a vote of "no" would be against the project

and would substantiate the position the House took previously this year, and on six separate votes in other years.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), a member of the conference committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conference I support the provisions of this conference report, and I am sure that since the works provided reach into every nook and corner of the country that the report has had the attention of practically all the membership of the House.

My colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works have covered rather thoroughly the main provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as the membership knows, due to the untimely death of our good friend, Mike Kirwan, long-time chairman of this subcommittee, I now rank next to our distinguished and able chairman, GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, on the committee. It is a real privilege to serve with him and other members of the committee. We spend perhaps more hours in hearings, certainly as many hours, as any committee in the Congress. This we did on this bill.

Since the main provisions of the overall bill, which provides attention to the entire Nation, have been covered I shall limit myself to saying, as I said when we overrode the President's veto of the appropriations for public works in 1959:

The more we owe, the more our obligations, the more seriously we are involved with countries around the world, the more imperative it is that we take care of our natural resources here at home. We must conserve our streams, protect our people and property from floods, protect our soil from erosion, reforest our land, and thus look after our own country first, for this is the basis on which all the rest depends.

If we keep these things in mind, you will see why it is that our committee is proud of the job we have done here.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI

Again, I shall not review the overall situation which has been amply covered; but in my own area, whose interests I also have the obligation to look after, I would point out that we have provided \$84 million for the Mississippi River and tributaries, which, with the carryover of \$20 million, certainly should protect lower Mississippi from levee breaks and the resulting disaster.

YAZOO BASIN

In the Yazoo Basin we provided \$225,000 for the Greenwood project. We provided \$260,000 for initiating the upper auxiliary channels, which is the final segment of the flood control plan passed years ago by the Congress at the instance of that able Member from Mississippi, Hon. Will Whittington. We provide \$80,000 for beginning the Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayou project and direct that the work proceed from the south to the north.

We have provided funds for main stem levees, and \$1,220,000 for tributaries,

\$550,000 for the Big Sunflower River project; Yazoo backwater, \$1,687,000; control structure in Muddy Bayou—Eagle Lake—\$100,000.

We provide funds and direct that the Corps of Engineers cooperate with the Soil Conservation Service on bank caving in the Yazoo Basin.

RESERVOIR AND ADJACENT AREAS

It has been my pleasure to work in this area through the years. With time, sometimes it is forgotten, but under legislation which I got the Congress to pass the counties adversely affected by the reservoirs in my district each year receive 75 percent of the land rentals on lands taken off the tax rolls for flood control. These funds go to roads and schools. Not only that, but I am proud also that with regard to the two reservoirs built after I came here, Enid and Grenada, a part of the overall project, the people were given the right of trial by jury as to the value of their lands—a right which I got the Congress to give to them. Unfortunately, we still have the problem of having the Corps of Engineers to fix rentals at a reasonable figure. We still have the problem of periodic flooding with the remaining water problems, but I truly believe with the upper auxiliary channel and the Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous work that we will have the matter substantially solved. As was so well pointed out by the Corps of Engineers, had these projects been in existence, the floods of year before last would have covered only 25,000 acres instead of 165,000 acres and the floodwaters would have been 3 to 5 feet lower at both Swan Lake and Greenwood.

BRIDGES

In addition to this, we have provided for Sardis, Arkabutla, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, with a ramp to be built at Enid, for the completion of the Paducah Wells and Crowder Bridge which at my instance the subcommittee included several years ago so that a part of the school district and county would not be separated from the other.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

In presenting this matter I am somewhat leaving the biggest until last in some respects, for this bill provides for the first time for \$1,000,000 to begin construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation project—a project that will extend from Demopolis, Ala., above Mobile, to the reservoir formed by the Pickwick Lake and Dam near the Alabama-Tennessee line—an overall distance of 253 miles.

THE YELLOW CREEK PROJECT

In addition to this, our committee has provided for \$1,250,000 to begin construction of the Yellow Creek Port project, the first port on the Tennessee River on the Mississippi side. This, together with Tennessee-Tombigbee, should bring great development to the entire area of northeastern as well as eastern Mississippi, giving to our State what few States have had—a waterway on each side of the State, together with the gulf on the south—truly a bright picture for our people.

Additionally, our committee has provided funds for the continuation of the planning study of Hatchie River.

Of course, throughout the area we provided for flood prevention and watershed protection of the Corps of Engineers' share of flood control projects.

OTHER WORKS FOR OUR COUNTRY

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not point out that it is also my privilege in looking after our own country to serve on another subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—that for agriculture, where with the support of the members of the subcommittee and of the Congress we have taken care of rural electrification, rural home loans, watershed development, agricultural conservation program, the Soil Conservation Service, research and extension, school lunch and school milk, and hundreds of other programs which go to the well-being of all Americans, the latest major one being water and sewerage loans which will be greatly enlarged from funds we are making available this year.

As we pointed out in our last report, truly the bill might be termed the "bill for the protection of human health" or the "bill for the protection of the consumer." I mention these matters here because all of this effort is in line with our argument when we overrode the President's veto in 1959, that we must take care of the physical resources of our own country first, for all the rest depends upon that. This our committee has tried to do.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed the Dickey-Lincoln project.

In 1965, the House of Representatives on a record vote opposed the authorization of the excessively costly and unnecessary Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. At that time, total Federal expenditures were only \$117,181,000,000, and the total public debt stood at \$326,609,000,000. At that time the total cost of Dickey-Lincoln was put at \$227,000,000.

Now, in September 1970, we are being asked by the conferees to provide preconstruction planning funds for this same costly project. For fiscal 1971, total Federal expenditures will have risen to more than \$200,088,000,000—70 percent higher. The total public debt as of the end of the 1970 fiscal year has risen to \$383,428,000,000—11 percent higher. The total admitted cost of the project also has risen to at least \$369,000,000. With inflation and the normal escalation of construction costs, the total cost of the project ultimately may well be as high as \$545,000,000—140 percent more than the original estimate.

If the House was correct in opposing the authorization of a \$227,000,000 project in 1965 with Federal expenditures at only \$117,181,000,000, we will be even more correct today in 1970 in voting against a \$545,000,000 project at a time when public expenditures will be in excess of \$200,088,000,000 per year.

Eight times the House has voted this project down; the first time was in 1965; the last time was on June 24, 1970. Today, the House should again refuse to provide money for this project when the need for economy is greater, by many times, than it was 5 years ago when the

project is almost twice as costly as when it was first rejected.

This House has a duty to protect the taxpayers. They are the forgotten men. Let us demonstrate that we support the forgotten people. Let us support the taxpayers. Let us stand against waste in Government. Let us demonstrate to the Nation that we stand against needless Federal spending that will serve only to push inflation prices still higher.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the House conferees, as well as those from the other body, who worked so diligently in ironing out the differences between the House and Senate public works appropriations bills.

One item in this bill is most important to my home State of South Dakota, the appropriation for the Oahe Irrigation Unit. Still in its planning stages, the \$850,000 item for Oahe, as provided for in this bill, will complete the advance planning and permit the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with designs and specifications for the pumps and motors for the Oahe Pumping Plant, as well as the plant structure.

The Oahe Irrigation Unit is vital to the economy and agricultural growth of South Dakota, particularly at a time when there is a mass exodus from the farms all across the Nation. The first stage of the Oahe Unit will irrigate 190,000 acres at an estimated cost of over \$200 million, all but 10 percent of this, however, which represents nonreimbursable costs, will be repaid to the Federal Government.

In addition to irrigation, 17 towns and cities in the project area will be furnished municipal and industrial water supplies.

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of this project to South Dakota because irrigation is the key to stabilizing and revitalizing the economy.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this bill.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of South Dakota and I were greatly pleased when we were informed that the House conferees on the public works appropriations bill for fiscal 1971 had approved the \$850,000 funding level for the Oahe Irrigation Unit.

This project is vital to South Dakota. The Oahe Unit, patterned after the Garrison Irrigation Unit, in our sister State of North Dakota, will help stabilize the agricultural base in our State. Such a stabilized agricultural base reflects well on the prosperity of the South Dakotans who live in our towns and cities. The net result is an entire State cooperating and prospering together.

During my 10 years in Congress it has been a distinct pleasure to work with the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. The subcommittee's efforts in appropriating moneys for public works projects across the Nation has been outstanding. Their diligence and professionalism should be applauded.

On behalf of all South Dakotans, I sincerely thank the House conferees for their kindness toward South Dakota and their decision to accept the \$850,000

funding level for the Oahe Irrigation Unit.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 4. Page 6, line 17, strike out "\$825,689,000" and insert "\$871,808,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$852,063,000, of which \$807,000 shall be available to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs, Maine."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the only controversial item in this conference report, I believe, concerns the Dickey-Lincoln School project in the State of Maine.

May I say at the outset to my colleagues, this project has been recommended by three Presidents—President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon and it has been recommended in several budgets submitted to the Congress.

The project is recommended by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, with a cost-benefit ratio that is almost 2 to 1. In other words, about \$2 will be received in benefits for every dollar that is expended. The project cost will be repaid with interest from the power revenues.

This project has the strong bipartisan and unanimous support of the Maine delegation. Both the Senators and House delegation from Maine, and the Governor of Maine support it. This is a Maine project and the State of Maine supports it.

The merits of the project have been debated many times. The need for the project is obvious in view of the blackouts and the brownouts in electric power experienced by the consumers in New England and the East. The power situation is becoming desperate. I am told that today there are brownouts here in Washington, even affecting this Capitol Building.

This project is one of the last great major natural power sites remaining in America. We have public power in the Southwest, in the Southeast, in the Far West, and in the great Northwest. New England is the only area in the Nation that does not have public power, and a power yardstick. Why discriminate against the consumers in New England and in the East? Why deprive the people of Maine and the East from the benefits of a power yardstick to maintain reasonable electric power rates?

A statement was placed in the Record yesterday, and it appears this morning for all Members to see, detailing the

enormous amount of money being spent by private utilities interested in blocking this project.

The public interest, not the private power interests, should be served. This has been demonstrated to be a good project which will mean lower cost power for consumers in New England which now pay the highest electrical rates in the Nation.

A colleague asked me recently, "Why do you support a project in New England when you have TVA power in the South?" I replied, "It has always been my philosophy that all sections of the Nation have the right to develop low-cost electric power for the benefit of the consumers, the people who have to pay the bills."

I have supported the great reclamation and public power projects in the Northwest and throughout the United States, and I support this project in the East.

The amount carried in the bill is only \$807,000 to resume preconstruction planning.

There is no logical basis for denying such a project in the East. There is opposition against it. But there is no logical basis for denying this project in northern Maine. It has been recommended by the Senate, time and time again, by three Presidents, by the Corps of Engineers, and by the majority of our committee. We have brought this item back in disagreement to give the House an opportunity to work its will, but I urge that the funds for planning included in the conference report, be retained in the interest of those in New England and the East.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), a very able, distinguished, and most eloquent Member of this House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. There just must be a way for Members of this House of Representatives to say "no" to a proposal to destroy vast portions of our natural beauty by the unnecessary construction of a hydroelectric project and make it stick. How many more times must the "larger" body of the Congress reject this project?

Because Dickey-Lincoln is one of the most destructive projects ever proposed by the Army Engineers in terms of our natural heritage, it is vigorously opposed by national and regional conservation organizations. Included in these groups are: Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Audubon Society, Maine Fish and Game Clubs, Massachusetts Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Council of Maine, New England Advisory Board on Fish and Game Control, Sierra Club, State Biologists Association of Maine, and the Wilderness Society.

Dickey-Lincoln would create an artificial reservoir of dead-surface water spread over 140 square miles of the upper St. John Basin, plus six dams around its perimeter to keep it from spilling over, plus various powerplants, switchyards, transmission lines, project buildings, and spoil areas. It would have a reservoir fluctuation of 40 vertical feet, and a shoreline exposure at low pool ex-

ceeding 42 square miles. It would take the despoilers only 7 years to destroy what has taken nature an eternity to create for the benefit of mankind.

The upper St. John Basin is the largest remaining wilderness in Eastern United States and should be preserved in its unique wilderness condition. For generations, the Great Maine Woods have provided a caliber of outdoor adventure and inspiration that cannot be experienced elsewhere in the Northeast. Dickey-Lincoln would destroy much of this area. In addition, the area's famed scenic qualities include the entire portion of the river and valley above the mouth of the Allagash, which enters the St. John between the proposed Dickey and Lincoln damsites. The most vibrant two-thirds of the upper St. John above the mouth of the Allagash would disappear beneath Dickey Reservoir. The "Fish River Chain of Lakes" would be traversed by extra-high-voltage transmission lines. The strikingly beautiful mountain setting of Debouille Mountain, about 4 air miles from Dickey damsite, would be excavated to obtain gravel and stone for Dickey Dam.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial revision in our thinking on priorities as they relate to our environment. We, the people of the United States, have come a long way toward recognizing there is more to life than merely living. We are now concerned with those things which may contribute to the betterment of life.

I realize there are also some other priorities on use of our natural resources which must be met. But, I assure my friends here today Dickey-Lincoln is not a case requiring further sacrifice of the Nation's diminishing areas of unique natural beauty for a vitally needed water resource project. Dickey-Lincoln's only water resource purpose other than power is not significant. In my opinion, the values of the Upper St. John and its Great Maine Woods are far too precious to be sacrificed for power development. Construction of Dickey-Lincoln in the middle of these Great Maine Woods would result in a level of intrusion and ecological disturbance throughout the entire region that would forever destroy its unspoiled, cathedral-like wilderness quality.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge every Member in this body to join with me in voting to reject any appropriation for further planning of the Dickey-Lincoln power project. Let us say "No" this time with such overwhelming emphasis that it can be put to rest for all time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. I rise in opposition to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

It has been asked a great many times why a Representative from New England might be against Dickey-Lincoln, and the answer to that is for many reasons, principal among which is the cost to the public taxpayer. This is an uneconomic and a wasteful project of the first magnitude. It just is not so that the benefit-to-cost ratio of this project is 1.9 to

1. The actuality is that the benefit-to-cost ratio is about 0.8 to 1. Dickey-Lincoln power would not pay for itself. It would benefit the area only by way of huge Federal subsidy, which means at the expense of the general public.

What is sought here is to have the taxpayers of the United States, to the tune of half a billion dollars, pay for this at a time of fiscal crisis when Federal funds are already in deficit. Understandably, the Representatives from Maine want to have jobs for their constituents and to have lower cost power in that area of the country whoever pays for it.

But those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee and on the Ways and Means Committee and other committees of this body that are charged with the responsibility for voting for sound fiscal projects and voting against uneconomic and wasteful projects owe it to the public in order to serve the public interest, to once and for all, decisively, today retire this project to the back recesses of committee files.

There is no sense in spending five times as much money to build Dickey-Lincoln as it would cost for an alternate equivalent source of power. As the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out here earlier in the discussions, the utilities that have been so often falsely berated as being some kind of monsters that bleed the general public—even though their rates are determined by public regulatory commissions and who are limited to a 6- or 7-percent return on their invested capital—those utilities have built and are building millions of kilowatts of power in the New England grid, 12 million to be added by 1976, and they are building them at a cost of approximately one-fifth of the capital that would be involved as a charge to the taxpayers of the United States for building this Dickey-Lincoln project.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but this project which is almost entirely for peaking power availability, is 400 miles away from where the peaking power would be used. It would not even supply a fixed source of power, but only peaking power that can be supplied by local generators close at hand, tied onto a system by a private utility at a fifth of the cost.

I think in the circumstances of the present discussion that we ought to take note of the fact that the cost of alternates that were stated in the report to former President Johnson in 1965, were stated in terms of a steam-electric plant facility in the Boston area and in Maine, stating the cost of these alternates on the highside, projecting an annual cost at \$23.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.6 mills per kilowatt-hour—when at the same time a unit was built in Bow, N.H., that cost only \$110 per kilowatt with an annual cost of only \$13.87 per kilowatt-year. The cost-benefit ratio of this project has been repeatedly distorted and misrepresented by the device of using such alternates. The cost of Dickey-Lincoln is substantially understated in this way.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to build a project for peaking power purposes 400 miles from the source of supply with an \$80 million transmission line, when it would be on the line only 2 hours a day, is something that this Congress

ought not to be doing at this time when there is a short supply of money and there is a tremendous argument in America about shifting priorities in the allocation of dollars in short supply.

If actual cost of power from modern plants is used for comparison then Dickey-Lincoln has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity.

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

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from New Hampshire familiar with the Zender Associates report, which was requested by the Governors of Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, which was recently published, which estimates the cost-to-benefit ratio at 1.56?

This is done by an unbiased Washington organization which is expert in the field of electric power generation, and which also recommends the Dickey-Lincoln School project as part of the whole power picture in the New England area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, to permit me to respond?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. So that there will be continuity in the record.

In response to the gentleman's question to me about this Zender Associates report, I must again state that the alternatives have been misstated. No matter what experts have proposed, these benefit-to-cost ratios—the Army Corps of Engineers, Zinder Associates or other persons—the truth of the situation on the Dickey-Lincoln School project is that it will cost a little bit more than each dollar we put into it for what we get, so that the benefit is something less than even. It is not 2 to 1. It is something less than even. We cannot get away from it; it is a subsidized operation.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I cannot see how the gentleman can disagree not only with the Zender report, done by an independent agency in Washington, but also with the staff study done by the Appropriations Committee and the study by the Corps of Engineers, which evaluates most projects and public works bills. There is no reason to believe they would distort the figures with regard to the Dickey-Lincoln project when they do not distort the figures with regard to other projects. This happens to be the only one ever questioned.

I am inclined to believe these objective judgments, rather than the gentleman's judgment that the benefit-to-cost ratio is not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood in this position many times, and have advocated this project to the Members of the House over and over again. I have talked about the value of the project, about the 1.9 to 1 benefit-cost ratio.

This project has had bipartisan support not only from the current Democrat Governor of Maine but also from the former Republican Governor of Maine. The project has been endorsed by both the Republican Senator from Maine and the Democrat Senator from Maine. It is in President Nixon's budget not only for this year but was in the budget last year, for the \$807,000 which we are requesting now.

I believe that should provide objective assurance to the Members that this project has bipartisan support.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned that this is going to destroy a vast part of the wilderness area of Maine. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is on the floor. I should like to discuss this point with him.

The vast area that it will destroy is about one-half of 1 percent of Maine's woodlands; 85 percent of Maine is covered with woodlands. One-half of 1 percent of that area is not even significant.

Maine has 3,600 streams flowing throughout the State, and this project would stop up six of them—six out of 3,600.

It is true that every time we pave a road or build a house or build a building—whether it is this building we stand in or an office building—almost anything we do, we destroy the environment some percentage. But in this case, just as in the building of a house, we destroy only an iota. Certainly the benefits to be derived by having low-cost electricity in an area paying the highest price for electricity in the Nation—which, by the way, has one of the lowest per capita incomes with which to pay for high-cost electricity—certainly is worth the price of one-half of 1 percent of Maine's woodlands, and it seems to me it is worth the price of six out of 3,600 streams, to benefit the people not only of Maine but also of all New England.

Another argument which has been raised in the past, and which I know will be raised before the debate is over today, is with respect to the cost figure for the Dickey-Lincoln project. Let me read from the Zender report which has been mentioned, and which should be distributed in the very near future. I do have a part of an advance copy here. I want to read that portion with respect to the cost of this project.

The report was as follows:

The capital cost of the Dickey-Lincoln school project was estimated by the Corps of Engineers in January, 1970 to be \$248,000,000.

This compares with their 1964 estimate of \$217,700,000, giving an increase of only 14 percent in 5 years. Although in general hydroelectric construction costs have increased an average of 5 percent per year in this period, changes in design could offset the escalation and the Corps of Engineers estimate is considered reasonable.

That is the objective judgment of an impartial consulting firm here in the Washington area which concludes, by the way, by stating that the Dickey-Lincoln School project would fit admirably into a bulk power system operated by an interstate compact agency.

Now, what is the real argument here?

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I yield to my colleague from Maine.

Mr. KYROS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague and say this in addition: Walking up here into the Chamber today, along the passageways you notice that all of the lights are shut off. They are shut off for one reason, and that is there is a brown-out, a shortage of power. There is a shortage of power going on all over the Northeast. This power source that we are speaking of here would just be another power source in the armory of power sources that we need. This is a power source that—ecologically and environmentally, with hydroelectric power being used, would do the least destruction to the air and the earth.

I would like to point out, also, to my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, a very good friend of mine, who has fought along with us in New England and elsewhere in this House many times, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN), although I respect his views and know that he would like to have the interests of Maine at heart, because he is a woodsman and has a very keen concern for the people of Maine as well as those of New England, that Maine remains one of the last sources where electric energy, has not yet reached the demands of the people. We need energy. There is a discussion going on about oil going into Maine and going into the bays, and there is great concern about pollution taking place, but there is not that concern about putting in this Dickey-Lincoln project. So I would suggest in all fairness that the people in the State of Maine have spoken. I know that the gentleman from New Hampshire has great love, affection, and concern for them. They are concerned about getting power in there. I say that Maine remains one of the last areas in the United States that does not have a public power project. If we spelled out all of these projects throughout the United States, it would be shocking to see how left out the Northeast is. We are entitled to our fair share; \$800,000 is not an excessive sum of money to spend in the State of Maine this year to go forward with the planning for this project.

So, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I would encourage the people here to support this project.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank our colleague for his excellent comments.

What this amounts to really is a fight between the public interests and the private interests. I think that the investor-owned utilities are unduly concerned about putting a public power yardstick into the Northeast area. This is the only part of the country left where you can put in a hydroelectric power project. We all know that it is the only nonpolluting source of energy. It is not going to take up a large amount of the space in that area. Evidently, as the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), has pointed out, they are willing to spend \$560,000 in the period from 1964 to 1968

to try to defeat this project. They are evidently very much concerned that this will be a Federal takeover in that area. This is just not true. There will not be space to put any more of these projects in that area.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced here with a great power shortage. We are faced with it here today. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS) and I did not engineer this shortage for our purposes, but it is a real power shortage which is existing in the Capitol of our Nation—they have turned off half of the light bulbs in the basement—and we do not know how long this situation will exist. Privately owned and investor-owned utilities are trying to meet the shortage, but they will not be able to do it in time. If we had continued with the appropriations from the first authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, this project would be on the line now. Mr. Luce, the chairman of the board of Consolidated Edison, said a couple of weeks ago here in testifying before one of the committees that he could very well have used the power from the Dickey-Lincoln project to alleviate the shortage in New York. We are hesitating today longer than we should. We need this additional power. They are trying to do something through nuclear and pump storage, but we all know that the people of the country are boycotting this and are coming out against nuclear and pump storage plants because they have a great fear of damage to our environment.

Now, I guess certain people feel that they are going to hold up the completion of many of these nuclear plants and in view of that, it is of the utmost urgency to proceed immediately to construct the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), for his most persistent and effective efforts in this area and urge support of his position. Further, I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and I hope the House will provide the funds with which to move ahead with this very important project.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KYROS. It has often been stated that power would be in use hundreds of miles from the source of generation. Could the gentleman tell us where the power is going and for what purpose it is to be used?

Mr. HATHAWAY. Most of the power will be sold in Maine where you will not have to have the long transmission problems. It is my opinion that they were talking about a line from the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam to Boston. In the meantime, because of transmission lines already constructed or partially con-

structed, that has been shortened to about 150 miles and, furthermore, the benefit-cost ratio—they figure on the Federal Government picking up one-half of the tab with respect to transmission lines, and with the other half being picked up by the private utilities.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO), a valued member of the committee.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply rise to support the committee and the House of Representatives. As I stated before, there have been six separate votes on this issue in the House. I feel that we should support the House and the committee. Our committee originally came in without this project contained in the bill. I want to support the position of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have had six separate votes on this project. If you check the record of the other body, you will find there have been no votes on it. Therefore, based upon the number of times which this project has been considered in the House of Representatives, I believe it is incumbent upon us to support the position of our committee and the House.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln project. As the gentleman from Ohio has stated, we have voted against this project many times in the House, but still there is this effort made on the part of the other body to prevail over the House on this project.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I do not want to go into all the arguments, the pros and cons, concerning this project. We have been doing this for 5 years consistently in the House. The record is filled with facts and statistics which mitigate against this project.

One of the problems is that there is too much misinformation promulgated by some of the proponents of the project. The record should be set straight with reference to this matter.

For example, a statement was made several moments ago to the effect that most of this electricity would be used in Maine rather than for peaking power electricity, which is the very essence of hydroelectric power. The very purpose of the Dickey-Lincoln project was for peaking power electricity for the Boston grid system and the New England grid system. Electric power for the State of Maine can come into existence through the construction of thermal plants. The only justification for hydroelectric power as represented by the Dickey-Lincoln project is because it would supply peaking power for other areas.

Secondly, reference was made to the brownouts. We know there are brownouts and power shortages in the country.

We know there are power shortages in the northeast.

In fact, reference was made to the New England power shortage. If my memory is correct, this summer New England transported and sold power to New York. The utilities in New England are alert. They are trying to provide for the power needs of the area. There are approximately 16 new plants either under construction or scheduled for completion by 1976 which are designed to produce the necessary electricity. But the really critical question that we should ask ourselves here today is this: Knowing that we will need power, knowing that the power needs of the American people are growing, how do we get them the cheapest power? I submit that it is not through this extravagant Dickey-Lincoln project.

Also, we should ask ourselves another question which we roll over all too easily at times. In these pressing days of crises, when we are burdening the taxpayers of America with more and more obligations, should the Government undertake a half-billion-dollar project, if in fact this project can be done by the nongovernmental sector, and in fact can be done more cheaply than the Government could do it?

I believe the House of Representatives has come to the conclusion on many occasions that this is the case. Therefore, why should we burden the taxpayers of America with another half a billion dollars in expenditures for a very questionable program, and one which would result in high-cost electricity?

The gentleman from Maine, Mr. HATHAWAY—and I will yield to the gentleman in a moment—has made reference to the Zinder report which purports to favor the Dickey-Lincoln project, and it does. Everybody knows that these are consultants, and they are eminent consultants, and they are hired by the Governors to come forth with a report. But if you will look at the Zinder tables in the report, particularly to table 7-7, you will see that it indicates that the cost of the Dickey-Lincoln power project would be at least \$18.7 million, at a Federal interest rate of 4½ percent; more than the cost for alternative private power at \$13.3 million plus \$5 million in taxes. That is the Zinder report to which reference was made.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. The gentleman should further state that in the Zinder report they give the benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.56 to 1, and they recommend it be included in the power package in New England.

Mr. GIAIMO. Correct, and I will say to the gentleman from Maine that we have been talking about the benefit-to-cost ratio in this House for 5 years now, and we have come up with different benefit-to-cost ratios from 1.9 to 1.5, to 1.3, to less than 1 to 1. Benefit-to-cost ratios involve many factors and depend upon what you intend to show. When you add to the original estimates

of the Corps of Engineers interest, which is high today, as the gentleman knows; when you add the cost of escalation in prices because of inflation; and when you add the fact that it will be 10 years before this is on the line and completed, the benefit-to-cost ratio is questionable and subject to these varying factors. The Corps of Engineers does not properly reflect these factors in arriving at a benefit-to-cost ratio.

The fact of the matter remains that we are talking about a half-a-billion-dollar project.

I do not see any need for a further extended rebuttal here of the claims made in the other body on Dickey-Lincoln; They are just a repeat of the arguments already posed and rejected in the House today. Actually, in the other body, where Dickey-Lincoln was reintroduced into this appropriation bill—and actually it was done so without hearings and without a vote—never has there been a record vote on this legislation. There has been no debate, there has been no discussion, and this project has been given appropriations each year without debate and without record vote.

I believe that the House of Representatives, which has looked into this matter and which has made a record in this matter by debate and record voting, should not continually be asked to recede and concur in the actions of the other body, which has never in 5 years taken a single recorded vote on this matter.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying that every vote we take here in the House that is not recorded is not on a good bill, and should not be passed?

The other body is so sure on this project, and I would beg to differ with the gentleman, they had hearings, they had hearings on each appropriation in committee, and further let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. GIAIMO. I will yield to the gentleman for questions, but not for a speech.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I think it is rather an endorsement of the project rather than an argument to be used against it.

Mr. GIAIMO. The fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Maine well knows that in 1965 the House voted against it, in 1967 on three occasions we voted against it, and again in 1968, and in 1969, and in 1970 the House refused to put funds for Dickey-Lincoln into the bill.

The fact is that in all of that time the other body, which has consistently reinserted this project in the bill and into the conference report, has never once taken a recorded position on this highly questionable program.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one observation?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HATHAWAY. In 1966 the House passed unanimously the largest appropriation that this project has had, \$1.3 million without a vote at all.

Mr. GIAIMO. That does not gainsay the fact that the other body has never taken a recorded position on the Dickey-Lincoln project and, yet, we are asked

time after time and year after year to give in to allow this highly questionable project, which will cost in excess of one-half billion dollars.

I think the time has come to say no finally and to vote against this project. In this regard I would like to ask one question of the gentleman from Tennessee.

As I understand it, the gentleman's motion will be to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which provides a total appropriation of \$852,063,000, of which \$807,000 shall be available to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam in Maine. That is the gentleman's motion as I understand it?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. Those of us who oppose the Dickey-Lincoln project should vote against the gentleman's amendment and then the gentleman will have to make additional amendments from there, if the gentleman's motion is voted down.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have some motions, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. In other words, those who are opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln project should vote no on the motion by the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I am normally a patient man and tolerant of the need to have full discussion of issues in this Chamber. But to start an eighth or ninth round of debate and voting on this patently ridiculous Dickey project is a bit much. Every year we vote to kill this unnecessary, unwarranted, absurd appropriation and every year the Senate tries to stuff it down our throats and then every year we say "No" a second time. With the pressing business of the Nation to be dealt with in this Chamber, I say this nonsense has gone far enough.

It is no longer just a case of throwing away some \$807,000 of the taxpayers' money—which eventually would be followed by another half billion dollars—but I wonder how much money is consumed every time we allocate time on this floor to discuss this cat that seems to have 99 lives.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, to you and to my fellow Members that this House is being held up to ridicule which as a legislative body we are asked time and time again to consider this worn out, worthless public works project.

Let us finally say "No" in a resounding fashion and make it clear to those on the other side of the rotunda that we will no longer tolerate this frivolous waste of our time and certainly will not now—or at any time in the future—condone the waste of a half billion dollars of money paid by the taxpayers of America who are already groaning under the load placed on their backs.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS).

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania that this power project is trying the tolerance and the patience of the House and, indeed, it will for the next 100 years because the people of the State of Maine want this project. They are entitled to their rightful share of public power in this country.

If these arguments were made for the last 35 or 40 years, when all other regions of this Nation have had public power projects, there would not be a single kilowatt flowing in the United States today.

It seems to me, this argument has been made over and over again today by the opponents of this project—not on facts but about wasted dollars.

It is all right to spend money for an SST, an ABM, a Vietnamese war or a venture into space but it is not all right for the people of the State of Maine. Our State needs power, just like any other State. This is a nonpolluting form of power. The project has been studied and has been endorsed by this administration. It is supported by the Corps of Engineers. I think it should go forward.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to close debate.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee. This motion, as he explained, will provide the amount recommended by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoir. The Senate added the \$807,000 necessary to continue this project. Up to date the Corps of Engineers has spent \$2,154,000 on the project, and it would seem to me we ought to continue planning. Even the \$807,000 recommended in this bill will not complete planning. It will take 2 more years to complete planning of the project.

Let me also emphasize that a majority of the House conferees concurred in the action in support of the recommendation to recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the House are familiar with the pros and the cons of Dickey-Lincoln. I know of few projects that have run the obstacle course of this House as often as it has. I know, too, that no other project that your Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works has considered that has developed more conflicting facts, data, and figures than this one has. Those of us who support this project rely on the testimony of the Governor of Maine and the Members of the Maine congressional delegations in the House and in the Senate as to the need for the construction of this first multipurpose project in New England, and probably—undoubtedly the last one. But beyond that, and more importantly and persuasively, I think, are the positions, the arguments, and the support that Federal agencies like the Federal Power Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers give to this project. These are Federal entities that represent the public's interest. They have not pulled their facts

out of thin air. Their support is grounded in extensive studies, and all of them have concurred and concluded that Dickey-Lincoln should be built.

Mr. Speaker, let me dwell for a moment on some of the reasons why the Members of the House should support this motion:

First, need: Power shortages in the Northeast grow more alarming each year. The area's principal suppliers, their dwindling reserves now at only 13.9 percent, cannot provide the power needed at peak consumption times. Brownouts, commonplace in the Northeast's biggest cities, are spreading rapidly to smaller communities. The Dickey-Lincoln project would be close to an ideal solution to the problem. Capable of turning out 730,000 kilowatts, Dickey-Lincoln's giant hydroelectric generators could provide the peaking power necessary during periods of high demand. Other kinds of power supply—thermal plants, for example, or pumped storage plants—can provide firm power but not peaking power. Thermal plants take too long to warm up; pumped storage plants have small reserves. Dickey-Lincoln, by contrast, could release vast amounts of energy at the flick of a switch. Private power companies argue that their Big 11 Power Loop—a planned energy network apparently designed as a response to Dickey-Lincoln—will meet the Northeast's future power needs. But the Zinder report a painstakingly objective analysis cited below, disputes this contention. The report shows that the Big 11 Power Loop cannot meet the region's future demands—certainly not its peak demands. Dickey-Lincoln is plainly necessary.

Second, cheaper power: Dickey-Lincoln is the cheapest available way of giving the Northeast the peaking power it needs. This is not speculation, but a fact. Studies conducted by the Congress, by the administration, and by private firms make this fact startlingly obvious. One study—this one carried out by the Zinder Co., an independent and highly regarded consulting firm based in Washington, D.C.—shows that New England pays the highest power costs in the country. Indeed, it pays rates a staggering 20 percent higher than those in States outside of New England but most nearly like our own. The report's conclusion: Dickey-Lincoln would bring our power costs much closer to the national average. The project, moreover, would give competition to New England's private power companies for the first time, providing a yardstick by which consumers can measure private rates. The competition generated by big public power projects—TVA is an obvious example, Bonneville, another one—has resulted in lower private rates in the areas these projects serve. Competition in power production, like competition in every other field, yields more efficient and economical methods. New England is now the only area in the United States that lacks such competition.

Third, feasibility and cost: Dickey-Lincoln's cost-benefit ratio is 1.9 to 1, virtually the highest ratio to come before the Congress this year. The ratio is fair and honest. It was reached by the same

formula used to evaluate every other Federal power project considered here. In fact, the data used in calculating the ratio even included half the cost of Dickey-Lincoln's transmission facilities—a cost the conventional formula does not demand. Despite the contentions of Dickey-Lincoln's opponents, the project is among the most economically promising in the country. Its total cost, as estimated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under equally rigorous procedures, comes to \$248 million. This figure is deemed "reasonable" by even the most hard-eyed skeptics in the administration and Congress. True, as the project's opponents maintain, the cost certainly might increase. In all likelihood, it will. But so would the cost of any alternative power project—especially nuclear projects. Opponents argue that a pumped storage plant would be cheaper. The contention remains valid, however, only if you ignore the energy cost of operating such a plant. Once this cost is considered, a pumped storage plant's price tag rises significantly above Dickey-Lincoln's. A host of studies—studies carried out by the Corps of Engineers, by the Interior Department, by the Federal Power Commission, by Senate and House committees—plainly show that Dickey-Lincoln is warranted. It would give the Northeast lower cost peaking power than any other source.

Fourth, pollution: Dickey-Lincoln, like all hydroelectric projects, would be wholly free of pollutants. Other power sources taint the air or foul the water. Even nuclear plants, once thought pollution free, heat river waters to levels that threaten the whole ecological cycle of life in and near the river. In an era when pollution threatens our very way of life the environmental advantages alone of hydroelectric plants are a powerful argument in their favor.

Fifth, recreational benefits: The lake created by Dickey-Lincoln would offer fishing, boating, camping, and other recreational opportunities. The demand for such opportunities in New England, already high, is expected to double within the next decade. The Dickey-Lincoln Lake would help meet this demand, providing facilities like boating docks and campsites. Granted, the project would flood some wilderness area. But it seems a small price to pay for a project that would not pollute the water, that would not pollute the air, that would not take up the kind of valuable urban space used by fossil fuel plants. Many conservation groups support the project. It is designed to preserve the wild Allagash Waterway, one of the few remaining free-flowing streams in the East. The project's water reserves, moreover, would help ease pollution by flushing out the Aroostook River during the low water months of summer.

Sixth, regional economic benefits: Construction of Dickey-Lincoln would be a welcome stimulus to northern Maine's sluggish economy, pouring millions of dollars into the area and providing many jobs. The project—during both construction and operation—would help put northern Maine back on its feet. Still further, Dickey-Lincoln offers great

potential for irrigating the region's potato fields. Studies have shown that Maine's yearly rainfall is not enough to bring the fields up to their maximum yield. Irrigation provided by Dickey-Lincoln would provide the water to reach a point very close to this maximum. It is estimated, in fact, that such irrigation would add the equivalent of \$20 million each year in more Maine potatoes. And, although largely unexplored so far, the project's role in flood control might turn out to be considerable.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAMO. Mr. Speaker, I wanted the gentleman to yield so I could ask him about his figure of \$248 million. I do not want to get into an extended argument with the gentleman, but I am sure the gentleman knows full well that figure does not take into account the escalation costs during the time of construction, and it does not take into account the actual interest rates which will have to be paid for the money, and the gentleman knows that figure is way out of line with what the true costs will be when the project is finished.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in my response to the gentleman from Connecticut, let me pass on the latest Federal Power Commission data on costs, which are less for Dickey-Lincoln on a comparable basis than for alternative plants, for pump storage plants, or for steam generating plants. Those costs are \$22.2 million, which is 17.7 mills per kilowatt-hour at market. For Dickey-Lincoln the cost is \$20.17 million, which is 7.4 mills per kilowatt-hour of market, at an annual saving of \$0.5 million.

I know there is wide disparity and a deep gap in the costs used by the proponents and opponents of the bill. Those who support this bill base their figures on those figures developed by the agencies of the Government that are concerned with the public interest and concerned with power costs in New England. They are based on the recommendations of the Federal Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and on our own staff study by the Subcommittee on Public Works.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question of the gentleman. Does not the gentleman agree if the project were feasible that we could back up enough water to make this thing pay, that if this were the case, the private facilities would seek to build it here, as the gentleman from Maine said, which is the last available location for this type of facility in the Northeast?

Mr. BOLAND. I can understand the opposition of the private utilities. This is a multipurpose project, and most of the multipurpose public power projects which have been built around the Nation have been opposed by the private utilities. I can understand their reasons for it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this House to vote "yes" on the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 131, nays 230, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 311] YEAS—131

Adams Addabbo Albert Alexander Anderson, Calif. Andrews, Ala. Andrews, N. Dak. Annunzio Ashley Aspinall Barrett Bell, Calif. Beville Bingham Blanton Blatnik Boggs Boland Bolling Brademas Brasco Brown, Calif. Burlison, Mo. Burton, Calif. Byrne, Pa. Carter Chisholm Clay Cohelan Conyers Corman Culver Daniels, N.J. Davis, Ga. Dingell Eckhardt Edmondson Edwards, Calif. Edwards, La. Ellberg Evans, Colo. Evins, Tenn. Farbstein

NAYS—230

Abbutt Abernethy Adair Anderson, Ill. Arends Ashbrook Beall, Md. Belcher Bennett Berry Betts Biaggi Blester Blackburn Bow Bray Brinkley Broomfield Brozman Brown, Ohio Broyhill, N.C. Broyhill, Va. Buchanan Burke, Fla. Burke, Mass. Burleson, Tex. Burton, Utah Byrnes, Wis. Cabell Caffery Casey Cederberg Celler Chamberlain

Hébert Heckler, Mass. Henderson Hogan Horton Hosmer Hull Hunt Hutchinson Jarman Jonas Kee Keith King Kyl Landgrebe Langen Latta Lennon Lloyd Long, Md. Lujan Lukens McClory McCloskey Mink Moss William D. Murphy, Ill. Murphy, N.Y. Myers Natcher Nix O'Bay O'Hara O'Neal, Ga. Pepper Perkins Pickle Poage Podell Price, Ill. Pryor, Ark. Pucinski Rees Reuss Rhodes Rivers Roberts Rodino Roybal Ryan Scheuer Sisk Smith, Iowa Stafford Stokes Stubbiefield Stuckey Sullivan Symington Tiernan Udall Ullman Van Deerlin Whitten Wright Wyatt Yates Young

Anderson, Tenn. Ayres Baring Brock Brooks Brown, Mich. Bush Button Camp Carey Chappell Conte Cowger Daddario Dawson Dennis Digs Dowdy Dulski Fisher Flynt Griffiths

So the motion was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs: Mr. Hays with Mr. Ayres. Mr. Purcell with Mr. Camp. Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cowger. Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock. Mr. Brooks with Mr. Bush. Mr. Chappell with Mr. Dennis. Mr. Nichols with Mr. Kleppe. Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill. Mr. Flynt with Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Fisher with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania. Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McKneally. Mr. Stratton with Mr. Button. Mr. St Germain with Mr. Brown of Michigan. Mr. Pike with Mr. Kuykendall. Mr. McFall with Mr. Conte. Mr. Karth with Mrs. May. Mr. Carey with Mr. Grover. Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mize. Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Halpern. Mr. Olsen with Mr. O'Konski. Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Reifel. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Quillen. Mr. Landrum with Mr. Roudebush.

Mollohan Monagan Montgomery Moorhead Morgan Morse Morton Mosher Nedzi Nelsen O'Neill, Mass. Fassman Fatten Pelly Pettis Philbin Pirnie Poff Pollock Preyer, N.C. Price, Tex. Quile Rallsback Randall Rarick Reid, Ill. Reid, N.Y. Riegle Robison Roe Rogers, Fla. Rooney, N.Y. Rooney, Pa. Rousselot Ruppe Ruth Sandman Saylor Schadeberg Scherle Schmitz Schwengel Scott

Grover Halpern Hawkins Hays Johnson, Pa. Karth Kleppe Kuykendall Landrum Long, La. Lowenstein McCulloch McFall McKneally MacGregor May Meskill Mize Nichols O'Konski Olsen Ottinger Patman

Sebelius Shipley Shriver Sikes Skubitz Slack Smith, Calif. Snyder Springer Stanton Steed Steiger, Ariz. Stephens Talcott Taylor Teague, Calif. Teague, Tex. Thompson, Ga. Thomson, Wis. Vander Jagt Vanik Waggonner Wampler Watson Watts Weicker Whalen Whalley White Whitehurst Wiggins Williams Wilson, Bob Wilson, Charles H. Winn Wolf Wydler Wylie Wyman Yatron Zablocki Zion Zwach

NOT VOTING—68

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Lowenstein. Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Digs. Mr. Staggers with Mr. Schneebell. Mr. Baring with Mr. Smith of New York. Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin. Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Taft. Mr. Patman with Mr. Widnall. Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wold. Mr. Waldie with Mr. Dawson. Mr. Tunney with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$851,256,000".

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman, all it would do is strike out the money for the project deleted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be reread.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the motion.

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

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 14, line 22, insert: "Provided further, That funds appropriated for fiscal year 1970 and allocated to States shall not be reallocated in accordance with section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until May 15, 1971."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 20: Page 17, line 9, strike "and".

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 21: Page 17, line 10, insert: "and \$5,000 for the Cascade Irrigation District, Ellenberg, Washington."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 22: Page 17, line 15, insert: "Provided further, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed \$140,000 may be used for archeological salvage of the cargo of the steamboat *Bertrand* in the Missouri River Basin."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted, and insert tables.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKE SHORE, MICH.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1198

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18776) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1198 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 18776 to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 18776 is to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan and to provide for its administration as a unit of the national park system.

The lakeshore would consist of three basic mainland units in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Mich., which are separated by the towns of Glen Arbor and Empire but which are joined together by a scenic road. Including this road, the mainland unit totals about 41,000 acres of land. The main features of the area would include not only the Sleeping Bear Dunes, but Pyramid Point and Empire Dunes, as well. The 31.5 miles of shoreline feature many clean beaches and clear water for swimming, boating, and fishing, as well as picturesque settings for hiking trails, scenic attractions for photographers, picnic spots for family outings, and an abundance of interesting flora and fauna for nature study.

South Manitou Island and North Manitou Island would be included in the lakeshore, adding another 19,789 acres of land and 33.5 miles of shoreline.

The sum of \$19,800,000 is authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition, which appropriation will be made from moneys available in the land and water conservation fund. In addition, \$18,769,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the development of the area.

The lakeshore would be an outstanding recreation area and, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1198 in order that the bill may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset of my remarks that this is a controversial piece of legislation. There has been much opposition to it in the State of Michigan, particularly from the residents who live in this area, by people who own property in this area, and by others who will be adversely affected by it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall the number of sessions in which this legislation has been introduced, but I know there have been many. This fact speaks for itself. It is a controversial piece of legislation and I hope that during general debate some of the controversial features will be discussed. I have learned that the \$19.8 million for land purchases and

the \$18,769,000 for development of the area will only be a starter. I have been advised, if this lakeshore area is going to be developed as the proponents would like, there will have to be a good many more millions of dollars of the people's tax money poured into it.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill is being debated we ought to keep this in mind and try to find out exactly how much money is going to be required to be put into the area and then determine whether or not the taxpayers will be getting their money's worth.

House Resolution 1198 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

(Mrs. REID of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to take up time to speak in regard to the rule for the consideration of H.R. 18776, but I must rise at this time to inform my colleagues that I do oppose this legislation. I will not oppose the rule because I want to see a rule adopted that will permit thorough debate of this measure. In my judgment, there are many phases of this bill which should be considered very carefully. I shall make a more detailed statement during the general debate, which I trust will have your thoughtful consideration.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I might point out the fact that the rule provides for 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule. I hope a full discussion will be had on the legislation.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18776) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 18776, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 18776 which would establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan.

INTRODUCTION

As many Members of the House are aware, this legislation is not new. Measures providing for the creation of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore have twice been approved by the other body and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended its approval during the 89th Congress; however, the legislation matured too late in the session to receive the attention of the House at that time. During the 90th Congress, the urgency of some of the more glamorous park areas—like the Redwoods—and the financial situation of the land and water conservation fund precluded its consideration.

Now some of these things are in the background. The Redwood National Park has been created and substantial progress has been made in the acquisition of many parklands. This administration has made a dedicated effort to utilize the funds made available by the Congress to transform authorized areas into meaningful national parks. Furthermore, the land and water conservation fund, itself, has a greater capacity to implement these authorizations now than it had 2 or 3 years ago when the income to the fund was unpredictable.

CHANGING ATTITUDE

Because circumstances are different today than they were during the first months of this Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been very active in the field of parks and recreation. A good deal of the credit for the conservation accomplishments of the 91st Congress will go to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) who has patiently and diligently guided the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation to a record of accomplishments which we can all appreciate and applaud.

It is appropriate that we discuss this matter on its merits, Mr. Chairman.

DISCUSSION OF THE AREA

First, I want to point out that this proposed national lakeshore is located on Lake Michigan where it is reasonably accessible to the millions of people living in the Great Lakes region. It is a beautiful area with recreational, scenic, and natural values transcending regional interest so that it will be attractive to people from all parts of the Nation.

Basically, the proposal involves a mainland unit and an island unit. The mainland unit totals about 41,000 acres of land and will make available to the public about 31.5 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline. Included in this area are some unique sand dune formations, stretches of beach for swimming and sunbathing, and natural features suitable for a variety of outdoor activities: hiking, camping, fishing, boating, and so forth.

Offshore, there are two large virtually uninhabited islands. The bill combines the outdoor resources of South Manitou Island—5,332 acres—which contains an

outstanding combination of botanical values—including a small forest of virgin timber and the largest known white cedar in the United States—with the large, undeveloped area of North Manitou Island—14,457 acres. Together they double the shoreline included in the lakeshore and add a different dimension to its recreation potential.

DISCUSSION OF LOCAL AND STATE INTEREST

I would not want anyone to be misled about this proposal, Mr. Chairman. It has always been relatively controversial. As has been the case with many other park proposals, most of the opposition arises from landowners in the area. In testimony before our committee, spokesmen for these people presented their case clearly and expressed the concern of residents of the area. The members of the committee listened carefully to all points of view and we revised the legislation in an effort to remove some of the irritants and to make the bill more acceptable to them. Needless to say, everyone is not satisfied, but the members of the committee are convinced that the merits of this proposal argue persuasively for the enactment of H.R. 18776, as amended.

It is significant to note that this Congress, unlike any heretofore, has seen every member of the Michigan congressional delegation introduce or cosponsor a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. In addition, this year the Governor of the State and both Houses of the State legislature went on record in favor of the lakeshore and indicated that the State would donate its lands to the United States for this purpose—except for 300 acres to be managed as an anadromous fishery in conjunction with the lakeshore. And finally, Mr. Chairman, even one of the local boards of county commissioners—Benzie County—formally endorsed the national lakeshore.

DISCUSSION OF THE COST

Enactment of H.R. 18776 will require a considerable Federal investment if it is to accomplish the objective which we have in mind. Unlike areas in the West where huge parks and recreation areas have been carved out of the public domain, most of these lands have long since passed into private ownership so that satisfaction of the public need will require a significant land acquisition effort. The most recent appraisal information available to the committee indicates that the lands needed can be acquired for \$19,800,000. To the extent that property owners take advantage of the many built-in options available to them, this cost might be significantly reduced. I am very hopeful that this estimate, like others in more recent years, will prove to be reliable and that no increase will be necessary in the years ahead. I hasten to add, however, that if this administration continues to fund authorizations as promptly as possible—as it has—then we should see this project completed at a cost near the estimate provided.

For development of the area, the bill calls for an appropriation of \$18,769,000. This is a most important item if the visitor load anticipated at this area is to be properly dispersed throughout this lake-

shore. Overcrowded conditions would not only destroy the resource which we seek to protect for all Americans for all time, but it would thwart the recreational objective of this legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that this proposal has been thoroughly reviewed by the committee. We feel that it resolves the objections which have been raised over the years and we urge its approval by the Members of the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is a rare occasion, indeed, when I disagree with my former colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or when I fail to support the recommendations of my good friends and congressional neighbors in the Michigan delegation—and I regret that I must do so on this occasion. It was my privilege to serve on the Interior Committee during my first 4 years in the Congress—on the National Parks Subcommittee, as a matter of fact. It was a most valuable experience for which I shall always be grateful—and certainly when I left that group to become a member of the Committee on Appropriations I did so with an even greater appreciation of the heavy responsibility of the Congress to this and future generations for the preservation and protection of our Nation's natural beauty and wise development of its recreational potential. In this regard, let me add that the people of this country owe a deep debt of gratitude not only to our distinguished colleague, Chairman ASPINALL, but also to the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and the members of the Subcommittee on Natural Parks and Recreation, for their conscientious and dedicated efforts in these important matters.

But both as a citizen and a Member of this body, I would be remiss in my duties here if I remain silent on this legislation—if I fail to express for the record what I know to be substantial and growing opposition to this proposal—and why I feel that H.R. 18776 is not wise legislation.

National parks legislation is, of course, unique, for while these bills are considered under broad national policy guidelines, they still have greater impact on some groups of citizens than others. I recognize, too, that seldom is it possible for all Members of the House to have personal knowledge of areas affected—and since I am well acquainted with the Sleeping Bear area, I feel it is incumbent upon me to bring my views to your attention.

I say that I have personal knowledge of this section because for many years my family has owned a cottage on Crystal Lake in Michigan—and although this is not or never has been within the boundaries or will be directly affected by proposals for a national lakeshore at Sleeping Bear, nevertheless the time that I have spent vacationing there over the years has given me an opportunity to know the area, to assess the degree of

public support from the people most directly affected, and to form a judgment as to the necessity for this new facility. I know, too, of the deep sense of pride which local residents have traditionally taken in the natural beauty of Sleeping Bear and the diligence with which they have sought through wise planning to preserve it—and I was pleased that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), did pay them a specific compliment for their efforts in his opening comments during these hearings.

Certainly I can understand why the people there feel that the establishment of a national lakeshore is not the best way to conserve the natural beauty of the area, and their fears are borne out by the predictions of officials of the National Park Service that there will be some 3 million visitations to the proposed park annually, which actually means the bulk of these will be in a very short period—mostly during the summer months. Contrary to what many conservationists and preservationists believe, the purpose of this measure is not preservation, but recreation. In my judgment, the result will be the destruction of the natural beauty of Sleeping Bear which the local people have so well protected over the years.

It seems to me that in these times when the President is asking for greater fiscal responsibility—when the people of the Nation are clamoring for control of inflation—and when we are becoming increasingly aware of the need for careful planning in the future if we are to restore environmental quality and avoid the follies of past actions, there are several questions we must ask ourselves not only on this but on all future legislation dealing with new authorizations for such facilities:

First, is it essential?

Second, is there reasonable public support in the area most directly involved?

Third, are the provisions for acquiring the property just and equitable?

Last, will this add to the already difficult problems of environmental pollution?

There are many others, of course, but these seem to me to be the obvious and critical ones in this instance.

So we ask ourselves—is this legislation essential?

I must say in all candor that I do not believe it is—even though I recognize the growing need for public recreation areas. Today we are being asked to authorize many millions for still another Federal recreational facility in a State already rich in recreational opportunities—and while this may be desirable from the standpoint of mass public recreation, I think the times require that we distinguish between what is necessary and what may be merely desirable for some. If you have read the committee hearings on this bill, you know that Michigan now has six federally controlled parks, forests, and refuges—that over 18 percent of the State is already in public ownership—and not only does Michigan rate second in national forest acreage east of the Rockies, it leads the Nation in the number of State parks and

recreation areas. Its State parks alone total more acreage than that of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin combined. At a time when we are so concerned with priorities—when so many other areas of the Nation still lack adequate recreational facilities—this does not seem to me to be a priority item.

What about public support in the area? As I have already pointed out, widespread opposition exists among a majority of the residents and not only residents, but many in the surrounding areas, for instance, the Traverse City Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution opposing the bill. The greatest support for the proposal comes from those who live a considerable distance away and would have infrequent opportunity to make use of the park. I believe that the success of such a project depends to a considerable degree on enthusiastic public support from those most directly concerned.

And now as to the provisions for acquiring property, I feel these are not equitable as written with a cutoff date of December 31, 1964. Under this bill, any property in the area which has been improved within the last 5 years is subject to condemnation, and this is certainly not consistent with treatment afforded citizens in other States in previous legislation enacted by the Congress. I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to correct this inequity.

How would the establishment of this lakeshore affect the already difficult problem of environmental pollution? Everyone today is concerned about ecology, but the residents of the Sleeping Bear area have observed pollution control programs for many years. Certainly there is no need for a Federal takeover because the State of Michigan already owns the Sleeping Bear Dunes. It is a State park, and it is fully protected and open to the public. There is no fee for entrance to this State park—although private concessions do operate dune buggies at a modest charge. On the other hand, national parks do have entrance fees of from \$1 to \$7 for those who do not hold a Golden Eagle Passport which sells for \$10 a year.

Furthermore, land in the designated area is presently zoned under county and township ordinances and is protected against undesirable uses. Three million visitations annually to the Sleeping Bear area will create an environmental pollution problem of immense proportions. I might point out, also, that the proposal provides that the State of Michigan donate the State-owned land in the park area to the Federal Government. Apparently the State has indicated a willingness to donate the land. However, this would require action on the part of the State legislature since there is a law in Michigan which prevents such land from being donated. A resolution was adopted on June 8, 1970, by the State legislature to repeal this law—but this was merely a resolution of intent and not provide for outright repeal. There is no assurance that this will be done. Here we are being asked to legislate on the assumption that another legislative body may act accordingly. In

my judgment, this is not good legislative procedure—and I am sure you will agree. Even if such action is taken, the right of the State of Michigan to give away public land could well be challenged in the courts.

Also, and a most important point to consider, the question of funding this legislation raises great doubts in my mind. At this particular time when so many urge the Congress to curb the inflationary spiral and reduce taxes, I feel that this is not the time to initiate more costly Federal projects.

Also, the cost estimates which have been projected thus far for the Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore are unreasonably low. Under the provisions of this legislation, acquisition of land is estimated at \$19.8 million, and development \$18.8 million, with an escalating provision for ordinary fluctuations in cost. Those acquainted with land values—and I would say experts might be those who have recently purchased land—in the area know that \$75 million is a more accurate cost figure for acquisition. As a matter of fact, an undeveloped tract in the area recently sold for \$1,000 an acre, and unimproved land throughout the vicinity is now selling for from \$1,000 to \$1,500 an acre, with lake frontage \$200 a foot.

The cost of the 35-mile highway needed for access to the proposed park is estimated at \$300,000 per mile, but, as we all know, the cost of the Interstate System has averaged about \$1 million per mile—and in view of the terrain in this area many feel that the cost will equal or exceed this figure.

To be taken into consideration also is the fact that there is no sewer system to accommodate the expected 3 million visitors annually, and to solve the sewer problem would cost the Federal Government an additional \$12 to \$15 million although there is a ceiling of \$18.8 million for all development. There is not an adequate sewer system in the entire taking area at this time—a fact we should not overlook.

We are now many millions of dollars behind in appropriations for parks already authorized. What will happen in the Sleeping Bear area if this legislation is passed and announcement is made of a newly authorized National Lakeshore in Michigan, when no provisions are ready for this great influx of people because of lack of funds and facilities? Rather than preserving an area of great natural beauty for future generations, which should be the purpose of this legislation, the result of this bill could be disastrous, causing irreparable damage, however unintentional.

It seems to me, too, that the question of administering such a large recreational project must also be considered in view of the recent news reports of difficulties being encountered in Yellowstone National Park and elsewhere—and it may be wise to defer development of new areas until it is demonstrated that we can properly police and administer what we already have. What good are more recreation areas if they are only playgrounds for vandals and of no use to those for whom they are intended.

Also, in reply to a query in the hearing before the Interior Committee as to whether it might be necessary to take additional property to accommodate the influx of visitors, the Director of the National Park Service responded that this legislation would allow flexibility, should such circumstances develop.

These are just a few of the reasons I feel that the Sleeping Bear project is not feasible. Certainly I share the deep concern of all in the Congress over the preservation of our natural landmarks and recognize the need for proper recreational areas; but since the Sleeping Bear Dunes is already under preservation by the State of Michigan and local zoning ordinances and may be enjoyed by the public now, free of charge, it is my opinion that the substantial costs involved—the fact that legislation must be enacted by the State of Michigan before this bill is effective—and the fact that this is principally a recreation rather than a preservation project—with the potential for severe damage to the ecology of the region—makes approval under present conditions impractical.

It has been suggested that if a national park is strongly desired in this area, it would be far more feasible to develop the 444,000-acre Manistee National Forest which is less than a 30-minute drive from the Sleeping Bear area—and actually closer to the large urban centers—land which is presently owned by the Government and which is underdeveloped.

These are my sincere and impartial convictions. My only interest is wise legislation—and I repeat that I would be remiss in my duties if I did not voice what I know to be the objections and vital concerns of those most directly involved.

I hope you will consider H.R. 18776 very carefully and that you will agree with me that this legislation does not merit approval.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not begin my remarks by thanking all of those Members of the House, especially the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL); the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR); and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), for their endurance and tremendous effort that finally has brought this bill before the House of Representatives.

As the chairman mentioned in his opening statement, this bill has been twice approved by the other body. In the 89th Congress, this bill was approved by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. However, this is the first time the bill has ever come before the House.

I think, too, that the efforts of the Michigan delegation ought to be noted in connection with bringing this bill to the floor today, particularly the work of my good friend, a member of the committee, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT, who

represents the area in which the proposed park is located.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of difficulty with this bill. But I think that it is the kind of difficulty that we have encountered with other bills in the past and that we are going to encounter frequently in the future as we make a stepped-up effort to conserve open space and scenic areas that are so rapidly being depleted by urbanization and by development. We are going to have to move quickly and firmly in this field. We are going to encounter difficulties such as we had with Sleeping Bear more frequently in the future as we try to preserve open space, recreational areas, and scenic areas that our citizens—especially the people who live in the very heavily populated eastern and midwestern parts of the United States can enjoy.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that Sleeping Bear Dunes lies within an easy day's automobile drive of well over 10 million people.

Now, there are other beautiful parks already established around the country, but many of them will never be visited by the residents of some of the large urban centers of the Great Lakes area. Sleeping Bear is a beautiful national lakeshore that will be visited by millions of those who reside in our cities and suburbs in our generation and in generations to come.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very proud and very pleased that we have gotten this far.

I wish to assure the members of the Committee that this bill has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and has been extensively amended since its first introduction. All legitimate objections have been given very careful and very thorough consideration. We have a far different and a very much better and fairer bill before us today than any bill that has been before us on this subject or, indeed, on any park proposal with which I am familiar.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a bill of which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as the entire House can be proud.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT).

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 18776.

This legislation, if adopted, will establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore of 61,000 acres in my congressional district in western Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is supported by the administration, it is supported by Michigan's Governor, Michigan's Legislature and Michigan's Department of Natural Resources. It is also supported by every conservation group in the State of Michigan and these groups are dedicated to the preservation of the environment. It is supported by the entire Michigan congressional delegation on both sides of the aisle.

Proposals to create a Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore have been before the Congress for 10 years. I opposed the original proposal as I would oppose it

today and as I would continue to oppose it in the future.

Mr. Chairman, in my first public utterance on the subject at a public rally in 1964, I said I was opposed to it and my opposition was based upon two fundamental objections, the lack of reimbursement provisions to the local units of government for any loss of tax revenues and condemnation provisions as they related to unimproved property. Those two objections were voiced again in testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it held hearings in Traverse City in 1964.

When I came to this body my first official business was to publish a position paper on Sleeping Bear Dunes spelling out where I stood on the issue. I said that my objections went to these points and suggested that probably the ideal approach would be an appropriation by the Federal Government to the State of Michigan for the purpose of enlarging the two existing State parks located in the area.

To say that the legislation which I then introduced met with little enthusiasm would be the understatement of this afternoon. It was received with the active support of not a single Member of this body. It did not receive the support of the Michigan Governor or the legislature, or the Department of Natural Resources. It was rejected by the previous administration. And when it was rejected finally and completely and fully by this administration I began to get the message that maybe my bill was not going to go anywhere. That was not an eventuality that had been unanticipated. I observed in that position paper what I think everyone else has run into somewhere along the line; one does not always get exactly one's way in the legislative process. I said, if my bill were rejected and if the support for Sleeping Bear remained overwhelming, I would see my duty and my responsibility to work as hard as I could to obtain modification and commitments that would enable the solving of those two problems that had been unsolved in the 6 or 7 years the Sleeping Bear Park legislation had been kicking around.

As the situation stands today, those two problems have been totally and completely resolved.

I extracted, first of all, from then Gov. George Romney and later from our present Gov. William Milliken, and from Michigan legislative leaders on both sides of the aisle, an indication that they intended to provide State reimbursement for any loss of local tax revenues. That indication has now been formalized in a resolution adopted unanimously by both houses of the Michigan Legislature stating their intent to provide for State reimbursement so that not 1 penny of tax revenue will be lost to any of the local units of government.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would ask the gentleman: Would it be a fair ob-

servation to state then that the State representatives and the State senators in the area affected will definitely work in the Michigan Legislature to see that the June resolution is implemented so that indeed the local units of government will be reimbursed insofar as their tax revenue losses are incurred when that property goes into Federal ownership?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. The local representatives and the State senators have so stated to me, and every member of the Michigan House and, in fact, every member of the Michigan Senate so voted, because the vote was unanimous that it is the intention of the Michigan Legislature to provide for the reimbursement for any loss of local tax revenues.

Mr. RUPPE. So that there is no question as to the loss of revenue at the local level?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. No; this is on the basis of the June 1970 resolution that was unanimously passed.

But that leaves us with a second problem, and that is condemnation as it relates to unimproved property. There is no problem as I see it with the condemnation as it relates to improved property, for the longstanding cottage owner on the land will continue to own his cottage outright, lock, stock, and barrel, forever under the provisions of this legislation. This right of the improved property owner runs with the land. The longtime property owner retains his property in fee simple in perpetuity. It goes to each subsequent purchaser. But the owner of unimproved property could find himself in a far less desirable situation under previous bills. He could decide to sell his property, but the Federal Government could very well say that "we will take it some day, but we will not take it now," and therefore the owner would not want to develop that land and really use it and enjoy it, because it might be taken away from him at any moment. That leaves the owner with the dubious right of continuing to pay taxes on the land that he could not use for 20 or 30, or even 40 years, until the Government decided to take it off his hands.

That was the problem under previous bills.

We began negotiations with the Department of the Interior, and the National Park Service and, frankly, our negotiations were not bearing a great deal of fruit. Then the administration indicated to me that they were just about ready to endorse Sleeping Bear Dunes legislation.

Faced with the prospect of my administration endorsing legislation that was unacceptable to me, and to many of my constituents, we redoubled our efforts in negotiations, and out of those efforts came section 3 of this bill.

Section 3 of this bill requires the Secretary within 30 days of its passage to publish a map fixing the land into three categories:

Public use and development, land that will be condemned by the Government; private use and development, land that will not be condemned by the Government, and the third category, environmental conservation, mainly unimproved

property. A great segment of it will never be subject to condemnation, but rather to the right of the Government to purchase scenic easements.

One hundred fifty days after the passage of this legislation, the Secretary is required to have completed these negotiations and agreements, agreeing with many of the unimproved property owners never to condemn that land in exchange for scenic easements.

So I think with section 3 together with the hardship clause in this bill, which directs the Secretary to purchase unimproved property immediately, if the situation I describe were to arise, and also with the fact that the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior have assured that they anticipate 50 percent of funding within the first 2 years for land acquisition purposes, and also by virtue of the fact that the Congress this year has upped the allocation from \$200 million to \$300 million annually, and also by virtue of the fact that the administration has indicated it is releasing funds that have been held back, I think the possibility of the situation we were worried about under previous legislation ever emerging as a realistic possibility has been removed. The property owner has moved from a status of uncertainty to a status of certainty.

This bill before us now contains greater safeguards and protections for property owners of the area than any national lakeshore legislation or park legislation that has ever been before this body. That achievement would not have been possible without the cooperation of the original sponsors of the legislation. It would not have been possible without the cooperation of the chairman and in particular the painstaking attention and study given to it by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina.

It also would not have been possible without the counsel, guidance and help and understanding of the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania nor without the help, understanding and cooperation of many friends and colleagues on the committee on both sides of the aisle.

But an interesting thing has happened to this bill on its way to this moment in its legislative history. Although the opposition in 1966 really centered around those two fundamental problems, now that the problems have been removed, the opposition remains.

As we look at the opposition, we see that those who are opposed have not been as interested in solving problems as in using the problems as arguments to defeat the legislation.

This opposition has been presented to this body I think extremely effectively and extremely eloquently and persuasively and persistently, and I think very importantly, by the gentlewoman from Illinois.

I think the opposition is based really on one underlying thought. I think it is a genuine, real concern—a downright fear that if this legislation passes, it will destroy rather than preserve and enhance the environment they have come

to know so well and have so much over the years. That is a concern that is not only important to express and to bring out, but it is one that deserves our very careful attention.

The argument is that 3 million people will be invading the area and they will bring with them hot dog stands and "Coney Island" concessions, leaving behind beer cans and wrappers and all of the encroachments of civilization. They also argue that we have taken care of the area through local zoning for the past 50 years and there is every reason to believe we can do a good job in the next 50 years.

If I could accept that argument—if I could believe that the area would remain, as it is today, forever I would be tempted to join the ranks of those who are opposed. But that is not the case. Change is already occurring.

Even with this cloud hanging over the area for the last 10 years we have seen development bit by bit and piece by piece. At this very moment there are dozens of developers, some of whom are known to me, waiting in the wings ready to pounce and proceed with pent-up speed to develop this area—if this House is so unwise as to reject the protections contained in this legislation this afternoon.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. I would just like to reaffirm what I have said before the committee and subcommittee in hearings, that I have never in my experience in Congress witnessed a more valiant fight to represent the interests of the people whom he represents than was demonstrated in the fight of the gentleman in the well. I think the legislation which we have before us today reflects his concern over the local interests that he does represent, and I want to commend him very highly for the kind of legislation which has resulted.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I thank the gentleman from Idaho. I am glad that I yielded to him.

In my remaining 30 seconds, let me just call attention to what will happen to the area, I believe, if we do not enact this legislation.

First, let me correct one possible misunderstanding. Much of the opposition and material that has been received in our offices refers to 3 million individuals invading the area. This is taken from testimony by the Director of the National Park Service before the committee. He is talking not about 3 million individuals, but about 3 million visitor-days.

If four people stay there 7 days—that is referred to as 28 visitors-days and not four people. There is a whale of difference between 3 million people and 3 million visitor-days.

There are two State parks within the area now with a couple of hundred acres of developed State park lands. Last year they logged over 700,000 visitors, which was double what it was 5 years ago. The Michigan Conservation Department estimates that it will double to 1½ million within the next 5 years, and in the 5-year period after that it will go up to 3 mil-

lion visitor-days—the very figure that strikes so much fear and concern in the hearts of those who are opposed. It is not a question of whether we are going to have 3 million visitor-days in the area. The question is how—how is the best way to cope with the inevitable population explosion in the area that we are going to have?

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I thank the subcommittee chairman.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think one of the toughest jobs is to be a Congressman in an area where a big national park proposal is pending, which is surrounded with controversy. In that situation you really separate the statesman from the politician. You separate the men from the boys.

I want to say that the gentleman from Michigan, who is in the well, has done as fine a job as I have seen in a tough situation of that kind in my 10 years on the committee. I want to commend him for it. It is a real tribute to his ability to negotiate. It is a real tribute to his statesmanship that he is able to come here today with the entire Michigan delegation, with problems in the Michigan Legislature ironed out. It would be a crime against the next generation and future generations if this bill were not passed. I think we owe something to the coming generations. We have the money. We are big enough as a country to do this. I would not take \$1 billion for Grand Canyon National Park. Future generations will condemn us deservedly if we do not avail ourselves of this opportunity and if we let 10 years of work on this project go down the drain.

I hope we will stand together and defeat all crippling amendments. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I believe he has done a magnificent job.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I sincerely thank the gentleman from Arizona. We would be hurting not only future generations but even those who are opposed to the legislation if we were to defeat it, because the proponents and the opponents of the legislation are not very far apart. They have exactly the same objective, exactly the same goal, and that is the preservation of the natural beauty of this area.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to commend my friend from Michigan for a very able presentation and commend him for his position on behalf of this legislation. We in Michigan are proud of what he has done, and also what our good friend and colleague JIM O'HARA has done on this legislation. Our delegation is strongly and uniformly in favor of the legislation. Again I wish to express the thanks of the delegation from Michigan to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) and the members of the

committee for having made this legislation possible.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I thank my good friend from Michigan and commend him for his very able work on this legislation.

With the inevitable invasion into the area of 3 million visitors these days the question I repeat is: How can we best cope with this problem? Not whether the people will come but how we can cope with them. Certainly our chances of preserving the environment are greater if we can spread 3 million visitor days over 61,000 acres rather than cramming them into a couple of hundred acres. And the spillover and overflow into the surrounding communities will be less if there are 61,000 acres of opportunity rather than 300 acres of opportunity.

That is why every single conservation group in the State of Michigan, every single group that has studied it nationally, groups that are dedicated to preservation, have studied the situation, are unanimously and in solid support of this legislation. That is what they believe will happen in terms of protecting and enhancing the environment. If this legislation passes.

But that is not enough. In closing, I would like to point out what I think goes to the heart of what the dispute is all about. Let me point out what I think is the most important change we were able to make in the original proposal. The preamble states that it shall be one of the primary purposes of this legislation to see that the area's features are preserved in their natural setting and protected from developments and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area.

The Secretary is then directed to "administer and protect the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in a manner which provides for recreational opportunities consistent with the maximum protection of the natural environment within the area."

A more ringing reaffirmation rather than destruction simply never has appeared in Lakeshore legislation than is contained in this bill. I say to achieve the goal both the opponents and proponents are trying to achieve, we must support this legislation. That goal of both is the preservation of the majesty of Sleeping Bear and the beauty of its surroundings.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last year during the August recess some of the members of the subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation had an opportunity to visit this proposed lakeshore and discuss it with interested proponents and opponents. While we did not hold formal hearings at that time, we did hold extensive hearings in Washington last June. At that time the members of the subcommittee heard every witness desiring to testify.

We were impressed by the beauty of this area, by the open undisturbed beaches on Lake Michigan, the beautiful blue inland lakes surrounded by rolling ridges and overlooks, and well-spaced and well-kept summer homes.

I could understand why the National

Park Service felt that this area was needed for park purposes and I could understand why the cottage and summer homeowners wanted it left undisturbed for their enjoyment. No one today will contend that this area is unworthy of national recognition.

Rising above Lake Michigan are some of the Nation's most spectacular sand dunes which offer a different type of scenery and a fairly unique recreational opportunity. Likewise, the islands in this area make a contribution to the overall purpose of the project.

There is plenty of beautiful clean water, and water is a recreation magnet.

We concluded that the Sleeping Bear Dunes area is a magnificent part of this country.

As a result of the hearings, we revised the legislation to reflect some of the amendments suggested and incorporated them into a clean bill, which was reviewed by the full committee before being reported to the House. Among the changes adopted by the committee were provisions which were designed to satisfy objections raised to the legislation.

We included language in the bill to emphasize that the thrust of the lakeshore legislation should include preservation of the scenic beauty of the area as recommended by some of the opponents of the bill.

We included a classification system in the bill recommended as a constructive improvement by the resident congressman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT), who spoke so effectively a few minutes ago, which assures property owners of a prompt decision by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the need for their lands for the lakeshore in an effort to satisfy some of the opponents of the bill.

We are recommending language which enables a qualified property owner—on his own initiative—to avoid the threat of condemnation if he voluntarily restricts the use of his property to uses compatible with the purposes of this act. Of course, the bill includes, also, the usual language suspending the power of eminent domain where approved zoning ordinances are in effect. And we provided that the Secretary should expedite the acquisition of those properties where the owners wished to sell and we required him to make every effort to negotiate the purchase of a property before taking action to condemn it.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee made a sincere effort to satisfy the opponents of this legislation, and I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) a few minutes ago. We have gone further in protecting the property owners in this bill than in any similar bill which has come out of our committee and been presented on the floor of this House for many years.

We feel that much has been achieved and that, while some opposition remains, there has also been some shift in attitude favorable to this bill.

Four years ago this matter was quite controversial. Today, local people remain concerned about the proposal and that is

true of all national parks and recreation areas authorized, but all of the members of the Michigan delegation have introduced bills calling for the establishment of the lakeshore. In addition, the Governor's representative testifying before our subcommittee stated that the State administration favored the creation of a national lakeshore and the State legislature approved a resolution indicating that it would make the State-owned lands available by donation if the lakeshore is established. I believe the State of Michigan went further than any other State has gone on a project similar to this by agreeing to assume the responsibility of in lieu tax payments to the counties involved until the tax loss is offset by economic growth produced by the national lakeshore. The Board of County Commissioners of Benzie County approved a resolution supporting this lakeshore proposal.

Conditions at Sleeping Bear, as in other natural recreation areas, are changing. Detroit and Chicago are within easy driving distances. Visitors are increasing and there will be future problems of crowding and pollution whether a park is created or not.

We must admit, however, that creating a national lakeshore area will greatly increase the number of summer visitors to the area; but on the other hand the National Park Service will invest millions of dollars to provide facilities to handle the crowds and will help solve the problems of growth. I want to emphasize that no witness with any experience in park planning indicated that this lakeshore would be incapable of carrying the visitor load anticipated.

The park would consist of three detached units connected only by the proposed scenic road and by State roads. Even though the scenic road is an expensive element of the overall proposal, I believe that it is necessary. Its deletion would diminish the manageable use of the area by the public and would cause congestion of the existing roads located in privately owned areas.

To local businessmen, the prospect of millions of additional visitors is good news. It means a demand for more motels and restaurants, service stations, and other service establishments. It means a needed boost in the local economy.

To the nonresident owners of the summer homes it means sharing a beautiful section of America. The question here, as in many other park proposals, is should the area be left primarily for the enjoyment of the fortunate few who are in position to purchase summer homes there, or should a portion of this beautiful area be dedicated to the recreational needs of all of the people of Michigan and Illinois and the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We might like to put this national lakeshore somewhere else if we could find an equally desirable location where there would be no opposition, but I know of no such place. If we are going to provide

recreational opportunities then they must be located where they can do the most good for the most people. They must be superlative in every respect and we think Sleeping Bear is such a place.

H.R. 18776 will make it possible for everyone to have an opportunity to enjoy the Sleeping Bear area. At the same time, it will provide the maximum possible protection for private individuals owning property in the area. For these reasons we feel that the bill should be approved and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE), a member of the committee.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, legislation to create the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan has been under active consideration since 1961. Since that time, all 19 Michigan representatives have supported various proposals for the establishment of the national lakeshore. Two successive Governors and both houses of the Michigan Legislature have registered their interest in the passage of such legislation. Today, finally, a Sleeping Bear Park proposal has been brought to the floor of the House.

The recreational value of the 60,000 acres under consideration is unquestioned. The mainland and the islands to be included harbor over 60 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline for vacationers and sightseers. The breathtaking dunes, and the surrounding forest land, provide scenic sites for hiking and picnicking. The area is accessible to midwestern cities, and will therefore help to provide outdoor relaxation space for the people of our midwestern metropolitan areas. It is no wonder that the National Park Service has recommended for over 10 years that the Sleeping Bear Dunes area be included in our recreational system.

Perhaps more important, however, in this time of conservation crisis, is the need to preserve the unique Sleeping Bear Dunes for its ecological value. The dunes area itself lies on a great headland extending into Lake Michigan. Here, the ever-shifting winds off the lake shape a dynamic landscape of dune forms. Geographers, naturalists, and conservationists alike call this the most spectacular dunes display in the United States. The setting includes much more—forested hillsides, quite inland lakes, broad sandy plains covered with pine forests alternating with grassy swales. In fact, the islands large variety of plant growth, including some 50 acres of virgin timber, and the United States largest northern white cedar, is also of continuing interest to the environmental scientist. Certainly, we have a responsibility to preserve the Sleeping Bear Dunes area, not only for future recreational use, but also for future environmental study.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes landscape is however already endangered. Precisely because of its special attractiveness, it is under threat of dismemberment and dilution of its unique character. A quiet wooded peninsula between Lake Michigan and a nearby inland lake can be a haven for restful relaxation along a na-

ture trail. Or, it can be the site of a subdivision—and that subdivision stands today. The extensive shoreline along Lake Michigan offers many an opportunity for a sunset stroll along the sands. Or, that stroll can be marred by "no trespassing" signs and crowded cottages—and those cottages are abounding today. The threat to the area is not some kind of massive, intentional assault, but the slow and subtle encroachments of individual developments, subdivisions, roadways, and commercial establishments. Taken all together, these constitute a real and present danger to the Sleeping Bear Dunes landscape.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this area be brought under unitary planning and control, so that its development and use can be stabilized, so that public use will not be haphazard. That is the intent and main objective of this legislation.

Residents of the Sleeping Bear area, not surprisingly, have been concerned with the necessary changes which must be made to establish the national lakeshore. The members of the Interior Committee, and the Michigan cosponsors of the legislation, have worked especially hard to protect current area property owners. Allowances have been made for those citizens who previously improved their land, and wish to maintain their property within the lakeshore boundaries. The bill, furthermore, gives unprecedented flexibility to the Secretary of the Interior to work with private citizens groups to provide for equitable acquisition procedures for needed land. There are also provisions which require the Secretary to work with local units of government to enact proper zoning restrictions to safeguard area residents. The bill then, directs the Department of the Interior to insure that the national lakeshore benefits, not jeopardizes, the interests of area residents.

The Interior Committee has seen the need to expand the national park system, to provide for the outdoor relaxation needs of our increasingly urban nation. The committee voted to report this bill to the House floor, because the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will be an outstanding addition to our outdoor sport system. At the same time, the committee has sought to put this unique area under Federal jurisdiction, so that it will be protected from future overdevelopment and ruin. Under the direction of the Department of the Interior, the area will be preserved for the use of current area residents, and for the many future visitors to the northern Michigan region.

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the full committee for his interest in the legislation as well as that interest and support expressed by the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR); the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR); deserves both the commendation and appreciation, for his interest, sponsorship, and wise counsel on this legislation; and to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) for his unquestioned efforts to bring the various proponents and opponents of the legislation into agreement on legislation that would be in the best

interests of the people involved and of the State of Michigan and yet preserve these precious dunes for future Americans. I would like to congratulate, too, the gentleman from the district involved (Mr. VANDER JAGT) for developing legislation which protects the interests of the property owners to a greater extent than has ever been the case heretofore in legislation of this type.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I first want to note that it takes considerable courage for a Member to offer opposition to a bill of this kind, because at least the political opposition almost immediately begins to complain that the one raising objections is antienvironment or anticonservation.

Our Member from Illinois who has objected to this legislation has demonstrated courage and she has also made a very thoughtful and logical presentation.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to permit this bill to come to the floor in the committee in spite of some very serious reservations which are similar to those expressed by the gentlewoman from Illinois and others.

This is the first time this bill has appeared on the floor; it is not the last time this matter will appear on the floor. I do not care what kind of an appraisal the Department of the Interior makes on land, I do not think their appraisal is accurate. We have further evidence that in this instance particularly, when land is selling for \$1,000 and \$1,500 an acre, it appears obvious that the estimated cost here is going to be twice what the Department says it is.

Now, really, maybe that is not very important. However, it has happened almost every time before.

There is certainly another matter which is important. Mr. Chairman, before we get through with these discussions about saving and preserving areas, the cat gets out of the bag as it did in the hearings, as it did in the discussions and as it has now on the floor of the House.

Many of the people who tell us to preserve this area are arguing the case not because their first consideration is preserving the land, but it is rather economic development, to build the filling stations and the hotels and so on that are going to come to this area. We need a new highway because otherwise the State roads would be chock full of people. And then we get into the argument as to whether there will be 3 million people a year or 3 million visitor-days. What I think about is the damage resulting when 3 million people walk over the dunes once.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina said that we visited this place and there are open, undisturbed beaches. They are there. They are beautiful. These dunes are tremendous, ecologically and esthetically. Any way you want to look at them they are beautiful. I want to save them. I do not know how you can save these fragile dunes by marching 3 million people across them.

Now, someone says, perhaps, we are going to make a wilderness out of them. Mr. Hartzog said we probably could not because they are crisscrossed with jeep trails and roads. I do not want those dunes lost. We do have another area with woods even closer to the big cities than is the beach. There are 440,000 acres of forest which the Government owns closer to these cities that need recreation. It is there.

Mr. Chairman, if we want a playground, let us put in those words.

The subcommittee chairman says we need recreational opportunities. One does not go and stand behind a fence and look at these dunes and get that recreational opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, the State owns 21,000 acres of land and 7 miles of beaches. This is protected. I want to protect that whole area. I am absolutely sincere about it.

I do not know what property in that area is worth, and I hasten to add that neither I nor the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois owns any property or has financial interest in that area in any way. There is one thing that absolutely should be taken care of in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about what we have done for the property owners here. We say we have protected their rights more than we have protected the rights of people anywhere else. That is true with reference to some of the people. It is a little like the expression by George Orwell that some people are equal but some are more equal than others. I say this because if you happened to purchase your property and built on it after December 1964, you do not have all of these protections which we so nobly provided for the other citizens. I think, maybe, that as citizens of the United States these people have just as much right to the same treatment, whether they built their home in 1965 or 1963.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unhappy with anyone who has promoted this legislation. I think that the members of the committee and the members of the Michigan delegation have been completely and totally interested in conservation, and they will admit there is some question of preservation.

I do hope, though, in response to an amendment which will be offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID) that we can provide the treatment about which we boast to all of these people here, and not just to some of the people. I think we would then have improved this bill a very great deal.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I hope that the House will pass this bill today and that it

will become law in this session of this Congress.

In 1957, the Park Service of this country was ordered by the Congress to make surveys of the lakeshore areas of the Great Lakes, and this was one of the areas selected for national park status. Since that time there has been some opposition to it. The gentleman who represents the area, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT), told you why, as a member of the State legislature at that time, he was opposed to it.

He has also told you that since that time the two principal objections to it have been resolved.

Now, let us look into what has happened to this legislation:

In the 89th Congress the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported this bill. It went to the Committee on Rules. Unfortunately, because of the date at that time, the Committee on Rules refused to grant a rule. Let me show you what that has cost the taxpayers of this country. In a 4-year period the estimated price by the Park Service of this land has tripled, and if this bill is defeated today and it is brought up at the next session of the Congress it will have increased—and perhaps tripled—again.

Now, I heard the plea then that we should not do this because of the costs involved. Well, is it not strange that the President of the United States, who has made that plea on account of our finances, has had the Director of the Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior state to our committee and to the Congress of the United States that this is one of the bills he wants in this session of the Congress?

Now, it has been said that there were some things that were not taken care of, and that we ought to wait for the State legislature to act. The policy that we have in this bill is the same basic policy that we have had in a number of other bills. Just picking two that comes to mind in the great State of Texas, I recall that it reserved all of its public lands when it was admitted to the Union. In addition, it reserved all of its minerals for school purposes and for the education of children. Under no circumstances could those minerals be given away.

Well, very frankly, when we considered both the Big Bend National Park and the Guadalupe Mountains National Park we told the State legislature—at the recommendation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the corresponding unit on the other side of the Capitol—"If you want a park, you give us the minerals."

The State legislature gave to all of the people—not just to the people of Texas, but to all of the people of the United States—those minerals. We now have two viable units of our national park system with a reasonable Federal investment.

I believe that the State Legislature of Michigan said and I believe what the last two Governors of the State of Michigan said; namely, if the Congress would pass this bill and set aside this area for all the people of the United States, they will give to the people of the United States all of the State land that is in the area.

I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT), who represents that district. Let me recall to you what his figures were for the two little State parks that are included in the lakeshore. On about 21,000 acres, they already have—in 1970—700,000 visitor-days a year. In 5 years they expect 1,500,000 visitors, and in 10 years in those parks, if nothing is done, they expect 3 million.

So what we are trying to do is what our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa suggested, to make sure that this area is preserved.

The Park Service originally asked for a larger unit. We have included two islands offshore. If we pass this bill and make the appropriations for acquisition, within a very short time this will become one of the real viable units of our national park system—and it will be preserved.

You are not going to keep people out of that area. There are at the present time 436 improvements within the boundaries. Almost 300 of them are summer residences and about 61 are year-round residences.

But is it not strange that the State legislature has already told the counties that they will not lose any tax revenues? Is it not strange that one of the counties already has passed a resolution saying that they support this?

Let me remind the Members of this House about a situation that developed a few years ago. I remind you of this because it has tremendous significance today.

A number of years ago we recommended, as a unit of the national park system, the Cape Cod National Seashore—one of the really old inhabited sections of our country. From some of the little towns on Cape Cod came a number of vestrymen to tell the Members of the Congress how bad it was going to be, but there was an underlying current of people who were in favor of this, people not just in Massachusetts and not just in Cape Cod, but people all over the United States. So we passed that piece of legislation. The Secretary of the Interior and the Park Service said to the people in the Cape Cod area, if you will adopt the kind of ordinances and regulations that we ask you to do, we will not take your property unless it is absolutely necessary. They agreed to it and if you go up to Cape Cod today, and talk to people who are there, they will say, "Thank God that Congress had the wisdom to tell us a few years ago what should be done. What the Congress did was not just for us and our benefit, but it was for the benefit of all the people, even though we are the real beneficiaries of it."

So, Mr. Chairman, today I urge that this bill be passed and that it be passed unanimously.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure to serve in the Congress in this body for as long as this issue has been before the House and the Senate and the two committees in each of the bodies. At the outset it was

a most controversial proposal in the State of Michigan, and it was controversial for various reasons, one being the amount of acreage that was involved.

Another controversial proposal involved what the State legislature might do or what its reaction might be.

I think it is fair to say at the very beginning that Michigan newspaper editorial attitude was far from unanimous either way, and that feeling was predominantly the result of these differences involving acreage, local taxes, and so forth. But over the years—and it has been a long time—individuals who had different views on these controversial positions have been able to sit down and, to a substantial degree, I think, reconcile those differences. The net result is that we now have a bill before us that has an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House from our State, on both sides of the aisle, supporting this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill before the House today.

It has been my personal privilege, and I think it is a privilege for any American to have visited and walked or wandered around that beautiful area in our State. It certainly is an area of the country that must be preserved for future generations.

Let me make it crystal clear that I do not believe the people who have lived there generation after generation, and who live there now, would in any way destroy that area for the future. Over the years they have really been the ones who have basically preserved the area. I am certain that if they had not had this conscientious, dedicated interest in its preservation, long before now it would have been utilized for commercial purposes, and that gorgeous part of our State would have been destroyed or certainly damaged beyond repair.

So, I am not critical at all of those who have lived there one generation after another and who honestly believe that their method is the best way to save that area for future generations.

But I think we have to recognize that the more certain way, the more positive way to see to it that this area is not only preserved but open to more people or to all the people is by the enactment of this legislation. I just feel that this is the better course of action in trying to save an area in our State, not only for the 8 million residents of Michigan but also the literally millions and millions and millions of other Americans who, we hope, will come to see this gorgeous spot and be inspired by the sight and the natural beauty of that area of Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I do endorse, I do support, and I hope the House will approve this legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like the RECORD to show that both FORDS of Michigan are in complete accord in support of this legislation. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

From the very beginning of my career as a U.S. Congressman I have been sup-

porting Senator PHILIP HART's never-ending battle to set aside for the use and benefit of people now, and in future generations, some of the most extraordinarily beautiful land and shoreline in this country—the Sleeping Bear Dunes of Michigan.

We vote today on H.R. 18776, a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. Creation of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will allow us to preserve a portion of Michigan's natural beauty which is not only a source of pleasure and recreation but also a force in shaping our values, molding our attitudes and feeding our spirits.

As a cosponsor of this legislation I am pleased to say that this bill is now supported by all of the Representatives from the State of Michigan. It has the support of the administration, the Secretary of Interior, the Governor of Michigan, the Michigan Natural Resources Commission, the Michigan Tourist Council, the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, the Mackinac chapter of the Sierra Club, and the vast majority of the citizens of the State of Michigan.

The proposed lakeshore would take in 61,000 acres which includes approximately 31 miles of shoreline on the mainland and 13 miles of shoreline on South Manitou Island which lies 7 miles off the mainland. The dunes within this area rise 460 feet above lake level and are unrivaled in the world by any other lakeside sand dunes.

As described by a 1965 Senate report:

The original Landscape in the area was formed by lobes of glacial ice advancing into the Grand Traverse-Sleeping Bear area. Between the lobes there were deposited great linear hills of glacial debris. The subsequent action of the wind and waves in creating dunes and blocking bays left the area marked with inland lakes. The whole region is one of the hills and lakes affording unusual vistas from hilltops across the inland lakes and dunes to Sleeping Bear Bay, Good Harbor Bay and Lake Michigan.

The geological formation created by ice, wind and water are readily traced and demonstrated to visitors in the area.

The biological features are many and varied, ranging from the maple-beech forest surrounding Glen Lake to the swamps of cedar, birch, jack pine, tamarack, spruce, and other species. Many rare plants are found on South Manitou Island, including the largest known northern white cedar tree in the United States. South Manitou Island also has a large nesting colony of herring gulls.

A large number of books, studies, and papers by geologists, biologists, and botanists written about the area make it well known in scientific, as well as tourist and vacationist circles.

This area is rich in a wide variety of recreational activities. Swimming, sunbathing, boating, water sports, hiking, camping, picnicking, photography, fishing and nature study are all popular activities with visitors to Sleeping Bear.

The area is also rich in history, including the Chippewa Indian tale explaining the name of the area. According to the legend, a mother bear and her two cubs began swimming across the Great Lake to escape a forest fire raging on the Wisconsin shores. As they swam the cubs fell behind, and soon were lost to their

mother's sight. When the mother bear reached the Michigan shore, she climbed a high bluff and lay down to await her offspring. The cubs, however, failed to reach the shore and became what is known today as the offshore islands of North and South Manitou. The mother bear, curled in anticipation, continues to wait, gazing from her bluff across the Manitou passage.

After all these years of waiting it is surely time for us to take action to preserve the Sleeping Bear for the enjoyment of future generations.

The opportunities to preserve this beautiful area for public outdoor recreation and education are diminishing each year without the comprehensive, planned, conservation, management and use that National Lakeshore status would provide. Such status would allow for the preservation, use and development of the Sleeping Bear area by: first, halting impairment of natural features by early acquisition of undeveloped nonagricultural land; second, protection and preservation of natural features while yet making them accessible to visitors through public ownership; and, third, rehabilitation or restoration of features already impaired.

Time is running out for Sleeping Bear unless we act. Our children will not be satisfied with tales of what it used to be like; they will want to see it for themselves—unspoiled and preserved in its natural beauty.

Senator PHIL HART has been constant and unswerving in his continued efforts, over the years, to have this area developed by the Federal Government for the people of Michigan and I am proud that we are, at long last, finally ready to act here in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 18776

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress finds that certain outstanding natural features, including forests, beaches, dune formations, and ancient glacial phenomena, exist along the mainland shore of Lake Michigan and on certain nearby islands in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Michigan, and that such features ought to be preserved in their natural setting and protected from developments and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area. In order to accomplish this purpose for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreation, and enjoyment of the public, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall administer and protect the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in a manner which provides for recreational opportunities consistent with the maximum protection of the natural environment within the area.

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore, full recognition shall be given to protecting the

private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

Sec. 2. (a) The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NL SBD 91,000 dated May 1969, which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

(b) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of those lands owned by the State of Michigan within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore (excepting not to exceed three hundred acres in the Platte Bay area) and of such additional lands, if any, as are necessary to provide an area which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 3. (a) Within thirty days, or as soon as possible thereafter, after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a map or other description of the lakeshore delineating areas constituting the following categories:

Category I, public use and development areas.

Category II, environmental conservation areas.

Category III, private use and development areas.

(b) Lands and interests therein designated as category I may be acquired by the Secretary in accordance with section 8 of this Act.

(c) Within one hundred and fifty days after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register an additional map or other description of those lands, if any, designated as within categories II and III for acquisition by him in fee in accordance with section 8 of this Act.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (f) of this section, the Secretary may, after the publication provided for in subsection (c), acquire only such interests in lands designated as category II, other than those to be acquired in fee simple, as he deems appropriate to insure the continued conservation and preservation of the environmental quality of the lakeshore.

(e) Except as provided in subsection (f) of this section, the Secretary may, after the publication provided for in subsection (c), acquire only such interests in lands designated as category III, other than those lands to be acquired in fee simple, as he deems appropriate to protect lands designated for acquisition.

(f) Not later than one hundred and fifty days after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall notify owners of real property in categories II and III, other than property designated by him for fee acquisition, of the minimum restrictions on use and development of such property under which such property can be retained in a manner compatible with the purpose for which the lakeshore was established. If the owner of any real property in categories II and III agrees to the use and development of his property in accordance with such restrictions, the Secretary may not acquire, without the consent of such owner, such property or interests therein for so long as the property affected is used in accordance with such restrictions, unless he determines that such property is needed for public use development. The foregoing limitations on acquisition shall also apply to any owners of real property to whom the Secretary did not, within the time set forth, give such a notice, except that if any property owner has not, within ninety days of the notice

agreed to use the property in accordance with the notice, then the Secretary may acquire, without limitation, fee or lesser interests in property by any of the methods set forth in section 8 of this Act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in subsections (d) and (e), and in this subsection, which limits the acquisition of the fee simple title to property within the lakeshore, shall prevent the Secretary from acquiring, without the consent of the owner, the fee simple title whenever in the Secretary's judgment the estimated cost of acquiring the lesser interest would be a substantial percentage of the estimated cost of acquiring the fee simple title.

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist ten years after the establishment of the lakeshore pursuant to section 2 of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12(f), and 13 of this Act.

Sec. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan and the United States applicable thereto. The Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate agency of the State of Michigan, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Sec. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provisions for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewable natural resources

as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) Within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall review the area within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore and shall report to the President, in accordance with subsections 3(c) and 3(d) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1132 (c) and (d)), his recommendation as to the suitability or unsuitability of any area within the lakeshore for preservation as wilderness, and any designation of any such area as a wilderness shall be accomplished in accordance with said subsections of the Wilderness Act.

(d) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer funds, transfer from any Federal agency, or exchange lands and interests therein for the purposes of this Act. When an individual tract of land is partly within the area designated, the Secretary may acquire the entire tract by any of the above methods to avoid the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside the designated area may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal lands within such area, and any portion of the land not utilized for such exchanges may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. An individual owning property within the lakeshore may notify the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, and the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and shall within one year following the submission of such notice, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property, offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase. The certificate of the determination by the Secretary or his delegate that there has been compliance with the provisions of this subsection and of subsection (b) of this section shall be prima facie evidence of such compliance.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the use of condemnation as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such townships or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No improved property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance therewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner thereof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owner's agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period, the Secretary may, in his discretion, acquire such property by condemnation.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a fifty-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a twenty-five-foot distance from the abutters' property lines. Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under, and of any exception made to the application of, such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

SEC. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1964, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into ac-

count the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land adjoining any such beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

SEC. 12. In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally lying within the parkway zone designated on the map specified in section 2(a) of this Act. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interest so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

SEC. 13. In any case not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1964, as long as, in his opinion, the use thereof would further the purpose of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$19,800,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$18,769,000 (June 1970 prices) for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, lines 18 through 24, strike out all of section 2(a) and insert in lieu thereof:

XCVI—2087—Part 24

"SEC. 2. (a) The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the 'lakeshore') shall comprise the land and water area generally depicted on the map entitled 'A Proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Boundary Map', numbered NL-SBD-91,000 and dated May 1969, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 11, strike out "two" and insert "four".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 5, strike out "property," and insert "property".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 22, strike out "delegatee" and insert "designated representative".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 11, line 6, strike out "townships" and insert "township".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 14, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "the abutters' property lines." and insert "all contiguous properties."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 7, line 6, delete "(f)".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this corrects a clerical error in the bill by removing a reference to a subsection no longer contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. REID OF ILLINOIS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. REID of Illinois: Page 16, line 8 and page 18, line 1, strike out "1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1968".

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer a very simple amendment. It

would merely change the cutoff date for compensation for improved properties as specified in section 11 from December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1968, which is approximately a year and a half from the date when serious consideration of this legislation began. As presently written in the bill, property on which improvements were made which increased its value in any way after the cutoff date of December 31, 1964, would be subject to condemnation—and I think almost everyone will agree that this is unreasonable under the circumstances. In my judgment, this is a matter of equity since this legislation should conform with precedents provided in earlier measures establishing national parks calling for cutoff dates from 1 to 2 years preceding the effective date of the act.

For example, the effective date of the Cape Cod National Seashore Act was August 7, 1961, with a cutoff date of September 1, 1959—roughly a period of less than 2 years. Also, the Fire Island Act had an effective date of September 11, 1964, with a cutoff date of July 1, 1963—slightly more than 1 year. The Assateague Island Act had an effective date of September 21, 1965, and a cutoff date of January 1, 1964—here again a period of less than 2 years. Why, then, should the people in Michigan be asked to accept a cutoff date of approximately 5 years under these same circumstances? Certainly it could not be argued that they had sufficient warning of impending approval of a national lakeshore in their area since they had no positive reason to know that the legislation would in fact be enacted—at least no more so than people in similar situations in the States of Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, or Virginia.

My amendment is no more than simple justice. It assures for the people of Michigan the same treatment the Congress has previously given to a great number of citizens in other States. It will also continue a precedent which may protect the interests of citizens in all of the 50 States in the future should similar situations arise in any of our districts. I ask for your support as a matter of fairness and justice.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first may I say that the gentlewoman from Illinois, as usual, with her degree of understanding of fairness and a desire to cooperate, advised me yesterday as to what was in her mind concerning this particular amendment.

I must say, as I oppose the amendment, I do so out of deference to the argument made by the gentlewoman, but I must bring to the attention of my colleagues just exactly what is involved.

The cutoff dates of other national park authorizations have some bearing, but they certainly are not controlling in this respect. December 31, 1964, happens to be the date which the people of the area were advised would probably be the cutoff time for some features of this bill. They knew that they were taking a chance if the Federal Government did authorize the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. They knew that they would not be given the same treatment

as those who had improved their properties prior to that time would receive.

Five years does seem like a rather extended period of time, but one of the areas to which the gentlewoman made some reference happened to involve 3 years. This just happens to be a longer period.

I should say that this bill is centered around this longer period of time. In fact, all of the bills introduced or considered by the Congress since 1965 which would authorize this lakeshore provided for this cutoff date. As a result, anyone who constructed improvements after that time did so with the knowledge that if the legislation were enacted then the property involved might be acquired by condemnation, if necessary.

It is not a question of providing compensation for improvements; it is a question of condemnation rights.

The provision in the bill recognizes that some people who have lived in the area for many years constructed improvements on their lands long before any national lakeshore was contemplated. These properties have been taken into consideration, and the acquisition and development costs reflect this fact.

I want to repeat this: that the acquisition and development costs which we are authorizing by this particular legislation reflect the fact that the properties involved have a cutoff date of December 31, 1964.

It is essential, however, that a date be established in the bill so that everyone involved in the proposal will know whether or not his property would be subject to the acquisition provisions of the bill.

Of course, every private property owner is entitled to just compensation for his property. It makes no difference what the cutoff date is. Regardless of the cutoff date, if his property is acquired by the Government for the lakeshore, he is entitled to just compensation.

If a person constructed improvements after the cutoff date and if the Government needs the property for public use and development—and this is the part to which the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) made reference—then the property may be acquired, but the Government must pay the fair market value of the property as of the time of the taking. That is true whether it is taken now or whether it is taken 5 years in the future.

In other words, the only effect of the cutoff date is to preclude someone who developed his property after December 31, 1964, from employing the provisions of the bill which were incorporated for the purpose of protecting people who made improvements prior to the active consideration of the legislation.

This happens to be one of the most important provisions in this kind of legislation.

This is an important issue, because it will affect the cost of this lakeshore. A change in the date could radically affect the development program presented to the committee because it would exempt properties from eminent domain procedures which could otherwise be acquired if necessary. Of course, if a particular

property is not needed for public purposes, it should not be acquired by the National Park Service regardless of when it was improved, but if it was improved after the cutoff date and if it is essential to the public use and enjoyment of the area, then the Government should not be precluded from acquiring it at its fair market value.

Needless to say, the Congress could provide that none of the privately owned lands should be exempt, but usually protections are written into legislation of this type for people who improved their properties prior to the active consideration of the legislation. Some people have gambled that this legislation would never be enacted and they have improved their lands without regard to it. If those lands are needed for this lakeshore, then they are not exempt. We should not change the date at this time, because it would substantially alter the program and would probably result in greater costs to the Government and restrict the public benefit to be derived from the area.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

From the very time that the first piece of legislation was introduced in this area this cutoff date has been included so that everyone in the area knows, and has had reason to know, that this would be the cutoff date. If this bill had passed in 1966, in the 89th Congress, when it was first reported to the Committee on Rules, this would have been only a 2-year period. The additional 4-year period has resulted from the failure of the House to act since 1966.

I would sincerely hope that this amendment would not be approved. As the gentleman from Colorado explained any property taken by condemnation for public use, entitles the person owning it to full compensation or fair market value of the property as of the date of the taking.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. I would like to say that the 1964 cutoff date is not a new date that the committee plucked out of the air this year to penalize anyone, but it was the date in the bill reported in the 89th Congress and subsequent Congresses as well. It is probably the date we have always had—or at least it is the latest one. If we pass this amendment, we might simply reward some speculators or other people who gambled on the fact that the Congress would never put this area in the national park system.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is a fair analysis of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. REID of Illinois) there were—ayes 21, noes 29.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. REID of Illinois and Mr. TAYLOR.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 24, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18776) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1198, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress met in a rare and important joint session to hear a report on American war prisoners being held in North Vietnam and to once again focus national and international attention on this tragic situation. The sad fact is that for 5 years the Hanoi regime has remained totally insensitive, unresponsive, and unresponsive to appeals for human decency in the treatment of American war prisoners. For 5 years the Hanoi regime has openly flouted the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention on the Humane Treatment of Prisoners—a pact which they signed in 1957. For 5 years they have failed to release the names of those American servicemen being held prisoner, failed to release the seriously sick and injured, failed to permit the impartial inspections of all prisoner-of-war facilities, and failed to permit the free exchange of mail. All of these abuses are in direct contravention to the Geneva Convention, and all of these abuses constitute the most flagrant violations of the laws of human decency and morality. Can there be a more shocking example of man's inhumanity to man than the treatment accorded to these prisoners, their wives, and families?

Let there be no mistake about it, what we are really talking about today is the dual imposition of torture by the North Vietnamese Government. Not only are the American prisoners of war being maltreated and being denied the decency and care to which they are entitled, but their wives, children, and parents have undergone untold suffering from being denied even the most basic information on the condition and whereabouts of these missing and captured servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, as if to compound all this human suffering and misery, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong are now trying to use American POW's as bargaining bait for a larger peace settlement. In their so-called peace initiative announced last week, they said they would be willing to consider discussing the release of American prisoners if the United States would only promise to be out of South Vietnam by mid-1971. While I would hope that we will thoroughly explore any new peace initiatives, I consider it a cynical and perverted exploitation of human misery to tie the fate of these individual prisoners to an overall peace settlement. This is just one more page in what columnist Chalmers Roberts has termed "the most sordid chapter" of the Vietnam war—the chapter relating to "the deliberately induced agony of the prisoners and their treatment by the Communists."

Mr. Speaker, let us reaffirm our resolve on this special day to keep this issue before the eyes of the public, both at home and abroad so that we might bring the pressure of world opinion to bear on the North Vietnamese. Let us continue to press this issue before the United Nations. And let us continue to press at the Paris talks for compliance with the Geneva Convention on the Humane Treatment of Prisoners, and for a negotiated exchange and release of prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to also announce that I am today joining with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) as a cosponsor of a resolution to designate this Veterans Day as a "National Day of Support for the U.S. Prisoners of Southeast Asia." I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this resolution which is designed to attract national and international support for the proper treatment and early release of Americans imprisoned in Southeast Asia.

NATIONAL DAY OF SUPPORT FOR U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR HELD IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing a resolution which would designate November 11, 1970, as a national day of support for U.S. prisoners of war held in Southeast Asia. An observance such as this would serve as focal point for the many individuals and organizations who have been working to arouse the conscience of the world in support of the Americans imprisoned in Southeast Asia.

After hearing Col. Frank Borman's vivid account of the situation and con-

ditions that our boys are facing as prisoners in Southeast Asia, I feel that we must exhaust every possible means to insure their proper treatment and earliest possible release.

November 11 is of special significance to the millions of Americans who have served their country in the Armed Forces. It seems appropriate to me that we should dedicate this year's observance of Veteran's Day in honor of the more than 1,500 Americans listed as prisoners or missing in action.

These men deserve our vocal and prayerful support to demonstrate to them and to their captors that they have not been forgotten. Hopefully, a strong national response will encourage reciprocal acts of justice and humanitarian treatment on the part of the Communists.

I have been encouraged by recent declarations from the Communist delegation to the Paris peace talks which at least demonstrate their awareness of our concern for the treatment and release of American prisoners. The Appeal for International Justice on May 1, the National Day of Prayer on May 3 declared by the President, as well as the congressional letter to Communist leaders signed by more than 400 U.S. Congressmen, have all served to enlist public opinion in favor of early release and humane treatment of the prisoners.

A national day of support on November 11 for U.S. prisoners of war now held in Southeast Asia could reinforce this Nation's determination to do everything within the bounds of peaceful endeavor to help these prisoners. Hopefully, every community, including civic, church, and veteran's organizations will organize appropriate ceremonies and activities on November 11 to leave no doubt in the mind of the enemy about our concern for the American men held in their prisons.

I ask that the President of the United States lead the national observance with appropriate ceremonies in Washington and I invite every Member of Congress to join in support of this resolution.

POLITICAL BROADCASTING

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, at 2 p.m., the Senate will vote on the conference report on S. 3637, the political broadcasting legislation. As is well known, this legislation, cleared by the House 247 to 112 last week, would repeal the equal-time requirement of the Communications Act as it effects candidates for President and Vice President, and would impose statutory limits on spending for radio and television commercials by all candidates for Federal office, and for Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

As a member of the subcommittee which worked on this bill, I am delighted that it now seems on the verge of enactment.

For a time, last month, partisan considerations threatened to blow apart the carefully wrought compromise plan pre-

pared by our Subcommittee on Communications and Power.

The main item of contention was the Senate provision, incorporated in the conference report, to make the new limitations on expenditures effective 30 days after enactment. This provision now is moot, because of the delay in acting on the conference report, and the limitations will not apply until after the November 3 elections.

The case for the bill was summed up yesterday by an excellent editorial in the Los Angeles Times. I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMIT TELEVISION CAMPAIGNS

(ISSUE.—What would pending legislation do to reduce the advantage enjoyed by the rich political candidate in the TV age?)

As a practical matter, it is too late to impose federal limitations on radio and television campaign spending in this year's election contests. Congress should nonetheless pass the bill which is awaiting final action in both houses, and President Nixon should sign it.

Under the terms of the measure approved by a conference committee, no candidate for federal office (including the Presidency) or for governor or lieutenant governor of any state, could spend more than 7 cents on these media for each vote cast in the previous election.

In primary contests, allowable spending for broadcast time would be 3½ cents a vote. These limitations would reduce such spending substantially from the customary levels of recent major elections.

In recognition of the fact that a lot of political spots are paid for by committees or "friends" of candidates, the limitations would apply to broadcast spending in behalf of a candidate as well as by the candidate himself.

The major impetus for the pending legislation has come, unsurprisingly, from the Democrats.

As members of a party which is out of power and in considerable disarray besides, their fund-raising has been far less productive than that of the Republicans. The idea of a legislative equalizer thus has an obvious and understandable appeal to the hard-pressed Democrats.

There is no question, however, that support for the measure goes far beyond narrow partisan considerations. It reflects genuine concern, even alarm among thoughtful citizens as to what unbridled television campaigning is doing to the democratic process.

As one commentator noted, television has tipped the political system in favor of the man who is already in office, on the one hand, and the man of wealth on the other. The one can command TV attention because of his position. The other can buy it.

The millionaire candidate who spends his way from obscurity to success, via television, has become an especially familiar figure on the political scene this year.

In Ohio, astronaut John Glenn suffered an upset defeat in the Democratic senatorial primary to a politically obscure businessman who mounted a major blitz on TV.

In New York, Rep. Richard Ottinger was scantily known outside his own district until he "borrowed" \$1.7 million from his mother and went after the Democratic senatorial nomination. After an enormously expensive television campaign, he got it.

The same kind of thing happened in several other states.

The point is not that the worst men won in such cases; the opposite may quite often be true.

But no democracy can safely tolerate a situation where wealth becomes a prerequisite for elective office.

The pending bill does not wholly solve the problem, of course.

The rich candidate could still spend his money on billboards or newspaper ads, or use his enormous personal resources for pre-campaign image-building. And the measure does nothing to correct the evil of the 30-second TV spot, in which the object is not so much to discuss the issues as to avoid or distort them.

The bill is a step in the right direction, however, and should be enacted.

WE SHOULD ELIMINATE THE CRUDE AND COSTLY PROCESS OF STRIKES IN AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the lettuce strikes in my district recently have reaffirmed a growing conviction by all affected parties that strikes are a crude and costly process—an outmoded and ineffectual method for settling labor-management disputes.

In the dear, dead days beyond recall, when labor-management relations was new and developing, the strike may have achieved some well-deserved gains for the workingman. Labor and management are much more mature, sophisticated, knowledgeable, and compassionate now. The technique of brute power, intimidation, and coercion are no longer necessary, or acceptable.

In a society which deplors war and terrorism and which is revolted by extortion and violence, we certainly must apply our wit and energy to develop a substitute for the strike and lockout in labor-management relations.

A strike seldom accomplishes anything for anybody. After the strike has ended or abated, there still must be negotiation. Really, every dispute must be negotiated. Neither disputant is going to be beaten into subjection. Forced agreements are not mutually beneficial, and, therefore, can neither serve the parties nor endure. Negotiation is the wise, decent, effective process for settling disputes. If negotiation is the civilized way of the future, why not use it now? Why go through the agony, losses, and waste of a strike? Why not negotiate first?

Acceptance of the concept of negotiation will require some new attitudes and the abatement of some old and specious clichés and shibboleths.

Acceptance of negotiation as a tool of both labor and management will require the reestablishment of good will—a mutual respect and confidence. The reestablishment of good will would be salutary. Strikes and lockouts diminish good will. Negotiation could help to make good will invincible.

Strikes and lockouts are outmoded and uncivilized; negotiation can achieve anything a strike can achieve; and all of the parties appreciate this. All parties would like to put strikes out of their minds.

Strikes hurt everybody and no longer help anybody. The rank and file worker, the regular union member is especially hurt. He loses work and wages. His fam-

ily must do without and suffer. No strike fund or loan arrangement measures up to wages.

Agricultural workers are especially prejudiced by a strike and loss of work—the losses usually occur when work is most plentiful and wages are highest. And when the strike is over, the harvest and work is finished and there is no other job until the next harvest. There is no recoupment. Agricultural workers' families know that a strike is ruinous to them. Many agricultural workers tell me they will never again strike, especially at harvesttime for anybody or for any cause.

Many wives of workers have told me how much they resented the recent lettuce strike which deprived them, and particularly their children, of so many things they badly needed. They will not permit their husbands to strike again at harvesttime for any labor leader or cause. They, too, believe more can be accomplished by negotiation than by striking. They believe it would be far wiser and more productive to negotiate than to worry through another strike period without income, food, clothing, and other necessities, especially when work is plentiful.

Actually, responsible labor leaders would prefer to settle disputes and grievances by negotiation rather than by strikes. Good labor leaders can accomplish much more by negotiation than by strikes. Most workers today no longer applaud the labor leader that threatens to call out "his men." "His men" do not want to be "called out." The union members are now expecting more from their labor leaders—they expect their leaders to accomplish results by their ability and persuasiveness and the facts. They do not want to be used—they do not want to lose work simply because some labor leader cannot sell his position well or does not perform well.

Labor leaders, who are responsible and capable—and most of them are—know how their members feel. They do not want to strike. Strikes usually make the labor leader look bad. Strikes cost the union members money and misery. Now, because the strike is available, the labor leader is often inadvertently overwhelmed and plunged into a strike situation which he would truly prefer to avoid.

The labor leader, the worker and his family, the employer and the consumers would all benefit if the strike was outlawed and a system of fair arbitration established for the settlement of farm labor-management disputes.

The Christian Science Monitor's view is worth contemplating.

I include the editorial of September 17, 1970, from the Christian Science Monitor entitled, "Crude and Costly Process":

CRUDE AND COSTLY PROCESS

The autoworkers have struck General Motors. A third of a million workers are home today. Factories across the continent, which normally would be turning out 132,000 cars a week, have skeleton crews looking after them. Half the output of America's largest industry is stilled, perhaps—if informed guesses are right—until Christmas.

Many of the 40,000 small supplier companies to General Motors will begin cutting back shortly, too, if they haven't already.

Thus, for all the sophistication and subtlety of the American wage bargaining process, how crude it seems in effect.

True, the United Auto Workers has \$120 million in its strike fund. At the rate of \$30 to \$40 per worker a week, this will last a month and a half. But this is about \$150 less than the workers' regular pay. General Motors too has been long enough in the black to "afford" a strike. But given the jump Ford and Chrysler will gain on them, and an already gray sales picture, the cost of the strike will be dear.

The auto strike, too, will likely alter the national economic picture substantially. General Motors accounts for half of the domestic car output. A period of unproductivity will likely wipe out whatever other gain the economy may have made in gross national product this fall.

Specifically, the union is asking for a 61.5 cents an hour raise. The average salary now is about \$4. The company has offered 38 cents. The union wants the larger figure to make up for the 26 cents an hour it says it gave up when it signed away an unlimited cost-of-living clause three years ago. It wants the clause reinstated. And it also wants a retirement plan that would let workers retire at \$500 a month after 30 years' service.

The auto union's salary demands are not outrageous, relative to recent settlements for the construction trades. But still it is hard for the outsider to assess whether the companies (especially Chrysler, which is in tough financial shape) can afford them. Or, rather, whether the American public can afford them in the form of higher prices.

In fairness, one can credit the gains—in working conditions, jobs for minorities, as well as basic salary advances—the auto union has won for workingmen over the years. One can understand General Motors' reluctance to yield without a fight. Its power, it still feels, is great.

There is a third party to the dispute, however. This is the government. But it has been a silent party. Paradoxically, the wasteful standoff between the union and corporate giants must frustrate the administration's economic "game plan," which called for a business upturn this fall. It won't help its fall election image in many key industrial states, either.

Current economic wisdom accepts strikes and unemployment as ways to temper an unruly economy. This "wisdom" has to be challenged. A tri-effort between business, labor, and government must be made. The government must contribute more than silence and not let the others slug it out to everyone's loss.

PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the occasion of Colonel Borman's speech to the joint session today to express again my deep concern about the treatment of American prisoners in North Vietnam, and to reiterate that this protest unites all Americans regardless of their views about the war.

The Government of North Vietnam is a signatory to the Geneva Convention dealing with the treatment of prisoners of war. It is a continuing outrage that that Government has never disclosed the names of the men it is holding and has

refused to carry out any of its other responsibilities under that convention.

There are those who have written off these men as human footnotes in the long tragedy of the war. Others use their suffering for political purposes, to press a particular approach to the issue of war. Cynical and self-serving attitudes like these are utterly unacceptable and will be rejected by those of us who have friends and family in North Vietnamese prisons and by millions of others who have not forgotten the gallant human beings who are the victims of the wanton cruelty of the North Vietnamese Government.

So, I must say again today—as I said here over a year ago—that the barbarity and stupidity of the North Vietnamese Government in this matter makes peace more difficult to achieve, not less, and undermines efforts everywhere to maintain minimal standards of behavior and compassion to the detriment of that Government as well as to their victims.

I have protested the mistreatment of prisoners by South Vietnam as well as by North Vietnam, and I shall continue to do so as long as prisoners are mistreated in a war that costs America so dearly in lives and resources every day. But we must do more than talk, and I am accordingly sending letters today to Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam and to President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam. I believe these letters express the sentiments of most Americans of all backgrounds and points of view, and I include their texts in the RECORD. The text of the letter to the Premier of North Vietnam is similar to a letter sent to him recently by a large number of my colleagues here, and I am delighted to learn that a number of colleagues are planning a similar letter to the President of South Vietnam as well.

Furthermore, on this unusual day when Members of the House and Senate have sat together in rare unity, I want to urge every Member of Congress to join in the great effort to show the North Vietnamese Government the overwhelming sentiment of the American people—and of men of good will everywhere—concerning the mistreatment of prisoners of war by that Government.

To help in that effort, I am helping to circulate a letter to be sent to the Premier of North Vietnam. I hope millions of Americans will take a moment to sign this letter or to send letters of their own working, and that this outpouring of feeling will help persuade the Hanoi government to change its policy regarding prisoners of war forthwith. That government continues to deny that it is mistreating prisoners. If this is the case, they can only gain by allowing a representative of the International Red Cross to visit the prisons and interview the prisoners.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, let today be noted as a turning point in the effort to arouse every American to the need for action on behalf of these gallant men and their families. We can repay them for the suffering they have endured, but we can work harder to bring their suffering to an early end. We can, in fact, do no less.

The letters follow:

His Excellency PHAM VAN DONG,
Premier, Democratic Republic of Vietnam,
Hanoi, North Vietnam.

PREMIER PHAM VAN DONG: As a member of the United States House of Representatives, I am directing an appeal to your humanity and that of your nation in the matter of our Prisoners of War.

It is with a growing sense of outrage that the American people and the Members of Congress view your nation's continued insensibility to the feelings of the families of these prisoners. You have disregarded basic standards of human decency and morality in your nation's continued refusal to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention. That Convention requires you to publish the names of those prisoners in your custody, to provide them with proper food and medical care, to permit inspections of your prisoner of war facilities, and to allow the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families.

I shall not discuss here the merits of present American policies in Southeast Asia. The American people hold differing views on such policies, but we are united in our concern that you exercise compassion and humanity to those of our sons who are in your custody. This concern far transcends questions of international policies; it recognized a kindred humanity apart from consideration of race, color or political persuasion.

I have also written to President Nguyen Van Thieu urging his government to abide by the standards of the Geneva Convention in its treatment of military and political prisoners of war.

People everywhere look to you, as the leader of your nation, to respond to this plea.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

His Excellency NGUYEN VAN THIEU,
President, Republic of Vietnam,
Saigon, Vietnam.

DEAR PRESIDENT THIEU: As Members of the United States House of Representatives, we are directly appealing to your humanity and that of your nation in the matter of military and political prisoners of war now held by your government. In the conflict that is taking place in Vietnam, prisoners of war must include those taken in actual combat as well as those men, women, and children who are taken into custody by your government as political prisoners.

It is with a growing sense of outrage that the American people and many Members of Congress view your nation's continued insensibility to the feelings of the families of these prisoners. You have disregarded basic standards of human decency and morality in your nation's continued refusal to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention. That Convention requires that you not only publish the names of those prisoners in your custody, provide them with proper food and medical care, permit inspections of your prisoner of war facilities and allow the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families but that you also provide recognized standards in your detention facilities. Your government's violation in providing such facilities was recently documented at Con Son and caused most Americans to be filled with revulsion against your practices.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we will not now attempt to debate the merits of present American policies in Southeast Asia. Many of us hold differing views on such policies, but we are united in our insistence that you exercise compassion and humanity to those prisoners of war who are now in your custody. This concern far transcends questions of international politics; it recognizes a kindred humanity apart from consideration of race, color, or political persuasion.

We are among those Members of Congress who have written a letter to Premier Pham Van Dong appealing to his humanity and that of his government in the matter of prisoners of war who are our sons now in their custody and have advised him that the families of these men and a concerned American people look to him as the leader of his government to respond to our plea.

We look to you for a similar response.

TAX RELIEF FOR RELATIVES OF POW'S

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we have gathered together in this great Chamber to hear the President's Special Emissary on Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia, and consider the fate of those men who are missing in action.

Unfortunately, despite appeals, despite exhortations, despite declamations, most will agree that the impact of what we say here today will be quite limited. The voicings of a Congress which does not exercise the warmaking power cannot be expected to impress too deeply upon the consciousness of North Vietnam.

What purpose do we then serve? Why do we convene in joint session over the issues of prisoners of war and the missing in action?

Perhaps there are two reasons. In a very real sense, we are all prisoners—willing prisoners of the hope that somehow, someday we will find a way to help bring loved ones home, unite families, and ease the anguish of uncertainty. Toward this end we must spare no efforts. None of us can rest until every avenue, no matter how unlikely, has been traveled. Along that road, undoubtedly, our country has a long way to go.

A special reason for our meeting must surely be to consider specific ways in which we can help family and loved ones left behind by the cruel uncertainties of war. While we can do little to influence the behavior of our enemy, we can ease the burdens which our enemy has imposed upon families of men held captive or missing.

In the first session of the 91st Congress, the House passed an appropriate bill sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) which provided extra pay for men held prisoner of war. Subsequently that bill was passed by the Senate and signed into law by President Nixon.

Additional steps, concrete and resolute, should now be taken. Such steps can and should be directly related to the unique problems of those most effected by North Vietnam's flagrant violation of international law.

Of the mental anguish and emotional trauma suffered by family and loved ones we can offer only our heartfelt sympathy and understanding. Beyond that, we should move to ease financial strains caused by North Vietnamese intransigence on the issues of prisoners of war and the missing in action.

Many mothers and fathers, sisters, brothers, and wives, have spent thou-

sands of dollars in attempts to learn whether their loved ones are in fact dead or alive, and in attempts to seek their freedom. For most it was not a question of whether to spend the money. Prisoners of the same hope which convenes us here today in joint session, these people have understandably grasped at the most slender straws because they provided the only hope in an otherwise bleak future.

Expenses of such a nature—transportation, hotels, meals, telephone calls—these are hardly the stuff of which vacations are made. Nor can anyone say they are less essential than legitimate business deductions. Yet, today there is no way these expenses can be charged off against income to ease the tax burden.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses incurred in traveling outside the United States to obtain information concerning a member of his immediate family who is missing in action, or who is or may be held prisoner, in the Vietnam conflict.

In addition, I am proposing that the Internal Revenue Code be further amended to relieve prisoners of war and those missing in action from income tax liability during the time they are held in a detained status by the enemy.

These proposals were drafted after consultation with my constituents, Dr. and Mrs. Gordon Perisho of Quincy, Ill. Their son, Comdr. Gordon Perisho, has been listed as missing for 2½ years. In their extensive efforts to learn whether he is alive, they have observed firsthand the financial sacrifice made by many parents, wives, and other relatives of our men missing in action.

These are small steps, realistic steps, which the Congress can take. They can be the foundation of a tribute we erect to these brave men who have given so fully to their country. After all the oratory of this day has ended, these more durable steps can attest to the undying gratitude of the Nation.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. 19380

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses incurred in traveling outside the United States to obtain information concerning a member of his immediate family who is missing in action, or who is or may be held prisoner, in the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. EXPENSES INCURRED IN SEEKING INFORMATION CONCERNING FAMILY MEMBERS WHO ARE OR MAY BE PRISONERS OF WAR.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of his delegate, there shall be allowed as a deduction the amount of any expenses (including under subsection (b)) which are paid or incurred during the taxable year by the taxpayer, or by another person with respect to whom the taxpayer is entitled for such taxable year to an

exemption under section 151, in connection with a trip outside the United States for the purpose of locating or communicating with a member of the taxpayer's immediate family who is or may be a prisoner of war or is otherwise in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code) during and in connection with the Vietnam conflict, for the purpose of ascertaining whether such member is alive, or for the purpose of seeking his release from imprisonment or detention.

"(b) EXPENSES INCLUDIBLE.—The expenses which may be included in the deduction under subsection (a) with respect to any trip shall include the costs of transportation, board, lodging, telephone calls, and other items and services on or in connection with such trip, but only to the extent that they are directly related to and necessary for the purpose (specified in subsection (a)) for which the trip was made."

(b) The table of sections for part VII of subsection B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Expenses incurred in seeking information concerning family members who are or may be prisoners of war.

"Sec. 210. Cross references."

Sec. 2. Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) PRISONERS OF WAR, ETC.—Gross income does not include compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such member is in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code) during the Vietnam conflict."

Sec. 3. As used in sections 1 and 2, the term "Vietnam conflict" includes combatant activities by United States forces in Vietnam and other areas of Southeast Asia, and directly related military, naval, air, and supply activities, conducted on or after February 28, 1961, and prior to such date as may be specified by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of such activities.

Sec. 4. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

HUMANE TREATMENT AND EARLY RELEASE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for this country to demonstrate unequivocal and total commitment in gaining humane treatment and early release of American prisoners of war. Within this Nation, hawk and dove alike owe these men no less than this. That is why I am proud of the leaders in the House and the Senate for arranging today's meeting. That is why I am privileged to be here today to discuss our Government's efforts on behalf of our men presently missing in action and presumed to be prisoners of war in North Vietnam, and Laos.

I have long felt that if the story of these gallant men could be told, there would be an overwhelming demand from the American people to force their cap-

tors to abide by the Geneva Convention and provide humane treatment for American military personnel, including communication with their families.

That is why I assigned a member of my staff to work closely with the National League of Families of MIA's and POW's in their fight to bring this story to the attention of the world. The courage and dedication of the families of these men has been an inspiration to me in my efforts. I have written some 18 letters to the foreign press, and to those embassies continuing to maintain diplomatic relations with North Vietnam, urging them to use their office to obtain humane treatment for our POW's.

A continuing personal lobbying effort was made by my staff to encourage other Members of the Congress to also write these "Ambassador letters." So many contacts were made, it is not possible to know exactly how many letters resulted. I have in my file, however, copies of letters written by nine Members of the Congress contacted by my office. One of them is that written by my good friend, Congressman ROGER ZION, who sponsored the letter to Hanoi, signed by 406 Members of the House. His subsequent trip to Paris to deliver the letter to the representative of the Hanoi regime gave us one of the most hopeful signs yet received that the rising tide of world opinion was having its effect on their leaders. The film which he secured from the head of the permanent delegation in Paris, Delegate General Mai Van Do, gave new hope to a number of families who were able to identify their loved ones after viewing it.

One of the objectives of the League of Families, brought out before the Subcommittee on National Security of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in late April and early May was the desirability of a joint meeting to hear the POW story. To this end, in late July my office was privileged to arrange meetings with the leadership in the House, Congressman GERALD FORD and Congressman CARL ALBERT, and representatives of the League of Families to discuss the possibility of such a meeting. I want to thank all the Members of both Houses who have worked arduously on this grave issue.

I want also to express my gratitude to the Congressional Secretaries Club for publishing the address of the Ambassadors and foreign press at our request.

I am now hopeful that today's meeting is an indication that the long years of frustration and heartbreak may be nearing an end, and that our prayers and efforts are to be rewarded. For the privilege of playing some small part in that result, I am deeply grateful.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. There are more than 200 ballet com-

panies in the United States today. A member of the Netherlands Ballet recently stated:

American dance is the most advanced and richest in choreographic development in the world today.

THE TRAGIC SITUATION OF OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this body also devoted an afternoon to the consideration of the tragic plight of the Americans held prisoner by North Vietnam. Numerous appeals by Members of Congress, by thousands of American citizens, by the international press, and by Government leaders around the world have produced promises by the North Vietnamese but little else. The individual prisoner is still not allowed to write to his family on a regular basis and is probably not allowed to receive the mail faithfully sent to him. He is held in a terrible isolation, without adequate food and medical care. A recent North Vietnamese film shown on television reveals that the prisoners are still being exploited for propaganda purposes in direct violation of the Geneva Convention. With over 1,500 American men missing in action, Hanoi has yet to provide even a list of the men it holds. Despite a slight increase in the amount of mail coming from the prisoners, there are still many families who have no knowledge at all of the fate of their men.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the situation of the prisoners of war. Hanoi cannot continue its intransigent inhumanity toward these helpless individuals. It is tragic that men at the peak of their lives must lie isolated in crude jails denied all access to the outside world and denied even the comfort of mail from their families. The families, too, suffer unbelievable anxiety, wondering if husband or father or son is suffering, uncared for, from hunger or illness, and possibly not even knowing whether he is dead or alive. These families are unable to make plans for the future, but must live from day to day, trying not to wonder if husband or son will ever be seen again.

I would like to pay tribute to the gallant families of the prisoners of war. A group of wives from Delaware have again urged all possible action on behalf of their men and to assure me of their continued support for all our attempts to secure their release. I add my voice to theirs and again urge our Government to do all it possibly can to make Hanoi realize that such inhumanity toward the prisoners and their families cannot be tolerated. During the past year I have sent two letters to President Nixon supporting his attempts to gain better treatment for American war prisoners and I wish to reaffirm that position now. It is essential that we Americans continue to supplement the President's efforts by voicing public outrage at the North Vietnamese behavior. World outcry seems to be the only means of forcing Hanoi to

modify its stand, and it has already produced a small result: Hanoi has allowed an increased amount of mail from the POW camps. Perhaps if it is pointed out to them often enough, the North Vietnamese will realize that causing unnecessary anguish to the prisoners and their innocent families can only harm their cause. Perhaps then they will add action to their promises of decent treatment.

THE CONTROVERSY OVER IMPENDING VISIT OF VICE PRESIDENT NGUYEN CAO KY OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be quite a bit of controversy over the impending visit of the Vice President of the Republic of Vietnam, Nguyen Cao Ky, to our country. Some object to his visit as interference in the internal affairs of our Nation, others object to it on the grounds that he is coming to participate in a rally which openly calls for victory, and others on the grounds that they are not particularly fond of the man. I object to the fact that he is not getting the royal welcome which he deserves.

Vice President Ky has been a pillar of strength and steadfastness in the Republic of Vietnam. This is the man who put an end to the game of musical governments in South Vietnam. When Ky became South Vietnam's youngest Premier in 1965, his was the ninth government in that land since the Diem government had been toppled less than 2 years earlier. Since then the situation has improved tremendously as far as stability of that government goes and there have been several free elections. He is very pro-Western, a nationalist, and a hard anti-Communist. Perhaps this is his problem.

Let Khrushchev, Tito, or Kosygin grace our shores with their benign presence and there are loud hurrahs, accolades to world peace, and gushings of good will. Let a Tshombe or an Ian Smith even try to get into the United States and insurmountable problems with visas develop. The red carpet is rolled out for the Reds and rolled up for those who have indicated that they wish to do less than emulsify us at the earliest possible moment.

Fortunately the Nixon administration has not followed this policy. The visits of President Suharto, General Mobutu, Chiang Ching-Kuo, and now Vice President Ky indicates that we are not only inviting those with a demonstrated record of opposition to the Communists to visit us, but even if they are not invited, as is the case with Ky, by the administration, they are not denied access to a free land. Since the administration is making these steps in the right direction, it is unfortunate, to say the least, that the Congress is backsliding. Why do we insist on insulting our allies? What do you think the reaction would be if Vice President AGNEW were to make known his intention to visit one of our

allies and a substantial number of legislators in the country he intended to honor with his presence, were to tell him that he was not wanted. I think even the liberals who would just as soon see the Vice President out of the country, might feel a little miffed. Ky has promised not to run for any office in the United States so he poses no direct political threat to anyone.

What is this strange state of mind which seems to inflict itself upon some people when an ally announces he will be making the trek across the waters? I am sure the Vice President is up on his shots. Just what has the Vice President of the Republic of Vietnam done to deserve such shabby treatment? Common courtesy no less than identity of purpose and a shared war would seem to me to demand a somewhat less shabby reception from people in positions of responsibility.

PRESSING ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as September began, U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam was below 400,000 for the first time in 3½ years. This compared with the troop strength of approximately 540,000, and escalating, which existed when President Nixon took office in January 1969.

That the majority of Americans continued to support the Nixon de-escalation program was demonstrated in major public opinion polls. Nowhere was public support more dramatically demonstrated than in the Democratic-controlled U.S. Senate, which, on September 1, 1970, voted, 55 to 39, to reject the Hatfield-McGovern amendment to "end the war." With the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam proceeding on schedule, we are making a major move toward the day when the military draft may be replaced with an all-volunteer professional armed force, supplemented by an expanded reserve force, which I want to see effected as soon as practical.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE

On September 9, 1970, the Senate voted final congressional approval of a bill to give the District of Columbia a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives. This measure, which, with my support, passed the House on August 10, would provide the District of Columbia delegate with a 2-year term, an office in the House of Representatives, a full staff, and all privileges except a vote. He would, therefore, enjoy the same status currently enjoyed by the nonvoting delegate from the territory of Puerto Rico.

INFLATION, DEBT, AND TAXES

On September 8, 1970, the International Monetary Fund warned that U.S. inflation threatened the stability of the world's monetary system. The very next day, this inflationary threat caused Treasury Secretary David Kennedy to ask Congress for \$2.6 billion in new taxes

to reduce the budgetary deficit which might run as high as \$15 billion for fiscal year 1971.

In September 1970, the U.S. Treasury Department was borrowing money at 7.8 percent and higher, to pay off maturing Federal obligations and to cover the cost of deficit spending. The Government-created Federal National Mortgage Association was borrowing money at 8.9 percent, in direct competition with the U.S. Treasury Department. These high interest rates mean that by 1973, the U.S. taxpayer will be paying over \$30 billion annually in interest on the \$380 billion we now owe. Thus, Federal deficit spending, resulting from the actions of the Democratic-controlled Congress, continues as the major cause of the inflation which endangers our economy.

I believe that we should now consider wage, price, and rent controls, and that the Congress should establish a commission to determine fair wages for those engaged in manufacturing and in the rendering of services. Prices should be set at a level which would give manufacturers, distributors and retailers a fair return. I recognize that wage and price controls are distasteful to those of us who believe in the free enterprise system, but, unfortunately, they now appear to be necessary if runaway inflation is to be stopped. Meanwhile, we must reduce Federal spending, balance the budget, and begin to pay off the money we owe. If this can be done, controls would be necessary for only a short time.

NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

On September 9, 1970, I cosponsored House Joint Resolution 1362, to authorize the President to annually designate as National Family Week the week beginning with the fourth Thursday in November. This week would coincide with Thanksgiving and with the spirit and events surrounding it. Emphasis would be placed upon the importance of the family as the nucleus of our society. This legislation would encourage special State and community observances. Its greatest service would be its emphasis upon these two most basic truisms: From love of, and loyalty to, one's family flows loyalty to, and love of, one's country. From respect for discipline within the home comes respect for discipline within the school, community, State, and Nation.

PIRACY AND BLACKMAIL

Palestinian guerrilla hijackings of commercial airliners, blowing them up, and holding passengers and crews hostage constitute outrageously barbarous acts of international piracy and blackmail. They do intolerable violence to such basic human rights as those of freedom, dignity, privacy, tranquility, and lawful mobility.

In instituting the peace initiative which these hijackings have endangered, President Nixon acted in proper presumption that the Arab governments were in lawful control of all persons within their legal borders. As the Palestinian guerrillas continued to successfully challenge established Arab governments, it became quite clear that all other recognized national governments would be compelled to take appropriate

action to protect human rights and international peace.

President Nixon's decision to place armed guards on certain national and international flights was a necessary step toward that essential goal; so was his decision to personally review U.S. 6th Fleet exercises in the Mediterranean. His quickly announced Mediterranean visit made clear that the President sought to personally dramatize the U.S. interest in peace in that critical theater, and to take the personally courageous lead in "showing the flag" to those who would do violence to everything it symbolizes.

Meanwhile, there was reason to consider the possible necessity of curtailing commercial air flights to any nation permitting aid, comfort, or asylum to hijackers, whether by determined policy or by simple inability to control them.

CREDIT CARDS

On September 10, 1970, the House, with my support, passed H.R. 16542, to regulate the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. I considered this a necessary instrument for the protection of consumers against the abuse and tragedy which can result from the mailing of credit cards on an unsolicited basis.

For example, it is totally unfair for a person to be held responsible, not only for a credit card which he does not order but which, having been stolen en route, he becomes aware of only after he begins to receive the bills for purchases made by the thief.

I recognize the increasingly more important and convenient role which credit cards play in today's economic and accounting system; but I believe that it is most desirable that a credit card-issuing company give the intended recipient the courtesy of stating, in advance, whether he wishes to receive such a card.

ANDERSON MISINFORMATION CONTINUES

In his column of September 15, 1970, Jack Anderson tried to explain away the inaccurate statements and innuendos of his column of July 25, 1970, to which I took exception in my Washington Report of August 1970.

The fact remains that, with 22 other members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I struck from H.R. 17880 the poorly written section which provided for uniform cost-accounting standards to be used by defense contractors. A stronger, more comprehensive, and restrictive section was then added relative to uniform cost accounting standards to be used by defense contractors. A simple reading of this bill as reported out of the committee and passed by the House, with my support, would show this to be true. Apparently, Mr. Anderson did not read the bill or failed to read and understand the facts set forth in my August Washington Report.

With regard to Mr. Anderson's mentioning my use of my congressional franking—mailing—privilege, even he must know that this privilege is designed to facilitate communication with constituents—and that it includes the mailing of questionnaires and reports regarding congressional matters. I will continue to use my Washington Report, which is not printed at public expense, as a means

of keeping my constituents informed; when necessary, I will continue to correct inaccuracies by Jack Anderson or any other newsman when such inaccuracies refer to me.

Thank you.

FORD FOUNDATION POLICE DEVELOPMENT FUND

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the House passed H.R. 17825, authorizing amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Because the people I represent recognize that with Federal funds come Federal controls and they do not sanction a national police force, I was one of two Members who voted "no" to this bill. See page H6210 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Since June 30, there have been constant developments in the law enforcement movement, purportedly to upgrade peace officers but all bearing the mark of a federally controlled police force.

The original act provides for liaison and cooperation with privately funded foundations and organizations. Less than 30 days later, July 23, to be precise, the American people were informed that the Ford Foundation had funded, with 30 million of its tax-exempt dollars, a police development fund to be active on a national scale to improve the effectiveness of police departments throughout the country.

Mr. McGeorge Bundy, titular head of the Ford Foundation billions, hand selected as chairman of the board of directors of Ford's new National Police Foundation, Mr. Ivan Allen, Jr., a former mayor of Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Allen's controversial record as an ultraliberal mayor of Atlanta is only overshadowed by his dubious credentials in law enforcement experience and activity.

While Mr. Allen's public relations department accredits his 8 years of public service with a \$13 million arts center, a civic center, an exhibit hall, and a symphony orchestra, silence prevails on any accomplishments in the field of law and order. The absence of statistics such as decrease in crime, police benefits, narcotics, youth, and his rapport with the police of his city suggest an unfavorable police rapport.

No serious-minded person places any credence in Chief Herbert Jenkins, who was a member of the infamous L. B. J. crimebusters committee which concluded that the root of all the crime in the United States was the fault of the white people.

Mr. Allen's record leaves much to be desired and raises serious questions as to whether or not he is an agitator rather than a conservator of the peace.

He announces with pride that his first official act as mayor was to abolish all the ordinances and laws of the city that he did not approve of because of his feeling that they contained racial implica-

tions. This done, he accredits himself with personally leading the integration of all of his city's facilities; that is, rest-rooms, water fountains, and restaurants. He further accepts the credit for integrating Atlanta's once-proud and effective police force and having initiated the revolutionary new program of community rapport by unarmed police officers opening lines of communication with poor people.

Such would hardly appear to afford him the background of expertise in law enforcement to qualify him as the chairman of a national body which we can expect to testify before Congress on crime reform legislation to deter the criminals and restore law and order and confidence in our police officers. In fact, from what we know so far, it is not clear whether or not Mr. Allen would know a criminal if he saw one.

His credentials most certainly qualify him for friendship and alliance with Ralph David Abernathy and Julian Bond but where is there any record of his combating or controlling crime?

Mr. Speaker, I include several related newsclippings and the Dan Smoot Report of July 27:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, July 23, 1970]

EX-MAYOR OF ATLANTA—POLICE FUND AIDE NAMED

ATLANTA.—During his eight years as mayor of Atlanta, Ivan Allen Jr. gave high priority to improving his police force and devising ways to cut down on crime.

Now he has a chance to perform a similar chore on the national scale.

He was named Wednesday as chairman of the board of directors of a police development fund to which the Ford Foundation is giving \$30 million.

The fund's job will be to improve the effectiveness of police departments throughout the country.

Allen, a wealthy, 59-year-old merchant who was mayor from 1962 until last January, said the new post affords him "a significant opportunity" to use his experience "in resolving one of the most critical problems we face."

He said crime "has gone far beyond local capabilities to cope with it."

Allen, a silver-haired man, was mayor during a turbulent time of sit-ins and stormy racial controversy and lived in the midst of controversy and confrontation.

Police Chief Herbert T. Jenkins Jr., who served under Allen, said the former mayor is "the No. 1 man in the nation" for the new job.

EXCELLENT CHANCE

"I think it's excellent, great, just wonderful," Jenkins said. "Allen demonstrated clearly that he had better understanding of local government and local law enforcement than any other mayor in the country."

Jenkins was a member of President Lyndon B. Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

One of the first things Allen did when he took office as mayor was to erase from the city's books every law providing for segregation by race.

When he became mayor, Atlanta had 48 Negro policemen. When he left, there were nearly 200 out of a department total of 941 and black officers now include one captain, five lieutenants, four sergeants and 22 detectives.

When President Johnson's crime commission report came out, Allen moved promptly to implement it.

The city was one of the first to employ

CVI—2088—Part 24

community service officers, who, without guns, patrolled selected areas to increase police rapport with poor black and white citizens.

During racial disturbances in 1966, Allen personally led police and tried to break up the crowds. Disregarding rocks and tear gas, he went into jeering crowds in an effort to calm demonstrators.

On one occasion when he climbed onto a police car to speak, he was shaken off by the crowd. He had told police they were not to use force until he gave the command. He finally ordered tear gas.

RID CITY OF BLIGHT

Under Allen, Atlanta did much to rid its central core of the urban blight which he regarded as a continuing source of crime.

One of his first official acts was to integrate city hall facilities such as rest rooms and water fountains. He personally led a group of blacks into the whites-only restaurant, and it was open to all from then on.

Influential with fellow members of the business community, he was instrumental in bringing integration to privately owned hotels and restaurants in 1963, six months after passage of the federal Civil Rights Act.

During Allen's years as mayor, Atlanta built a municipal stadium, a \$13 million arts center, a civic center and an exhibit hall, and acquired a symphony orchestra which has won respect in the music world.

He is married and the father of three sons.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1970]

FORD FUND TO AID POLICE IN REFORM—NEW UNIT EXPECTED TO GRANT \$30 MILLION FOR INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

(By M. A. Farber)

The Ford Foundation plans to establish an independent, \$30-million agency that would grant money to police departments throughout the country to help them reform their operations and training.

A key aim of the agency would be to finance basic innovations that it feels might be neglected in the use of massive Federal anti-crime funds. The agency's support would be designed to provide greater leverage and opportunities for "enlightened" police officials who could demonstrate the value of reforms, particularly in urban areas.

In the last decade, the foundation has given about \$30-million for upgrading the country's system of criminal justice, including the courts, correctional practices and institutions, delinquency services and the police. They have granted \$6-million for police work alone.

Among the kinds of projects the agency might aid are the following:

Redefining law enforcement functions, to enable the police to focus more on criminal investigation and less on such activities as traffic control, licensing and serving papers.

Devising guidelines for making arrests in non-emergency situations.

Developing skilled management personnel, who might not be sworn officers, for police departments.

Creating new positions for short-term recruits who might be college graduates and community police officers who would reside in neighborhoods where they work.

Promoting better community relations through such methods as teenage patrol corps, strict police enforcement of housing codes and consumer credit regulations and grievance mechanisms for residents.

Finding improved ways to evaluate police performance.

McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, declined to comment yesterday on reports regarding the new agency, but an announcement by the foundation is expected today.

The agency, to be called the Police Development Fund, would be governed by a

board of directors composed of high city and police officials and academic experts in the fields of law and the administration of justice. Ivan Allen Jr., former Mayor of Atlanta, is expected to head the board.

The agency would make three types of grants initially: large-scale grants to police departments for major reforms; smaller grants to about a dozen departments for a variety of specific changes and a number of grants for police education and training.

The latter category might include a short-term institute for training mid-career supervisory police officers and an extensive police department-university educational venture. The agency could also institute a continuing university fellowship program for senior officers.

The agency would not assist general projects for increased police manpower or the purchase of equipment.

It is believed that the agency will have an initial life of five years, giving it \$6-million, on the average, to distribute each year. A decision on continuing the agency, with renewed financing, would be made by the Ford Foundation around 1973.

With assets of \$30-million, the agency would probably be the largest private organization devoted exclusively to police work. Under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, however, the Federal Government is now spending about \$500-million a year for law enforcement planning, training and operation.

Eighty-five per cent of the Federal funds are channeled through the states and this procedure has disturbed many of the nation's Mayors.

These city leaders have complained that the states are adding to the bureaucratic tangle, depriving the cities of administrative talent and allocating the funds on a per capita basis that ignores the concentration of crime in urban areas while enriching rural and suburban sections where crime is relatively low.

The views of these Mayors are said to be shared to some extent at the Ford Foundation, where the staff reportedly also feels that sizable sums of Federal aid will not guarantee fundamental changes in police affairs.

[From the Atlanta Journal, July 22, 1970]

ALLEN TO HEAD FORD PANEL ON AID TO POLICE

The Ford Foundation Wednesday named Former Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. as head of a major new subsidiary fund that will make grants aimed at improving the effectiveness of police departments throughout the country.

Allen is the chairman of the board of directors of the Police Development Fund, which will receive \$30 million from the parent organization over the next five years.

Creation of the fund was announced by McGeorge Bundy, Ford Foundation president, at a press conference in New York, with Allen standing by.

Bunday said the police development fund will be the largest private agency in the country concerned exclusively with police work.

"We hope the fund will be a major instrument to which police departments can look for help in improving their effectiveness," he said.

The fund, he said, will make three types of grants—large grants to police departments in three or four cities to bring about major reforms; smaller grants in some 10 to 12 cities covering a broad range of individual police functions, and selective police education and training projects.

Allen heads the board of trustees which includes men from the legal, academic and minority communities as well as police officials.

Other board members are:

Michael Canlis, president of the National Sheriffs' Association and sheriff of San Joaquin County, Calif.

Former Mayor Richard Lee of New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Hubert Locke of Wayne State University, former deputy police commissioner of Detroit.

Mayor Steven May of Rochester, N.Y.

David McCandless, director of the Southern Police Institute, Louisville, Ky.

Stanley Schrotel, former police commissioner of Cincinnati.

Lawrence Pierce, former deputy commissioner of New York City.

Quinn Tamm, president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IAACP).

James Vorenberg, director of the Harvard Center for the Advancement of Criminal Justice and former executive director of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

And Prof. James Q. Wilson of Harvard University.

The executive director for the fund is Charles H. Rogovin, former head of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice and former attorney general of Massachusetts.

A key aim of the new agency would be to finance efforts by police departments to employ new methods and approaches in their law enforcement activities.

Bundy said the foundation is "particularly happy" to have Allen as board chairman of the new fund and also to have Rogovin as its executive director.

"Each of them has established an enviable reputation for distinguished and progressive work in this hard field," he said.

The foundation indicated the thrust of its grant-making through the new agency will be to projects that might be neglected in federal anticrime programs.

The kinds of projects that will draw the interest of the new agency were detailed in some degree in a booklet outlining reasons for creating the new fund. Some of these:

Redefining police functions so that emphasis will be more on investigation of crimes and less on such things as traffic control, licensing of vendors, etc.

Fixing new concepts for arrest responsibilities in nonemergency situations.

Developing skilled management personnel for police departments.

Creating new positions for college graduates or others who will work in particular neighborhoods as, perhaps, community service officers.

Working to improve community relations.

Improving departmental efforts to evaluate their own performances.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1970]

FOUNDATION TO UPGRADE POLICE UNITS

(By Anne Hebal)

The 39-year-old president of the new Police Foundation here has specific ideas on how American police forces can change, and \$30 million of Ford Foundation money to put his ideas to work.

Charles Howard Rogovin, who heads the month-old agency, says he hopes it will be a catalyst for change in police practices across the country.

Some of his ideas include introducing into the traditionally conservative world of police organization such innovations of modern corporate management as executive development programs and even "sensitivity" tests.

The foundation initially called the Police Development Fund, was created July 22 by the Ford Foundation to be "the largest private agency in the country concerned exclusively with police work."

Rogovin, who resigned as administrator of the Justice Department's Law Enforcement

Assistance Administration in April, in a recent interview discussed both his own enthusiasm for creative change in police work and the upsurge of national interest in the role of the police.

As little as 10 years ago, he said, "people hardly gave the police a second thought."

"Opinions about the police? Nobody had them—except of course, the police."

Now, Rogovin said, interest in police and police work have become important aspects of national culture and conversation for young and old alike.

Talk everywhere is studded with such phrases as "police-community relations," "police brutality" and the epithet "pig."

It is in this context, of a rising national willingness to discuss and rethink the role of police in society, that the Police Foundation intends to work.

"This is not going to be a cocoon-type operation," he added. "I'm not running any study group. Although I don't disparage study groups, this just isn't one of them."

The Police Foundation, as he sees it, will be a catalyst in the interplay among local police departments and the academic community and private industry.

"There are thousands of very, very bright cops all over the country," he said, eyes widening behind tinted lenses, "whose departments simply don't have the money to implement any creative ideas."

"But the Police Foundation, with \$30 million and an ability to tap some of the country's best minds, can act as a broker between a local (police) department and top scholars and business executives."

Rogovin emphasized the foundation is "not going to be in the hardware business. We're not going to be buying fancy new radio equipment or the very latest in squad cars."

"I'd say we're going to be in the change business," added associate director Mark H. Furstenberg.

In the next five years, the foundation will disburse between "three and six major grants of several million dollars each," Rogovin said, rather than many small ones.

One of the areas he suggested for a major grant could be a program aimed at improving or defining the policeman's image in his community.

"There's certainly no secret about the alienation that's developed between citizens and their police," Rogovin said.

In the aftermath of the Chicago police operations at the 1968 Democratic Convention, added Furstenberg, came a new public concern over who becomes a policeman and how his leaders are trained.

On television screens over the decade of the 60s, he said, Americans "saw their police in a series of unfavorable, turmoil-filled situations—from Southern sheriffs on the civil rights marches to the Watts riots in 1968 and a host of student demonstrations in which we saw young people beaten by police."

Part of the task of the Police Foundation, Rogovin suggests, will be to translate a national concern into action.

A particular approach, he says, may come through management training.

"What's to say that an excellent foot patrolman will, in 10 years, make a good inspector of field operations?" Rogovin asks.

Such questions have increasingly concerned thoughtful police officials here and elsewhere in recent years.

"While private industry and the military have had executive training programs for decades," he said, "police departments have had none."

Through the Police Foundation's 14-man board of directors, headed by Ivan Allen Jr., former mayor of Atlanta, the foundation will have close ties to the nation's top corporations and most advanced academic programs.

Board members include Harvard police expert Prof. James Q. Wilson, former New

Haven mayor Richard C. Lee and James D. Vorenberg, director of the Harvard Center for the Advancement of Criminal Justice.

The scholarly world as well as police stand to benefit from the new foundation, Rogovin asserts. Academic pioneers in the near-virgin field of the history and sociology of American police will get a first-hand look at their subjects.

"We'll be able to invite, for instance, a noted professor of psychology, sociology, American history or economics to study a given problem in police work. He would gain not only some grant funds but also first-hand knowledge in a new, burgeoning field of academic inquiry: police work."

A former Philadelphia public defender, Rogovin switched sides in 1964 to become the city's chief assistant district attorney. Two years later he was named assistant director of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. At the time he was also in charge of the Organized Crime Task Force.

In 1967 he became assistant attorney general for Massachusetts and chief of the organized crime section.

After a year as administrator of the Justice Department's \$480 million anticrime agency, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Rogovin resigned in April over the so-called "troika" directorship of LEAA.

A Democrat, he chafed for some time under the agency's three-headed leadership system.

Rogovin anticipates an "enormous exchange of ideas" between the board and himself and between police departments and the foundation. In the first month alone, he received 120 grant requests from departments throughout the country.

He said the foundation will begin action on grant requests by Dec. 1. The foundation will open its permanent office in mid-October at 1015 18th St. NW.

[From the New Orleans States Item, July 2, 1970]

U.S. FUNDS FOR PRISON EXPECTED IN 7-8 MONTHS

(By Tom Frazer)

Federal funds for a new parish prison may be available in seven or eight months, Carl Corbin, executive director of Metropolitan Area Committee, said today.

Corbin was a member of a New Orleans delegation that went to Washington yesterday to check on the city's application for federal funds to help build a new parish prison.

"I would say all of us who went to Washington came away feeling optimistic. It was a very encouraging conference," Corbin said.

The New Orleans group met with congressional and government representatives.

Corbin said New Orleans is seeking funds from Housing and Urban Development and from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

He said representatives of HUD and LEAA attended the meeting, and "all seemed to feel that there was good hope for financial assistance to the parish prison project within a matter of seven or eight months."

Mayor Moon Landrieu, who was unable to attend the Washington meeting because of commitments in Baton Rouge, said, "This meeting was most important in our efforts to solve our parish prison problem."

He explained the city initiated the meeting "because a parish prison is of highest priority in our agenda of city improvements. We want the federal government to commit its share of the funds. The men representing the city in Washington reviewed our plans to date and called for haste in having the funds committed."

The city's application for urban renewal assistance has been reviewed and recommended for funding by the HUD regional office in Fort Worth, Tex., but federal funds have not been committed for 1970-71.

Recently Federal District Court Judge Herbert W. Christenberry Jr. ordered the mayor and City Council to make improvements at parish prison and to submit a progress report within 30 days.

Representing the city at the meeting were Frank J. Vaccarella, federal programs coordinator for New Orleans; Sheriff Louis A. Heyd Jr.; Corbin; Frank Keevers, director of the Community Improvement Agency; Victor Friese, consultant to the city on urban renewal, and Dick Cherry, the city's representative in Washington.

Also present were Larry Carpenter of Justice Department; Richard Velde, associate of LEAA; Lawrence Cox, assistant secretary of HUD for urban renewal, and Norman Watson, assistant for urban renewal projects.

[The Dan Smoot Report, July 27, 1970]

NATIONAL POLICE FORCE

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in the Justice Department, to channel tax money from the federal government to states for state and local law enforcement. Congress appropriated \$63 million for LEAA in 1969, \$268 million in 1970. The Nixon administration requested \$480 million for fiscal 1971.

On June 30, 1970, the House, by a roll-call vote of 342-2, passed HR 17825, authorizing \$650 million for LEAA in fiscal 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal 1972, \$1.5 billion for fiscal 1973. The two Congressmen who voted against it were Maston O'Neal (Georgia Democrat) and John R. Rarick (Louisiana Democrat). Rarick was the only Member of the House who voiced opposition. He said:

"The crime situation in the United States has reached such crisis proportions that the members of Congress are hearing from the folks at home with demands that something be done. The political impulse seems to be to do something, even if it is wrong.

"We are being asked to ignore the cause of the problem—the many crime-favoring Supreme Court laws. We are being urged to hoodwink our people into thinking that by massive expenditures of Federal money, by so-called upgrading our local and state police officers, and modernizing our correctional facilities, we can deter the criminal threat.

"The crime problem in the United States is not the fault of Congress—nor the police officers, nor the taxpayers. Congress is hiding its head in the sand if it thinks it can fool the people into believing that by giving away more of their money, they will be any safer from the criminal element which roams our streets and highways like some sacred cow. . . .

"We already have enough laws on the books.

"The . . . problem is that as we continue to talk about reducing crime, our law enforcement agencies are denied the freedom to enforce the laws. This bill offers no solution. It but provides for \$3.2 billion to be doled out over 3 years for grants to local and State police who agree to comply with various edicts and guidelines laid down by the Attorney General of the United States and enforced by the administrator of . . . LEAA. Except for this purported financial assistance, the measure offers only false promises of help to the police of America in their efforts to stop crime.

"Those of us who live in the South are familiar with Federal funding programs based upon compliance. The funded State or local organization loses all semblance of representing its local people and becomes completely subservient to the funding agency. In this instance, any law enforcement agency accepting Federal funds, which does not toe the line of compliance, can expect

to be threatened with loss of funds and if not whipped into line, have its funds cut off.

"We of the South have witnessed firsthand what has happened to our State and local governmental agencies that accepted Federal funds. We need only point to the wholesale destruction of our public schools and public education system which are in many areas either abandoned by a large segment of our people or made wholly inadequate to educate the youth.

"With Federal funds necessarily comes Federal control. It is utterly ridiculous for any rationally informed person to believe that we can buy personal safety or freedom from crime. It is equally ridiculous to believe that we can hand out Federal money and not end up with Federal control and domination over our local police.

"Up to now, the sociological pseudointellectuals have sought to justify throwing away billions of tax dollars with their theories that we can buy off criminals with massive Federal programs and funds. While they still refuse to acknowledge the utter futility of their upside-down thinking, some of the same spokesmen, that is, Ramsey Clark, the National Governors' Conference, the League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, and representatives of do-gooder organizations now support this bill and ask Congress to buy the police away from the people and put them under the control of an appointed Fed.

"The police power under the Constitution of the United States, with rare exception caused by judicial fiat, has historically been reserved to the States. Now, after 190 years of constitutional government with the police being under the State and local control, we are told that the Constitution must be warped if it says what it does not say.

"If it is a national police force that the Federal bureaucrats want, they have the Army, Navy, and Marines. I, for one, oppose every effort to destroy local police forces, or to even chance the 'foot-in-the-door' power building which is constantly sought by the socialist bureaucrats in their craze for domination of every facet of local and State government.

"This is bad legislation—spurred on by emotion and frustration—more laws by the democracy phobia of the mob—demands without regard or consideration for the further erosion and destruction of constitutional government.

"I intend to abide by my oath of office by casting my peoples' vote against this bill. I will continue to support my local police in upholding their responsibilities to maintain law and order to their people, unbridled by additional unnecessary Federal controls and redtape." 2

Of course, Congressman Rarick is correct. Federal aid to local law enforcement is unconstitutional. It will lead to federal domination of police (just as federal aid to education has led to federal domination of schools). At first, federal influence will be felt (is already being felt in some areas) in the quality of men recruited for police work and selected for promotion to key positions. Under pressure and guidance of federal bureaucrats who dispense tax money from Washington, local and state law enforcement agencies will emphasize the hiring and promoting of college graduates trained in sociology. A college degree, instead of experience in the field, will become the stepping stone to advancement in police work.

But the kind of indoctrination imparted by departments of sociology in many universities will unsuit, rather than improve, a man for effective police work. The thin blue line

of police officers who correctly look upon themselves as defenders of society—and who presently constitute the only real defense of our civilization against barbarism and anarchy—will gradually vanish. Law enforcement leadership will begin to reflect the permissive attitude generally prevalent in the federal courts and federal bureaucracy: the attitude that "society" and not the criminal is responsible for crime—that it is not society but the criminal who needs protection.

This permissive attitude of the federal courts is one cause of the breakdown in law enforcement. As federal influence brings the attitude into local law enforcement, enforcement will become less effective. Indeed, I anticipate that law enforcement effectiveness will decrease as federal aid to local law enforcement increases.

Something must be done will become a universal cry; and the chief criers will be the people responsible for the deteriorating situation: those who led the drive for federal aid to local law enforcement. They will not acknowledge that they have erred. They will not recommend a change in direction. They will fight the fire by throwing more fuel on it. That is, they will demand more federal aid.

As federal aid increases, federal influence on local law enforcement will evolve into federal control. At the end of that road is the instrument for total control that all dictatorships require: a national police force.

Then, the character of American law enforcement will undergo another, and this time a rather abrupt, change. When a national police force becomes a recognized, accepted, operating reality, it will no longer be ineffective and permissive. It will be ruthlessly efficient and repressive. Its mission, however, will not be to protect the public, but to protect entrenched political power against the public.

Then, Congressman John Rarick's June 30, 1970, speech in the House (if not purged from the record) will be an important historical document: it will reveal the identity of the one man out of 535 Members of the federal Congress who had the acumen to perceive the truth, the political courage to tell it, and the integrity to act upon it.

One of Mr. Rarick's points should be particularly re-emphasized and remembered: the argument for expenditure of federal tax money to curb crime by improving local law enforcement, insinuates that crime is the fault of law enforcement, which is inferior and needs improving; that Congress is responsible, because it has not heretofore appropriated enough money to improve local law enforcement; and that the taxpayers are responsible, because they have discouraged the spending of tax money for law enforcement. This puts no blame on criminals for committing crimes; on courts for helping criminals and hampering law enforcement; or on liberal politicians and bureaucrats who, by supporting governmental programs that violate the fundamental law of the land (the Constitution) set an example of lawlessness.

In reference to the argument that federal aid will improve local law enforcement, we should note that the trend I anticipate—the effectiveness of law enforcement will decline as federal aid rises—has already begun to set in. The first appropriation to curb crime by giving comprehensive federal aid to local law enforcement was for 1969; and the crime rate in 1969 was higher than the crime rate in 1968. The second appropriation for federal aid to law enforcement was for 1970; and the crime rate in 1970 is higher than the crime rate in 1969.

The Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is presently awaiting action in the Senate, where it will doubtless pass. The only opposition is from those who want the federal aid given directly to cities, instead of being given

¹ Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, June 19, 1970, p. 1581.

² Congressional Record, June 30, 1970, p. 22107.

to state governments for reallocation to law agencies in the state.

This bill is only one of several of President Nixon's crime-control proposals. Other major bills awaiting final action by Congress:

The Preventive Detention Act, aimed at the problem of indicted hard-core criminals being given pre-trial release and allowed to remain free to commit other crimes while awaiting trial;

The Drug Control Act, whose most controversial feature is the "no-knock" provision authorizing search warrants which would permit law officers to enter a premise without first knocking or announcing their intention;

The Organized Crime Control Act, aimed at underworld criminal syndicates.

The primary thrust of these three crime-control bills is toward giving law enforcement a little more leeway than it now has in handling the worst kinds of criminals: hard-core habitual criminals to whom release-on-bail is encouragement to commit more crimes; the traffickers in dangerous drugs; the denizens of the powerful, organized criminal underworld. And the tenor of these three bills is to put the blame for crime on criminals.

It is interesting to note that Members of Congress who are most aggressive in supporting the federal-aid-to-law-enforcement bill (which insinuates that poor law enforcement is the cause of crime) are most aggressive in opposing these crime-control bills which rest on the assumption that it is the criminal who is responsible for crime. They find nothing unconstitutional in a bill that provides federal aid for local law enforcement, although the Constitution does not authorize the federal government to subsidize local police. These same Members of Congress, however, consider as unconstitutional legislation which would, in some degree, restore to police certain powers that were traditionally and constitutionally theirs until taken away by act of Congress and court decisions in recent years.

THE SST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent column on the SST by Anthony Lewis appeared in the New York Times yesterday. Mr. Lewis, until recently London Bureau chief of the Times, discusses the ostensibly formidable competitive threat posed by the British-French Concorde. In Britain, he says, "The Concorde project is viewed as an extremely doubtful proposition," and he reports that "pressure on the new Conservative Government to kill the Concorde for economic reasons is heavy and growing."

I ask that the Lewis column be inserted in the RECORD. In addition, I ask that two recent items from the Paris Herald Tribune also be inserted in the RECORD. They are an August 29, 1970, story discussing the prospects of German participation in building a second-generation Concorde, and a September 17, 1970, story on current French attitudes toward the Concorde.

The items follow:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1970]

THE GUNS OF SEPTEMBER

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Historians have shown us, with painful conviction, how the World Wars could have been avoided if a few men had been wiser. But the sovereigns and the gen-

erals and the diplomats acted as if they could not escape events; they marched toward disaster, saying stubbornly that there was no alternative.

The world must reckon now with the possibility of biological as well as military catastrophe. And if in the end we do fatally injure the environment that sustains life on earth, some stellar historian should record that we were led to this disaster, by men who were well-meaning but without vision.

A depressing example is at hand on the most important environmental issue now awaiting legislative decision. The issue is the proposed American supersonic transport; the example of lemming reasoning is a column in Newsweek by Henry C. Wallich, the Yale economist.

Professor Wallich first makes the case against the building of the SST with succinct persuasiveness:

"The nuisance that the plane will cause to man at rest or at work outweighs its convenience to man on the wing. Sideline noise at the airport, take-off roar nearby, sonic boom wherever it goes at full speed will make the plane a prime nuisance. Disturbance to the upper atmosphere is a remote but serious threat. The traveler's gain in time is unimpressive. . . . Rarely will so many be bothered on any day to save so little time for so few."

But then Prof. Wallich turns around and tells us that we must continue building the SST. The reason, he says, is economic: the competitive threat posed by Franco-British and Soviet supersonic aircraft.

The Concorde is on test flights. It is likely to be commercially viable, Mr. Wallich says, and the airlines are "lining up" to buy it. Even if the United States wanted to stop supersonic transport it is powerless to do so: We could not close our airports to them, because other countries would retaliate against our jumbo jets. The loss of aircraft sales would hurt our balance of payments.

"We cannot escape," Professor Wallich concludes. The words are worthy of the Emperor Franz Josef.

Even before reaching the larger questions, it has to be said that Mr. Wallich's facts are shaky.

In Britain, the Concorde project is seen as an extremely doubtful proposition. The last Government tried to cancel it years ago but was advised by its lawyers that France could successfully sue in the World Court; that legal advice has come under question. Pressure on the new Conservative Government to kill the Concorde for economic reasons is heavy and growing.

The airlines have shown little enthusiasm and placed few firm orders for Concorde. Najeeb Halaby of Pan American, a believer in supersonic flight, has criticized Concorde's design as inadequate for passengers and uneconomic. As for Russia's SST, the TU-144, nothing suggests that major Western airlines are about to buy Soviet aircraft.

In any event, there is the question of American power that Professor Wallich raises. Can he really believe that Britain will ban jumbo jets from London airport, with all those affluent tourists, if we ban Concorde? That is too silly a notion to discuss. Whatever has happened to America's military role in the world, the economic weight of tourism across the Atlantic remains. If supersonic planes were barred from all U.S. airports, Britain's response would be to cancel Concorde.

Most of the steps we have to consider to preserve our surroundings are hard. Limiting the damage of automobile exhaust may greatly raise the cost of the basic American means of transportation. Restricting electric generating plants to smokeless fuel may deprive cities of urgently-needed power.

But the SST is an easy issue. There is no basic public need; it would serve only a tiny number of people, and them marginally. Eco-

nomie benefits are doubtful. And the damage the SST would do is unarguable except in degree.

If we are unable to get off the road to the SST, how can there be hope on the tougher issues? That is why the forthcoming Senate vote on the SST appropriation will be the most important in a long time.

[From the Paris Herald-Tribune, Aug. 29, 1970]

ROGERS SEES CONCORDE ROLE FOR GERMANY

WASHINGTON, August 28.—U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers says that he understands that West Germany may decide to join Britain and France in a second-generation Concorde supersonic airplane.

Mr. Rogers's statement was contained in a packet of endorsements that cabinet officers and heads of government agencies submitted to a Senate subcommittee yesterday.

[In Bonn, an Economics Ministry spokesman today described as "rubbish" a suggestion that West Germany might soon join the Anglo-French consortium building the Concorde, Reuters reported.]

Mr. Rogers based his support of America's SST program on the threat of the British-French Concorde SST program to the world leadership of American aircraft manufacturers.

Not only is the initial Concorde aircraft progressing favorably, but Mr. Rogers said he understood that West Germany might decide to join Britain and France in a second-generation Concorde that would be comparable in size and economy to the U.S. plane.

Mr. Rogers said that it was estimated that \$500 million in new financing would be required for Concorde-2 "but the consortium of companies already in being is technically qualified to proceed."

FRENCH DENY REPORT

PARIS, August 28 (Reuters).—The French makers of the Concorde supersonic airliner said today that they knew of no German plans to join the Anglo-French consortium building the plane.

"We know of no such plans at present," an official of the Société Nationale Industrielle Aérospatiale said.

[From the Paris Herald-Tribune, Sept. 17, 1970]

GAULLIST SAYS CONCORDE DRIVE THREATENS AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

(By Stephens Broening)

PARIS, September 16.—A ranking Gaullist deputy, in a private report to the party's ruling political bureau, has termed the Anglo-French supersonic Concorde airliner a doubtful commercial venture which may condemn France's civil aviation industry to death by 1980.

Former Foreign Trade Minister Charles de Chambrun sites the Concorde as only one example of what he says has been official waste. Although he never mentions Gen. Charles de Gaulle's name in the 17-page report, Mr. Chambrun condemns the prestige-oriented industrial policy of the former president.

"A summary analysis of the years since 1962 reveals a maddening truth: in aeronautics, SECAM [the French color TV system], shipyards and electronics, we have wasted, or have committed ourselves to waste, \$10 billion on projects without any serious hopes for commercial outlets," he says.

Mr. de Chambrun warned his fellow Gaullists that further errors on this scale could have serious consequences for the regime.

ABERRATIONS SEEN

Focusing on aeronautics, Mr. de Chambrun said that, "in the future we will be able to call the 1960-1970 period one of 'missed opportunities' if not one of 'intellectual aberrations'."

"Everything seems to indicate today that our aeronautics industry is condemned for 1980, for we shall have nothing more to sell," he added.

The report was made last June 17.

Mr. de Chambrun argues that in 1962, when France and Britain signed the agreement for the joint development of the Concorde, the French industry had the option of pushing on with a medium-range carrier based on the commercially successful Caravelle or putting everything into the supersonic venture.

According to Mr. de Chambrun, France made the wrong choice and "gratuitously abandoned" an expanding market to the British and Americans. He cited the success of the BAC-111, the DC-9 and the Boeing 737, with which a "super-Caravelle" could have competed.

CONCENTRATION ORDERED

"Because of the Concorde operation," he said, "any new creation of commercial airplanes has been forbidden in France since 1962. At the same time, Great Britain has assured itself of markets with the BAC-111 and has built the Trident and the VC-10, while France has renounced any new civil aviation projects.

"The whole Concorde operation excludes—and for a long time to come—any other operation of any significance."

Meanwhile, Mr. de Chambrun said, the Concorde project has far exceeded initial cost estimates. The original estimates were \$490 million for development, to be shared equally by France and Britain. Today, Mr. de Chambrun said, development costs are nearing \$2 billion and France has already spent \$720 million.

Moreover, he said, "what is tragic is that today its commercialization is not assured. I would even go so far as to say that it is even more problematical than it was four years ago."

THE 74 OPTIONS TAKEN

"Thanks to governmental pressures, special credits to developing countries, pressure by the Foreign Ministry and the solidarity of Air France, some 50 to 60 planes will probably be sold," Mr. de Chambrun said. Airlines have taken 74 options to buy; none of them is firm.

Mr. de Chambrun complained that "we had been told a theoretical figure of 450 which can only be attained if we win the market of the American airlines. Today, none of them has decided to take Concorde, and the reasons are very simple."

He said that the rising volume of subsonic air traffic "has created such problems that the best-informed authorities don't envisage a solution in the most ideal conditions before 1980. As if by chance, the American supersonic transport will be on the market at that time."

The Concorde, being built by Sud Aviation of France and the British Aircraft Corp., is designed to carry 120 passengers at 1,400 miles an hour from London to New York. Several design changes and increased weight have created performance problems which it is hoped that current tests on two prototypes will resolve.

FOR CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to redirect the great wealth of talented manpower from the decelerating defense and space industries to employment which

will aid in the resolution of our pressing social ills.

Our economy in the aftermath of World War II and the Korean war was characterized by the need for substantial adjustments in our manpower training programs. As the war in Southeast Asia winds down, we find ourselves in a similar situation. Job loss due to the reduction of military activities is in this case further compounded by the recent general cutbacks in the budgets of both the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At present the number of scientific, technical, and engineering personnel in defense and space-related activities is unprecedented. One out of two such personnel in the Federal Government is employed by the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the Atomic Energy Commission. Over \$14 billion is being spent on research and development by these three agencies. Of the engineers, technicians, and scientists employed by industry, one in every four is engaged in defense-related work.

We as a nation cannot afford to let this talent stagnate as defense-related jobs disappear and unemployment grows. In today's economy it appears that the initial victims of the job shortage are scientific, technical, and engineering personnel, and we must take immediate remedial measures.

I have been interested in the problem of conversion for some time. In 1964, I first introduced legislation to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission. This Commission would consider the problems arising from a conversion from heavy defense spending to a civilian economy, and encourage appropriate planning and programing by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion capability.

With the gradual phaseout of the Vietnam war, the problem of conversion has become serious and immediate. Every effort should now be made to plan and implement programs for an orderly transition from defense research to programs designed to solve pressing domestic problems.

For this reason I am introducing the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970, legislation which authorizes \$450 million over a 3-year period for general conversion research, for retraining of defense and space-oriented scientists and technicians, and for assistance to defense-related small business firms. Specifically, the bill provides that the National Science Foundation sponsor conversion research and that it develop and administer retraining programs for technical personnel. It provides further that the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce sponsor conversion programs for management personnel. Finally, the Small Business Administration is asked to assist small firms in conversion by providing technical grants, loan guarantees, and interest assistance payments.

I believe there is widespread support in the House for legislation of this na-

ture, and I am hopeful of speedy and careful consideration. It is essential that the Congress give full airing to such proposals. The future of the country depends on how we attack and resolve such problems as poverty, housing, and environmental pollution. We can fully utilize our problem-solving resources only through the effective conversion of scientific and technical talent from disappearing defense jobs to the needs of the civilian economy.

JAMES FARMER PRAISES PROJECT TO RETURN OVERSEAS PROPERTY FOR USE BY THE STATES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress the Committee on Government Operations recommended that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the State surplus property agencies explore possibilities for returning unneeded overseas property to the United States for further Federal utilization and for donation to the States. This recommendation is contained in House Report No. 865, 90th Congress, which resulted from a study by a subcommittee under my chairmanship.

Through an outstanding feat of cooperation, the groups concerned, acting on the committee's recommendation, have developed a unique pilot project that shows both substantial tangible results for today and great promise for tomorrow. Already over 250 container vans have now been shipped from Germany and Japan to the United States, at the expense of the States, for channeling into our Federal donable property program. This program, established by the Congress under the Federal Property Act, provides surplus personal property to our States for education, public health, and civil defense purposes.

Last August 25, the Army pier at Oakland, Calif., was the scene of a notable episode in this story. An entire shipload of property from the Far East arrived with over 9,000 measurement tons of Federal property unneeded by the Government overseas. Some 4,750 tons of this property were earmarked for the donation program. The rest is to be distributed by GSA for further Federal utilization.

At a ceremony to celebrate the ship's unloading, attended by high Federal and State officials, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, James Farmer, spoke some significant words about the importance of the event and of the program itself. They are words of hope and help that inspire as well as inform. They are, I believe, worthy of the attention of all Members of the Congress; and I inserted it in the RECORD at this point:

SHIPLOAD OF PROPERTY FROM PACIFIC-ASIA AREA

I am sure that representatives of the Department of Defense, GSA, HEW and the National Association of State Agencies for

Surplus Property, who comprised the task force organized to carry out the recommendations in the 14th report of the House Committee on Government Operations to the 90th Congress, regarding the return of personal properties no longer needed by DOD overseas operations, did not believe that the "overseas program" they devised would be the great success nor achieve the outstanding results that it has up to this time. It took the combined efforts of all members of the task force over six months to develop an experimental program to enable the return of property overseas, no longer needed by Department of Defense activities, to the United States for further federal utilization and for donation for health, education, and civil defense purposes on a basis which would enable the costs—in the case of federal utilization—to be economical and—in the case of donation—to be within the realm of "donation."

My office of surplus property utilization assigned one of its members to spearhead the screening and shipment of property in Germany. The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property formed an Overseas program group whose initial twelve State members contributed sufficient funds to enable that organization to also furnish a screener to work in Germany. With the advice, counsel and assistance of GSA and DOD staffs, both here and in Germany, the test program began operating on a full-time basis in May 1969. The first containerload of property, approximately 40 measurement tons, was received by the Maryland State Agency for Surplus Property the latter part of June. Many of the items in that container and in subsequent containers were of the kinds and types desperately needed by health, education and civil defense institutions, and which had not been available in the surplus stream within the continental United States for many years.

By the middle of November 1969, it was apparent that the test program for Germany had proven quite successful. As a result, in a meeting at that time with officials of DOD, GSA, our department, and the National Association of State agencies for surplus property, it was determined the Germany program would be put on an indefinite basis and extended to include the whole of Europe. It was also determined the same test procedures would be tried in the Pacific area. A similar joint task force group visited Department of Defense Installations in Japan, Vietnam, Thailand and Okinawa to discuss the proposal with officials at these installations to lay the groundwork for starting the test program. As a result, it was decided the test program would be initiated only in Japan and Okinawa. Here again, through the cooperative efforts of all members of the Task Force and with the financial assistance of the National Association of State agencies for surplus property, my office of surplus property utilization was able to assign a member of its staff to Okinawa and the National Association of State agencies for surplus property provided a man to work in Japan and another to work in Okinawa. The General Services Administration also placed staff in Okinawa and subsequently in Japan. The first container-load of property arrived at the California State Agency for surplus property from Okinawa in January 1970. Here again as in the case of property returned from Germany, the kinds and types made available are sorely needed by Health, Education and Civil Defense entities.

Just to give you some idea of the impact these programs have had on the surplus property utilization program of the department, through August 1970, 161 containers of property which had a federal acquisition cost of \$7.8 million have been returned from Germany and distributed to the presently participating 27 state agencies for surplus property. 21 containers of property have been

received from the Pacific area, having an acquisition cost of \$7 million through the same date.

We are today witnessing and celebrating the return of a complete shipload of property from the Pacific-Asia area for further Federal reutilization and for donation for health, education and civil defense purposes. The combined efforts of all the Federal and State agencies concerned is represented by this shipload of property. Never, in the history of the surplus property utilization program, have we witnessed such complete cooperation and dedication by Federal and State agencies in accomplishing a goal as we have witnessed in this overseas program. I want to express on behalf of HEW our sincere appreciation to Mr. Kunzig, the Administrator of GSA, to Dr. Marrs, of the Defense Department, and to Mr. Underwood, president of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, for the significant contributions they have made in making this overseas program a true success. As far as I can recall, this is the first time in the history of our country that property no longer needed in overseas defense operations has been so returned to the Continental United States for further Federal reutilization and for donation to health, education and civil defense institutions. I also believe that the foresightedness of the then chairman of the special subcommittee on donable property of the House Committee on Government Operations, Congressman John S. Monagan, in making the recommendation in the 14th report of that committee to the 90th Congress, should be commended. There is no doubt but that, as a result of this program, Federal agencies and health, education and civil defense donees will save millions of tax dollars which would otherwise have been spent to purchase property they will now receive through this overseas program. In this manner, swords are being beaten into plowshares. Materials no longer needed for defense are now returning to aid in the defense of all the people of this Nation against disease, ignorance and illiteracy, and poverty. At the same time, the taxpayers are receiving a partial return of the tax dollars used to acquire this property.

SUPPORT OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in welcoming and commending Col. Frank Borman after his important mission to 12 foreign capitals on behalf of American prisoners of war.

Colonel Borman's appearance before a joint session of Congress dramatizes the plight of our captured servicemen and of their families who have tried so desperately, but in vain, to learn the fate of their sons, husbands, and fathers. The Defense Department estimates that over 1,500 men are missing or captured in Vietnam. Some 400 of these men have been on the Department's list for more than 4 years.

Despite intense American diplomatic efforts during the last 5 years, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have refused even minimal cooperation. Not only have they failed to release U.S. prisoners, but have ignored pleas for a list of prisoners. They have consistently refused to permit inspection of their POW camps by neutral observers. They have refused to

release sick and wounded captives. Finally, they have permitted only about 100 prisoners to write home.

The North Vietnamese and Vietcong have even failed to respond to the direct pleas of the wives of missing American servicemen. POW wives have courageously organized themselves in an effort to learn of their husbands. Local groups of POW families rising up around the country have initiated write-Hanoi campaigns, made speeches, and appeared on television. Many have assumed the role of global ambassadors, meeting with the North Vietnamese in Paris, as well as with other world leaders. These efforts have dramatized the plight of the POW's to the world. However, they have failed to move Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

Such mistreatment of prisoners is a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention. Earlier in this session of Congress I cosponsored a resolution urging the North Vietnamese Government and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, and pressing the U.S. Government to take all appropriate steps to obtain prompt release of prisoners. This resolution, which was adopted by the House on December 2, 1969, as an amendment to a bill supporting the President's efforts to obtain peace with justice in Vietnam, was an important step in dramatizing the inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war and of their families.

Today's joint session of Congress with Col. Frank Borman is a further essential step. The U.S. Congress should and must serve as a focal point for the individuals and groups who have worked so hard to improve the treatment and obtain the release of Americans in Southeast Asian prisons. For this reason I fully support an additional resolution being introduced into the House today dedicating this year's observance of Veterans Day to the American prisoners of war. These men deserve the unqualified support of all Americans. In enacting this resolution, the Congress will demonstrate that these men have not been forgotten and that every effort will be made to secure proper treatment and release.

Perhaps the weight of public opinion, led by the Congress, may be able to accomplish what diplomacy has thus far been unable to do. It is quite appropriate that the upcoming Veterans Day be dedicated to those who have given so much for their country. These Americans deserve nothing less than our firmest support in the effort to bring them home.

THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, understandably, everyone wants to save life and limb and there is general support for legislation to improve safety standards in industry. The House may consider such a measure next week. My distinguished

colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM STEIGER of Wisconsin, and I and others have joined in introducing an Occupational Safety and Health Act which is to be offered as a substitute for H.R. 16785 reported by the Education and Labor Committee.

We seek a substitute bill to provide an effective health and safety bill but one without the serious objections which have been voiced to the committee bill. In simple terms, we want to avoid too much power from Washington in this field.

For instance, we propose that the program be administered by a board which is directly concerned with the problems of health and safety in industry. We believe this is preferable to vesting all functions in the Secretary of Labor in a centralized Washington operation.

This is a new program. It will have to try its wings. The substitute bill gives flexibility in its application. This is needed in a new program. We think a bill which does not mandate cumbersome standards-setting processes would be more effective by virtue of being more acceptable both to labor and management and will create far fewer problems. In this connection, as one illustration, the committee bill gives the inspectors dictatorial powers which in the wrong hands could work against an effective program.

The committee bill does not spell out guidelines on safety and health standards and we consider this an invitation to bureaucratic meddling which can produce untold problems in the operation of the bill.

In other words, we seek to avoid an unworkable bill or one which creates unreasonable problem. We want the program to succeed. We encourage the development and use of State plans and a realistic acceptance of programs best adapted to the individual States and to local communities. This in itself is of considerable importance.

We do not consider the substitute bill to be slanted toward any particular group, but believe that it will encourage cooperation between labor and management and Government to achieve a realistic and useful program which actually does save life and limb.

WAR RISK INSURANCE

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Transportation Secretary Volpe announced that the Federal Government will offer airline "war risk insurance" to cover 334 planes operated by American international air carriers. The Secretary of Transportation said that the Department of Transportation will offer aviation war risk coverage because it is not available at "a reasonable rate" from commercial insurers. He further stated that annual premiums for the Government insurance would be 20 cents per \$100 of insurance, double the present commercial rates but considerably less

than the threat of higher commercial rates resulting from the increased risks arising from the recent hijacking and the destruction of four airliners by Arab commandos.

This action by the Department of Transportation puts the Federal Government into the insurance business on a large scale, committing the taxpayers of America to a potential liability of \$3.2 billion on private equipment.

The Secretary of Transportation has committed the administration to this insurance program under the same provisions of the law which the administration attempted to provide for Defense Department loans of almost \$1 billion to the insolvent Penn-Central Railroad.

Let us understand what is going on in this situation. The Federal Government is insuring private property which is principally mortgaged, or in some cases owned substantially by commercial banks. What this really amounts to is an insurance coverage on a bank loan asset. In a sense, the taxpayers of America are paying the premium for insurance on a bank loan to the airlines.

This may be a perfectly necessary decision and I am not prepared to pass final judgment on the wisdom of the administration's action. However, if the U.S. Government is to become an insurer of last resort, why should it stop when it insures the assets of American bankers? Why not consider providing insurance coverage to homeowners in urban areas who are unable to obtain insurance on their property or their small business activity simply because it is located in a high-risk area? For the same reason, why should not the Federal Government consider the possibility of extending casualty and liability coverage to motorists who are assessed impossible premiums or who cannot obtain coverage at a reasonable rate simply because they happen to live in a high-risk community.

If we bail out the banker and the giant corporation, why not help the small homeowner and the citizen.

TWO PRESIDENTS SUGGEST A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO CAMPUS UNREST

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young lady in my district who was about to enroll at Western Illinois University for the fall term. In her letter she expressed considerable concern and apprehension about the possibility of campus violence—a fear which I am sure is plaguing the minds of the students' parents as well. The coed enclosed with her letter a letter she had received from Western Illinois University President John T. Bernhard. In his letter, President Bernhard pointed out that although Western has been fortunate in avoiding "violent and criminal extremes, it would be folly not to face the adverse possibilities of an unpredictable future."

With that the president went on to discuss not only the policies and procedures of the university relating to the outbreak of trouble, but the responsibility of the university community to prevent such an occurrence in the first place. In his words:

No rules, regulations, laws or policemen—however useful and necessary—can keep a university dynamic and viable. Only strong human dedication can keep the torch of learning vital and bright.

And the president made a forthright appeal to the students:

Please do all you can to oppose violent and destructive acts on our campus. Be a forthright agent for positive action leading to progress within the context of peaceful change. If you move in this humane and civilized direction, Western will benefit immensely from your personal dedication.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this letter I was struck of how closely the thoughts of President Bernhard paralleled those enunciated by President Nixon in his Kansas State University speech last week:

It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by government.

And again, from President Nixon's speech:

It requires that the members of the academic community rise firmly in the defense of the free pursuit of truth—that they defend it as zealously today against threats from within as they have at other times against threats from without.

Mr. Speaker, here are the forceful and forthright statements of two presidents—one, the president of a university; the other, the President of the United States. Despite their differing responsibilities and perspectives they share a common hope and belief that the university community can and should deal effectively with its own problems with a minimal amount of outside intervention. That belief will be vigorously tested and challenged across the Nation this year. Its affirmation will depend primarily on whether those in the academic community are willing, in President Nixon's words, to "take an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct and of respect for others," or whether they, "fall into a slavish conformity with those who falsely claim to be the leaders of the new generation, out of fear that it would be unpopular—or considered square—not to follow their lead." In the meantime, the rest of the Nation waits, and watches, and hopes and prays that our institutions of higher learning can master what President Nixon has termed, "the greatest crisis in the history of American education today."

Mr. Speaker, for those who have not yet taken the time to read President Nixon's Kansas State speech I commend it to their reading and refer them to the September 17 RECORD, page E8272. I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the full text of the letter which Western Illinois University President John T. Bern-

hard sent to all his students last July. The letter follows:

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
Macomb, Ill., July 1970.

DEAR STUDENT: As you well know, the campuses of many American colleges and universities have in recent months been scarred by terrible episodes of violence, bloodshed, and destruction. Much of our collegiate turbulence stems from a sense of emotional outrage created by the war in Indochina, the allegedly slow pace of domestic reform, and the conviction that has now become the scapegoat of American youth society. Much of this ferment is based upon legitimate concern about the future plight of humanity in a world growing more bitter each day.

Unfortunately, some of this outrage has erupted into forms that are wanton and inhumane. Apparently, a small hard-core militant group is determined to achieve a major objective: the destruction of the American university as a keystone of our total society. Obviously, no university worthy of its name can tolerate the intolerable; but this is easier said than done.

A university is both powerful and fragile. Its great strength lies in its educational mission and in its general service to the public—key elements which support the progress of human civilization. However, a university is also very vulnerable to physical attack. It is almost defenseless; it cannot become an armed camp and at the same time encourage freedom of thought; nor can it financially support a large police establishment. As a last resort of self-defense, it must rely upon the assistance of outside law enforcement agencies.

At Western, we have been fortunate in avoiding violent and criminal extremes. While our students are interested in and concerned about the large society around them, they are genuinely committed to democratic dialogue and peaceful change. This is a condition for which all friends and supporters of W.I.U. are indeed grateful and proud. Hopefully, it will continue to be the case, but it would be folly not to face the adverse possibilities of an unpredictable future.

In all fairness, I think that you should be aware of the attached major policy statement of our Board of Governors, issued first on May 15, 1969, and revised on February 21, 1970. I have also attached a statement of internal procedure which we are prepared to apply at Western should any unhappy disturbance arise in the future. Please study these statements carefully and make yourself aware of all the implications connected with disruptive campus behavior. Your full cooperation and support in this sensitive area are very much needed and will be greatly appreciated.

Above all else, the university must remain a congenial abode of the free human spirit. This is a subtle but extremely significant element, without which the campus would merely be a collection of cold buildings and isolated individuals. Without the good will of faculty, students, staff, alumni, and friends, no university can ever achieve or retain this quality of spirit. No rules, regulations, laws, or policemen—however useful and necessary—can keep a university dynamic and viable. Only strong human dedication can keep the torch of learning vital and bright.

In all earnestness, I urge your active support for the future destiny of Western Illinois University. Please do all you can to oppose violent and destructive acts on our campus. Be a forthright agent for positive action leading to progress within the context of peaceful change. If you move in this humane and civilized direction, Western will benefit immensely from your personal dedication.

Best wishes for a bright future at W.I.U.
Very sincerely,

JOHN T. BERNHARD,
President.

THE INNOVATION MIRAGE

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of the convocation speech delivered at Rockford College in my hometown of Rockford, Ill., by its distinguished president and my good friend, John Howard. President Howard chose as his topic, "The Innovation Mirage." His thoughtful presentation questions the automatic worth we tend to attach to change and innovation in our society and what all this portends for the quality of our civilization. President Howard poses the questions:

Why should anyone presume that newness, per se, is to be equated with worthiness? Why is that which is different automatically regarded as an improvement?

And to this he adds the observation that, among other things, the speed with which change is taking place has a disorienting and confusing impact upon people.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the full text of President Howard's convocation speech. It provides considerable food for thought not only for educators but for anyone interested and concerned about the future direction of our society. The speech follows:

THE INNOVATION MIRAGE

(Opening convocation address by President John A. Howard, Sept. 9, 1970, at Rockford College)

In 1933, the city of Chicago celebrated its centennial with a World's Fair. The theme of that fair was, "A Century of Progress." All forty-eight states, a great many foreign countries and most of the major manufacturers provided a vast array of exhibits to dramatize the cultural and technological achievements of man. The millions of visitors marvelled at what they saw. It is unlikely that it occurred to any of them to question the theme. Man's progress was impressive and the world had converged on Chicago to congratulate itself.

Anyone who would boast today that man had just completed a century of progress would encounter many startled responses of "A century of WHAT?" or words to that effect. The grand sweep toward an even brighter day has lost its momentum. Man is beset with so many quandaries he is not even sure which direction is forward. We have lots of things on the increase—hostilities and polarities, psychoses and neuroses, air and water impurities, an over-production of babies—but few people would claim that these abundances or any others add up to progress.

Given the present state of affairs, man needs to put on his thinking cap and try to figure out what will make it possible for man to live with himself and with other people. All the material comforts and labor-saving devices and medical advances are to no avail if people are suffering personality disintegration as individuals and fighting each other when they are in groups. Somehow we are going to have to domesticate mankind so that he will not destroy himself individually or collectively.

It may be that the very magnitude of our difficulties will provide the impetus for more people to pay attention to the general predicament. In a recent article entitled "Vertical Is To Live—Horizontal Is To Die", Buckminster Fuller observes how the conscious-

ness of the results of carelessness forces a person to be careful. The airplane mechanic, recognizing that lives could be endangered if he does his work sloppily, exercises the greatest care when he is performing his professional duties, but in all likelihood, at the end of the day he gets into his car and is just as foolish on the highway as everyone else. Fuller uses the phrase, "inherent integrity of spontaneous behavior," to describe the high level of performance of air transport personnel, who automatically work with great care, conditioned as they are to the critical responsibilities they bear.

Another writer concerned with flight personnel and human behavior, Earl Hubbard, states, "It is not a question of taste—as to whether you drink or take pot or sulk. It is a question of survival . . . The right to do as you please may be debatable in a dormitory, but it is not debatable on the frontiers of space . . . Moral behavior is survival behavior. Moral behavior is concerned with the survival of the race of man."

Perhaps the time has come to recognize that we are really dealing with the survival of man at least as much in the dormitories as in preparing a plane for flight. People may have become so interdependent and human problems may have become so threatening that our society will not survive free-wheeling behavior on the part of the college student or the housewife or the store clerk, any more than the plane could stay in the air if the mechanics and flight engineers and pilots took such an attitude. Buckminster Fuller often refers to the earth as a space-ship. It could be that we are rapidly reaching the time when all earth-dwellers are going to have to perform with the same high degree of responsibility toward each other that astronauts do in their miniature spaceships.

There is no doubt that man must discover some better ways to conduct himself. We who are blessed with the vocation of using our minds, whether temporarily involved in that vocation as students or permanently as teachers, have an extraordinary opportunity, and probably an obligation, to think our way through the troubles that lie about us and seek some more effective answers. That process requires challenging and re-working the common assumptions of our time if we are to identify and proclaim more productive ones.

This morning I wish to examine with you a very pervasive assumption that seems to underlie much of man's present activity. The assumption is that innovation is a good thing. In one of the books assigned this year for precollege reading by the entering students, *The Silent Language*, Edward Hall states, "Not only do we Americans segment and schedule time, but we look ahead and are oriented almost entirely toward the future. We like new things and we are preoccupied with change." He is right. We are preoccupied with change. The individual or the organization that is constantly springing something new not only attracts interest, but attracts allegiance as well.

Corporations which used to advertise their stability and venerability with reminders that they had been in business since 1868 or some other impressive by-gone year, now wish to convey an impression of being ahead of the times. Watch the ads and you will be startled, I think, to note how many are bristling with the innovation image.

However, it isn't just the profit-making enterprises that are so inclined. Education, too, has caught the bug. College admissions literature, including our own, presents innovation as a recurrent theme, with each academic institution proclaiming itself to be a fertile source of novelty, experiment and invention. In response to the advice of the academic community, President Nixon has announced his support for the establishment of a National Academy for Higher Education

which would have as one of its primary functions to serve as a clearing house for information about innovations which colleges and universities have undertaken. One of the newest periodicals serving higher education is entitled simply, *Change*, and features innovative theory and practice. A recent publication by the Committee for Economic Development is labelled, "The Schools and the Challenge of Innovation." Innovation is an "in"-thing. If you can out-innovate the next guy, it is presumed you are headed straight for glory.

A question poses itself. Why should anyone presume that newness, per se, is to be equated with worthiness? Why is that which is different automatically regarded as an improvement? Actually, the speed with which change is taking place has a disorienting and confusing impact upon people. John Jay Chapman vividly described this phenomenon:

"The young person . . . during the past quarter century has been like a rat in a bag which the rat-catcher keeps agitating lest the creature's teeth get a purchase on the prison. The . . . youth cannot be expected to get hold of any idea while the kaleidoscope is turning so furiously. He is numb and dizzy. He cannot connect his reading with his environment; for the books of the world have been projected out of quietude. They reflect stability, depth, relaxation, and all those conditions of peace and harmony which make thought possible. The youth, therefore, discards books as incomprehensible—foolish in fact. Education has for the time being lost its significance."

Although this excerpt is drawn from an essay more than fifty years old, it seems altogether pertinent today. The college student now is likewise beset with the circumstances of perpetual flux on campus as well as off. Even before the colleges became embroiled in the push and shove turbulence of groups pressing their demands and grievances, the colleges were emulating the outside world with new courses, new calendars, new curricula, new teaching devices and new horizons succeeding each other as swiftly as new styles in women's clothing.

It is possible that the vogue for independent study is an off-shoot of the fascination with innovation. Like many other novelties, this one seems to have been accepted without critical analysis and to be carried on without meaningful evaluation. It should be ascertained, for instance, whether the aggregate learning of the students involved in independent study surpasses, equals, or is less than what would have occurred in a more formal class situation. We ought to know what are the characteristics of the student who will maximize the opportunity he has in independent study and which students will flounder on their own. A high grade point average may not automatically signify competence for solo study. Furthermore, it needs to be asked whether the kind of learning achieved by the student gifted in independent study is worthier learning for him than what he would have achieved had he been in a class where the teacher presented a distillation of what he has found most important in his years of professional study. These questions are not intended as an assault upon independent study as a technique, which certainly has some validity, but rather as an illustration of how unthinkingly that which is new and in vogue is taken up by the academic community. In the new mythology where the innovation god sits on one of the lofty thrones, the sacrifices seem to be offered with little thought of the purposes served or the value of that which is sacrificed.

Now there may be those who perceive in these comments the setting up of a strawman to be knocked down for oratorical effect. They might assert that innovation in the current parlance is a label generally used

only when the enthusiast for a particular innovation has already perceived merit in the new thing which he champions. No, I do not think that is the case. Newness *does* seem to be regarded as worthiness. Perhaps the best way to support that assertion is to turn the coin over.

Consider oldness for a moment. Of all the terms in current usage, one of the most devastating, belittling, demeaning, stop-in-the-tracking epithets that can be applied is "reactionary". It is a red-flag word and the mere pronouncement of it tends to conjure up a vision of a dangerous, unthinking, unyielding type. And that is a paradox, for if the word does produce that result, it is an unthinking, unyielding reaction. The word, reactionary, used in a political or social context properly describes one who favors a return to former political or social policies. Surely, thinking man does not want to rule out the possibility of reinstating policies that have proven workable in the past when successor policies have proven ineffective. Thinking man doesn't, but contemporary man blinded by the supposed virtue of innovation seems to.

Take, for instance, the swelling chorus of cries for relevance in the curriculum, and relevance in this usage seems to mean that which deals only with me, today. The relevance seeker says, "Forget all this business of classics and philosophy and history and literature—it doesn't reach me." Undoubtedly many who hold that attitude do so with great earnestness. Nevertheless, their views cannot be permitted to prevail in academic institutions. Lincoln was once trying a case in court. Following one of Lincoln's statements, the opposing attorney, with great indignation, snorted that he had never heard of such a thing. Lincoln replied, "Your honor, I cannot permit the distinguished counsel's ignorance, however great it may be, to take precedence over my knowledge, however limited it is."

To set aside man's recorded experience in favor of man's present gropings is upside-down logic. Although technological developments have created wholly different circumstances in which man lives, human nature seems to remain a constant. Even the most cursory review of such works as Homer, the Book of the Dead, the Bible and the Essays of Marcus Aurelius will establish that man's motives and man's behavior were the same several thousand years ago as they are today. With regard to human nature, the old French proverb seems on target—"Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose." ("The more something changes, the more it remains the same thing.") It is, I submit, only as we can come to understand humanity that we will be better able to provide the modes of conduct and the social institutions which will make human survival possible.

To illustrate this point, let us turn to two recent analyses of two very different cultures. The first is a lecture which Dr. Walter Judd gave at Rockford College last January in which he compared the way of life of pre-revolutionary China with the way of life of contemporary western society. He observed that westerners have chosen to esteem progress, development, achievement, acquisition of things, and accumulation of power. It is a culture based on changes which are designed to increase material prosperity and to liberate man from labor and care. Our heroes are the movers and shakers, the go-getters, the businessmen and the political leaders. We exalt youth and vigor and we put the sixty-five year olds out to retirement pasture. The unit of organization is the state, which in some western nations is said to exist for the individual, while in other western nations is said to be the entity for which the individual exists.

In ancient China, by contrast, the family was the basic unit of governance and alle-

giance. Any offense committed by an individual was an offense against the people closest to the offender, his family. The individual's sense of right and wrong was heightened by the hurt he did to those closest to him when he committed an offense against the commonly held and clearly defined limits of morality. The overriding concern of the people was not for material things or for accomplishment but for kindness and courtesy and modesty and propriety and integrity in dealing with other human beings. The human virtues were those which made life pleasanter for others. Their educational program was not designed to make a vigorous, independent, driving, go-getter out of the child, but rather to teach him the wisdom of the past, to arm him with the highest thoughts of the sages. Their heroes were the contemplative scholars who had achieved uncommon understanding about beauty and goodness. The highest respect in each family was accorded to the eldest, so that a person, knowing that one day those he loved the most would count on him for his judgment, would, as a result, strive to prepare himself in wisdom for this trust. It was a society designed for stability, not for change. It was one in which the meagerness of material things was offset, or really overcome by the kindness and respect which people gave to each other. That civilization lasted twenty-five hundred years.

The other analysis I would call to your attention is a work by Christopher Booker, entitled, *The Neophiliacs*. In this volume, Mr. Booker considers what took place in Britain from 1956 to 1969. After commenting on the headlines of the era, the authors, musical groups, fashion experts, television personalities and the various adventures in revolt that took place in this period, he recounts the growing disillusionment with "Swinging London" and with its impact upon the lives of the people—"The lessened stature of politicians, a diminution in the general sense of community and responsibility, a feeling that life had become generally more unreal and fraught with neurosis, a widespread unease at the new power and influence of technology, a sense that too much importance was being attached to the trivial and superficial, a sense of the undoubted moral confusion that was following from the relaxation of conventional standards . . . the growth of an increasingly violent tradition of 'protest' attached to so many causes that it had eventually come out in its true colors as a condition of indiscriminate rebellion."

He observes that Britain had seen the fulfillment of the two components of the twentieth century dream: "the technological dream, whereby man would achieve a golden age . . . through a complete scientific mastery of his environment," and the libertarian dream, whereby man "would at last be able to fulfill himself through the sweeping away of social and political barriers and hierarchies, through a complete understanding of his own psychology, and through the pursuit of a new and total freedom in the arts and social relationships." He notes that during this fourteen year period there was a great acceleration in the fulfillment of both aspects of the dream, "toppling the barriers which kept the dream out of reach and therefore intact. The dream has come true . . . and its hollowness is increasingly exposed. Both technological advance and personal liberation from restraints and inhibition have proven to be hollow prizes and the society which won them is suffering the hangover of disillusionment."

In our country, the excesses of liberation have not yet run their full course, but there is here, too, a growing recognition that what has been thought to be the liberation avant-garde may, in fact, have been the trend toward a new and more devastating kind of imprisonment, that the bonds of obligation

to others have been thrown off in favor of the chains of a life without hope or direction or purpose. In an article in the May issue of the *Saturday Review*, Peter Schrag laments "To live or grow up in America in 1970 is to search for a center that doesn't exist." "The events and the forces we have created, and which we honor, tend to displace and destroy." "A generation ago . . . we regarded our discontinuities as signs of progress. Other things being equal, change was always for the better." After recognizing that that faith in change has been ill-founded, he concludes with the comment, "We are now all refugees in our own country."

All right, things are not as we would like them to be. We can sit around wringing our hands and wallowing in self-pity and some find a perverse enjoyment in doing exactly that. Or we can recognize that there has seldom been a time when the world was so ready for intelligent, highly informed courageous leadership. In a letter to the *Harvard Bulletin*, a Radcliffe graduate, Barbara Bernstein, berates two Harvard students who proclaimed that the world is over. She says, "Yes, the world is indeed sick, even in the critical ward, the nation is in the hands of Yahoos on the loose (both in and out of elective office), the problems overbearing. And what will deliver the coup de grace? The cop de out. It is very sensitive and intelligent to recognize just how horrible things are, but it is sheer self-indulgence to deny any responsibility for correcting them."

If the leadership of our society is largely composed of Yahoos, then that misfortune must, in part, be attributed to an educational system which graduates Yahoos. In education, as in all other functions of our society, it may be that we have been too heavily focused on novelty and innovation and individualization, encouraging the natural instincts for aggressive experimentation in behalf of one's self and minimizing man's time-proven necessity for norms of personal conduct which the individual must accept in order for a society to work. If we permit the thrust for contemporary relevance to prevail, then we cut ourselves off from the vast library of man's past triumphs and mistakes, a library which offers a roadmap of where man has been and how he got there and which identifies those roads that lead to a dead end.

It is both the task and the opportunity of the liberal arts to engage in a profound scrutiny of the nature of man and to discover what has given purpose and meaning to man's life in the past and what are the accepted standards and limits which have made living together in a society bearable or even enjoyable. We must, I believe, eradicate the foolish bias which assumes that that which has been said and thought and done in the past is irrelevant and recognize that on the contrary, it is only by familiarizing ourselves with the experience of an ancient China or recent England or classical Greece and Rome that we can better interpret what is happening now and more clearly perceive the options which are open to us. The Yahoos of this generation who occupy positions of power and influence must be succeeded by people of your generation whose judgments will be formed on a broad base of specific knowledge of man's history and culture and philosophical analyses. Without such a base of humane knowledge the decisions of leadership are doomed to be determined by what is popular, or by guesswork, or we will continue to see, to quote Peter Schrag again, "those entrusted with management try to invent (or enforce) conditions and problems that make their stewardship appear successful."

Actually, we in the liberal arts colleges face a double challenge: first, to steep ourselves in the wisdom of the ages at a time when innovation and newness have upstaged wisdom, and we must, I think, be wary of

the product or project sold on the basis of its innovativeness; and second, to diminish the hurly-burly of the campus scene so that our primary attentions can be directed to learning and contemplation rather than dissipated in the constant warring of power politics.

A cartoon in the *Saturday Review* last spring depicted an automobile sales area. The customer was saying to the salesman, "I drive in rush-hour traffic a lot. I need a car that can really creep." This may be an appropriate parable on which to end this commentary. Higher education has become sort of a perpetual rush-hour. Perhaps we need to acknowledge that circumstance and try to develop an educational vehicle that will shut out some of the noise and distraction on all sides, a vehicle which is not sold because of its innovation and gimmickry, but which will be intentionally designed for the slow pace of learning, which wisdom requires.

THE OIL-IMPORT QUOTA

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of winter, the Northeast is again threatened by a very serious fuel oil shortage; indeed, there have been warnings that such fuel oils may have to be rationed.

Mr. Speaker, the oil-import quota program in recent years has created a serious deficit in our country's supply of oil and it has placed a particularly heavy cost on the home oil consumer. New York consumes more heating oil than any other State, and under the quota system the retail price of home heating oil in New York State in 1969 averaged 17.6 cents per gallon. This compares with the average price in Montreal of 14 cents and in Iowa of 15.5 cents. This may seem like pennies, but each extra penny actually costs New York consumers \$45 million annually.

Last year, on May 1, I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) in cosponsoring a bill providing a schedule for the gradual, but total, elimination of the mandatory oil-import program. Mr. CONTE's bill has the sponsorship of 65 Members of the House.

On January 30, 1970, I joined with a group of 19 New York Congressmen in writing to the President urging that he give particular attention to the cost to the consumer of any import program he might authorize.

THE CABINET TASK FORCE REPORT

On February 20, 1970, the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control recommended to the President that the import-control program be phased out over a period of 3 to 5 years and that a system of variable tariffs be substituted for it. But the President decided to continue the quota restrictions on oil imports, at the cost of \$5 billion a year to consumers.

On June 17 the President did sign a proclamation amending the oil import program so as to admit 40,000 barrels per day of home heating oil in the east coast. This is a help, but it is not enough; more imports will be needed to correct the growing shortage. Furthermore, the President's order requires that the oil come from the Caribbean where there is the threat of price escalation. In July,

54 Members of this body, myself included, wrote to the Interior Department's Oil Import Administrator, urging that a minimum of 150,000 barrels per day be admitted, to meet the problems of price and supply in the home heating oil situation.

Although the oil-import quota was ostensibly imposed in the interest of national security, the fact is that the present import-quota program actually impairs national security, in addition to imposing high costs on the consumer.

The oil industry claims that domestic oil prices above the world price are required in order to provide an incentive to discover domestic oil and to maintain domestic capacity to process crude oil into the products required by the American economy. Since 1959 oil import quotas have resulted in high prices, but none of the hoped for benefits have been achieved.

According to the Cabinet Task Force's report, the total number of exploratory wells drilled declined by 32.8 percent during the period 1959 to 1968. This decline is no coincidence but is the result of the present oil policy.

STATE PRORATION LAWS

State proration laws are part of the underlying cause of the oil industry's inability to meet the Nation's needs. State proration laws regulate the amount of production on the basis of a maximum efficient rate or market demand, whichever is less. In practice, the result is a rationing on the basis of market demand. Under market demand rationing, the State agency responsible estimates that at a given price a certain amount of oil will be consumed and allows only that amount to be produced.

But, the States, in computing the amount each well may contribute to the total, take into account the cost of each well and allow wells to produce enough to cover their costs. Thus, the most inefficient and high-cost wells are allowed to produce 100 percent of the time while the efficient low-cost wells are allowed to produce less than 50 percent of the time.

The proration laws are effective only because of Federal policy. In 1935 the Connolly "Hot Oil" Act was passed, preventing interstate shipment of oil not drilled in conformity with State regulations, and making State control supreme. Until 1950, virtually all domestic oil came from Continental United States, of which about half came from Texas and Louisiana and these States literally controlled U.S. oil prices.

By 1959, low-priced imports threatened to make the State proration law ineffective by giving buyers the opportunity to buy low-priced oil in place of high-priced domestic oil. It was then that President Eisenhower issued an Executive order placing a quota on oil imports. In 1962, the Congress expressly provided for such quotas. The effect was to reinforce the State proration laws.

When offshore oil came into production on Federal lands, the Department of the Interior again reinforced State proration by allowing production only to the extent allowed by the contiguous State.

DOMESTIC REFINERY CAPACITY AND THE
RESIDUAL OIL CRISIS

The impairment of national security by the present quota system is dramatized by the recent sharp rise in prices for residual oil—50 percent—resulting from the unavailability of oil from certain middle eastern areas.

Residual oil is one of the most important products to be made from crude oil, for it is residual oil which is used to heat buildings and run electric generators. Seventy-one percent of the Nation's demand for residual fuel is concentrated in the east coast of the United States.

But, domestic oil companies no longer build or wish to build refineries which make residual fuel. Instead they prefer to use new processes to make virtually all crude oil into more profitable gasoline and jet fuel. The high prices for these fuels are, of course, supported by State proration laws and the import quota. As a result, since 1966 residual oil has been imported without restriction into the east coast area and 40 percent of all residual fuel used is imported.

Now that there is a crisis in foreign oil—the very thing the oil-import quota was supposed to be designed to meet—domestic refiners cannot meet it because they cannot make it. Thus, there is no shortage of crude oil, but only a shortage of residual oil in the United States today because domestic refineries are not able to manufacture it. If there had not been the market dislocation resulting from the State proration laws and import controls, the oil industry might still have refineries to make residual oil because it might have been profitable.

The fact that no provision has been made for the maintenance of residual oil supplies demonstrates that the basic concern with the import program is not national security, but oil company profits. As the task force report itself stated with respect to the residual oil problem:

One may wonder whether the security test should be different when imports do not threaten the profits of the domestic industry than when they do.

Canadian oil was until recently not subject to the quota as overland oil. But, President Nixon on March 11, 1970, put Canadian oil under the import quotas. To date, no explanation has been offered justifying this on the basis of national security by the administration.

COSTS TO THE CONSUMER

It has been estimated that the direct costs of the Federal oil program to the consumers for 1969 alone was \$4.8 billion. That amount would have been saved by consumers if the import program had been ended at the beginning of 1969. Because the import program has built up costs within it, such as the lack of available transportation for cheaper oils, and so forth, the cost increases each year. It is estimated that the cost to consumers per year for 1970 to 1985 rises from \$6.040 billion per year to \$9.692 billion per year by 1985.

The burden of this cost falls disproportionately heavily on the east coast of the United States. This is illustrated by the fact that the import ticket which allows

oil to be imported sells for \$1.50 per barrel on the east coast compared to \$1.05 on the gulf coast and \$0.85 on the west coast.

At the present time the quota's primary purpose is to allow the oil producing States to effectively impose high prices on the citizens of consuming States. If the national security requires that we rely on domestic oil, then steps should be taken to insure that oil is produced efficiently and the required refinery capacity is available.

WHY THE PROPOSED SLEEPING BEAR NATIONAL LAKESHORE IS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE RESIDENTS AND LANDOWNERS OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES AREA

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois for her statement in opposition to the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park proposal.

Because my congressional district borders on Lake Michigan, and because many citizens of my district also have summer homes in this area, I have received a considerable quantity of mail on the subject.

I will admit that the mail has been both pro and con, but the overwhelming arguments are on the side of those who oppose this bill.

So that my colleagues are aware of these arguments, I ask that a list of them be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

WHY THE PROPOSED SLEEPING BEAR NATIONAL LAKESHORE IS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE RESIDENTS AND LAND OWNERS OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES AREA

I

The various bills introduced in the 91st Congress propose a lakeshore recreation area, not a park. Thus the emphasis would be on recreation not preservation. We believe that this would tend to destroy the very thing the local people have so well protected, namely the beauty of the area.

II

No need for a federal take-over exists because the State of Michigan already owns much of the Sleeping Bear Dunes and it is fully protected and open to the people. The State of Michigan owns a total of 21,000 acres (land and water) in the "taking area" and included in the state ownership is approximately 17 miles of frontage on Lake Michigan.

III

The size of the proposed national recreation area is unnecessarily large (71,000 acres, land and water.) It would include 66.5 miles of shoreline and 41,000 acres on the mainland plus both North and South Manitou Islands.

IV

None of the proposed bills in Congress contain any provision for payment "in lieu of taxes" to local units of government. This would create a grave hardship for the schools and local government, and would make it necessary for those outside the park to pay higher property taxes to make up for land taken off the tax rolls.

V

The school districts that will lose a sizeable portion of their tax base if Congress approves any of the present proposals (namely: Honor, Glen Lake and Benzle Central Schools) all have outstanding bond issues secured by all the taxable lands in the districts. To now decimate the districts by Congressional action, is to take away a part of the bondholders' security.

VI

Although the security of the United States is not involved, all of the bills would grant to the National Park Service authority to condemn large areas of so called unimproved land. This is a violation of the basic right of American citizens to be secure in the ownership of property and not be subject to undue seizure.

VII

Michigan has 2,959 miles of shoreline. The state owns 480 miles of this, the Federal Government 85.7 miles and the Local Government 55.8 miles. So roughly one-sixth (1/6) of the Michigan shoreline is publicly owned. Isn't this enough?

VIII

The Federal Government owns 34% of all the land in the United States. Isn't this enough?

IX

Michigan has 6,350,000 acres of state and federally owned land. 72 state parks are located in the scenic areas of Michigan. This state has been cited many times for its outstanding state park system. Since the private sector supports the public sector reason must prevail over bureaucratic desire.

X

The legislation now pending in Congress proposes that property owners may only keep their house and three acres of land as long as they lived up to park regulations. We feel this is of doubtful legality as it restricts the free use and alienation of private property.

XI

While forests and fields may to the authors of the proposed legislation be unimproved property, they belong to residents and taxpayers who harvest their maple syrup, fire wood, logs and deer, and derive relaxation from them. Or they may have been purchased as an investment in land or to produce timber. Even so they have the same rights to their property as does the owner of the most expensive home on the lakeshore.

XII

The proposals describe improved property as a single dwelling that was started before December 31, 1964, plus three acres of land. This so called cut-off date, we believe, makes the exercise of the Secretary's discretion both retroactive and of doubtful legality.

XIII

President Nixon has called for an increase of state and local responsibilities. We therefore urge the State Department of Natural Resources to develop the 21,000 acres they now own in the Sleeping Bear Area by using a part of the \$100,000,000 bond issue that was approved in Michigan last year for this purpose.

XIV

President Nixon has asked the Congress to cut federal spending as an anti-inflation measure. We urge the Congress to save an estimated 50 million dollars as will be required to initiate the Sleeping Bear Recreation Area. We urge the Congress to save this money as our contribution to the anti-inflation program.

XV

All present proposals in Congress provide that the State of Michigan donate the state owned land in the park area to the Federal

Government. However there is a law on the books in Michigan which prevents the land from being donated.

XVI

All the land in the designated area of the "playground" is presently zoned under county or township ordinances and is protected against undesirable uses, and further government controls are neither needed nor desired.

The above listed are some of the reasons why we have opposed the establishment by Congress of a Sleeping Bear Recreational Area. More could be documented. But in essence we say that it is just plain wrong for the Federal Government to take over a populated area, push families from their ancestral homesteads and established homes, dismember established governmental districts and schools, and force the surviving local taxpayers to help pay for the creation of this federal incursion into local matters by increased local taxes.

CITIZENS COUNCIL OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES AREA.

December 22, 1969.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Aug. 10, 1970]

SLEEPING BEAR REAWAKENS

(By Judd Arnett)

Long-time readers of this pillar, if any, will be distressed to learn that it may be necessary to launch another attack against the bureaucratic predators who are panting once more to get their hot little hands on the Sleeping Bear Dunes.

If you are now saying "oh, no!" then you are doubtless recalling the previous running fight over this issue which lasted three or four years and was not terminated until Congress decided it didn't have the money to buy the land, anyhow.

Well, Congress doesn't have the money today, either. In fact, the Department of the Interior, under which such matters fall, is already over-committed on the purchase of lands for park purposes to the tune of \$490 million. This is why a number of projected recreation areas, including the Pictured Rocks in the Upper Peninsula, have not been developed despite federal agreement-to-purchase.

It may be ten years, or in some instances much longer, before Interior has enough money to bring these lands into park use. In the meantime, property owners have no idea what will happen to their investments in the years ahead; and in some instances the suspension of building and development is leading to economic hardship.

For the uninitiated, Sleeping Bear Dunes is a tract of unspoiled acreage fronting on Lake Michigan in Leelanau and Benzle Counties, with Traverse City the nearest large community. The size of the proposed park in years past depended on the ambitions of the gentleman attempting to seize it.

Sometimes it was 40,000 acres, again it was upward of 75,000. The argument, of course, was always to "protect the lake shore" and in particular the dunes, which are unique among natural formations.

Initially, the National Park Service went into the area without the advice or consent of the home owners and carved out the section it coveted, including some inland lakes and residential sections long established. Then a bill was written to authorize purchase, again without the advice or consent of those most directly and deeply involved, and Sen. Philip A. Hart became its champion.

There is one more thing you should know about Sleeping Bear Dunes, past and present. Under private and state ownership (there are considerable state holdings in the region), it has remained beautiful and uncontaminated. There are no honky-tonks or two-

bit souvenir stands featuring goods fresh off the boat from Japan; through private donations and surveys, pollution has been prohibited; on state lands there are camping facilities (although nearly a mile of shoreline has not been developed), and motels and hotels accommodate other visitors.

In every true sense, Sleeping Bear Dunes has been available to the public at all times. The region has supported a good school system, roads have been adequate to needs—for many property owners, this is home the year around. There is, in short, the principle of the ownership of private property involved in this issue, now as then, and this column has been interested in the full protection of it.

The old bill to seize it was a mess, and the new bill, once again sponsored by Senator Hart, in conjunction with Rep. Guy Vander Jagt, is no better.

The new one may be worse, in fact, for whereas the previous one would have turned Sleeping Bear into a national park, with all of the eventual protection that implies, the latest version calls only for the establishment of a "national lakeshore." And in the matter of government gobbledygook, it holds its own. Listen to this:

"(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act (H.R. 12230) the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. An individual owning property . . . may notify the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, and the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and shall within one year following the submission of such notice, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value."

Any property owner who would willingly submit to such an absurd contract would be a fool. It comes down to this: if the Federal Government wants to buy the land in question, let it come up with the cash or a reasonable facsimile thereof. That is the way business is done.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the speech given today by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN).

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MIZE (at the request of Mr. GERARD R. FORD), for September 21 through September 28, on account of official business.

Mr. MCFALL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, September 21, and Tuesday, September 22, on account of death in the family.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington for September 23, 24, 25, 28, and 29, on account of official district business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BROCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHMITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 15 minutes, on September 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. CORBETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of California, immediately following the recess today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON in two instances.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. PETTIS in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. LATA.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in three instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in four instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in three instances.

Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.
 Mr. ASHLEY in three instances.
 Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
 Mr. DORN in two instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. VANIK in three instances.
 Mr. NIX.
 Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
 Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in two instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in four instances.
 Mr. HUNGATE in four instances.
 Mr. HOWARD in two instances.
 Mr. TUNNEY.
 Mr. CULVER in two instances.
 Mr. MOSS in five instances.
 Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
 Mr. BRASCO.
 Mr. CONYERS in five instances.
 Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

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. 3318. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5365. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public land held under color of title to Miss Adelaide Gaines of Mobile, Ala.;

H.R. 13543. An act to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat; and

H.R. 17795. An act to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 21, 1970:

H.R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez;

H.R. 16900. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17613. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration facility at Bonham, Tex.; and

H.R. 17734. A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb and others.

On September 22, 1970:

H.R. 10149. A bill for the relief of Jack W. Herbstreit.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow,

Wednesday, September 23, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2394. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the activities of the Department of Justice in the enforcement of title II (extortionate credit transactions) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act during fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2395. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 91-273 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15405. A bill to render the assertion of land claims by the United States based upon accretion or avulsion subject to legal and equitable defenses to which private persons asserting such claims would be subject; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1218. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16785. A bill to assure safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women; by authorizing enforcement of the standards developed under the act; by assisting and encouraging the States in their efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions; by providing for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health; and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1460.) Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 19377. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 19378. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 19379. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential task force on women's rights and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 19380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses incurred in traveling out-

side the United States to obtain information concerning a member of his immediate family who is missing in action, or who is or may be held prisoner, in the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LENNON, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, Mr. KEITH, and Mr. GROVER):

H.R. 19381. A bill to revise and improve the laws relating to the documentation of vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 19382. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 19383. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States be free of phosphorous; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 19384. A bill to provide for the retirement of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, and of certain officers and members of the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 19385. A bill to amend section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 19386. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr.

GERALD R. FORD, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. REUSS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. KARTH):

H.R. 19387. A bill to amend the act creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to terminate the accrual and payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr.

O'KONSKI, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. O'HARA):

H.R. 19388. A bill to amend the act creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to terminate the accrual and payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for

himself, Mr. CAREY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KYL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. O'HARA,

Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. McCLEURE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 19389. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 19390. A bill to provide for the protection of persons and property aboard U.S. air carrier aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19391. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 19392. A bill to amend Public Law 875, 81st Congress, to require the Office of Emergency Preparedness to investigate and study the need for action plans for preventing or minimizing effects of disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 19393. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that, in cases of international aircraft hijacking, American air carriers shall be prohibited from transporting certain persons until such time as the hijacker has been extradited to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 19394. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for better control of interstate traffic in explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19395. A bill to provide that Interstate Route No. 80 shall be known as the 80th Division Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 19396. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate certain tax preferences for builders and dealers in low and moderate income housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 19397. A bill to protect the personal security and academic freedom of students, faculty, staff, and other employees of institutions of higher education by requiring the adoption of procedures by the States to govern the treatment of disruptive campus violence by students, staff, and other employees, as a precondition to Federal assistance, and to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 19398. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize educational assistance to wives and children, and home loan benefits to wives, of members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action, captured by a hostile force, or interned by a foreign government or power; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 19399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat a portion of tuition paid to certain educational institutions as a charitable contribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX (for himself and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 19400. A bill to provide for periodic, pro rata distributions among the States and other jurisdictions of deposit of available amounts of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BRADEMAs, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 19401. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the authorization for programs under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 19402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to receive gifts for the benefit of the National Agricultural Library; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 19403. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 19404. A bill to retain May 30 as Memorial Day and November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 19405. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 19406. A bill to repeal section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides penalties for offenses relating to certain airline tickets and advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 19407. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants to medical schools to provide scholarships to students who will provide service to communities determined to have a shortage of and need for physicians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCDADE:

H.R. 19408. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and other laws to provide increased research into, and prevention of, drug abuse and drug dependence; to provide for treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons; and to strengthen existing law enforcement authority in the field of drug abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McEWEN (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DENNEY, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 19409. A bill to amend the act creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to terminate the accrual and payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 19410. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 1379. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY:

H.J. Res. 1380. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate November 16 to November 22 as "National Good Grooming Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. ROUBUSH, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. BRAY, Mr. ZION, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MANN, Mr. AB-

BITT, Mr. KEITH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.J. Res. 1381. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare November 11 (also known as Veterans Day) as a National Day in Support of U.S. Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FREY, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. RUTH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HOMER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.J. Res. 1382. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare November 11 (also known as Veterans Day) as a National Day in Support of U.S. Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROE, Mr. PELLY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. RYAN, Mr. McCLEURE, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.J. Res. 1383. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare November 11 (also known as Veterans Day) as a National Day in Support of U.S. Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BARING, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.J. Res. 1384. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare November 11 (also known as Veterans Day) as a National Day in Support of U.S. Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H. Con. Res. 742. Concurrent resolution relative to U.N. Charter review; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 743. Concurrent resolution regarding persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. REES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. PELLY, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MINISH, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. BISTER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. ADDABO):

H. Con. Res. 744. Concurrent resolution regarding persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WINN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. ASHLEY):

H. Con. Res. 745. Concurrent resolution

regarding persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 746. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BARING, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 747. Concurrent resolution urging the President to determine and un-

dertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. GRIFFITHS introduced a bill (H.R. 19411) for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

593. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N.Y., relative to the treatment of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

594. Also, petition of the City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to declaring a boycott of Arab states in an effort to curb aircraft hijackings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

595. Also, petition of the Mountain Maternal Health League, Inc., Berea, Ky., relative to family planning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

596. Also, petition of the Dallas County Republican Executive Committee, Dallas, Tex., relative to a joint meeting of Congress concerning American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH MAKES SIGNIFICANT ADDRESS ON CRISIS IN WATER RESOURCES

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on September 15 our colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH delivered an important address at the Fourth Annual Governors' Conference on Water Resources in Columbia, S.C.

Sharing the platform with Gov. Robert McNair and introduced by Dr. R. C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, Senator RANDOLPH drew on his knowledge and experience as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee to present a very thorough and thoughtful discussion of the water resources problems faced by the United States.

Because of the importance of this subject to all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator RANDOLPH'S address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

"And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Thus in the second verse of the Bible we read of our most basic of natural resources.

You are aware of the exalted status of water in the world today. We are acutely conscious that water is vital to life and that without it the earth would be barren and lifeless.

Yet water, perhaps because of its basic nature and abundance, is too often taken for granted. Its value is indicated by the references to water in everyday conversation:

Bread and water, the most meager of meals, but capable of sustaining life; soap and water, the combination that keeps our world clean. And for relaxation, there are some persons who mix bourbon and water.

As with so many of the necessities of life, the great quantities of water available have lulled us into its misuse and waste. We are only now awakening to the fact that the supplies of water are not limitless. Even though most of the earth's surface is covered

with water, much of its population is suffering from or faced with serious water shortages.

We are in much the same situation as the ancient mariner surrounded by water but dying of thirst. Our growing population and industry have an apparently insatiable thirst that is becoming more and more difficult to slake.

The increasing consumption of water by people and industry is not the only problem we face with regard to this vital resource.

Water provides an important means of transportation, and rivers, harbors and waterways must be maintained in a modern condition to facilitate the movement of goods in commerce.

The demand for clean water forces several challenges on us. When it is a matter of basic water shortage, the challenge is a relatively simple one—new sources must be tapped and ways devised to deliver the water to where it is needed.

On the other hand, many localities have large supplies of water at their doorsteps but find them of limited use because of severe pollution. We are now harvesting the bitter fruit of two centuries of haphazard development and neglect. Streams that once were clear and pure now are rainbow-colored from wastes dumped into them, foul smelling and rapidly becoming devoid of life. The tragic cases of Lake Erie and the Hudson River are regrettably not isolated instances of a contamination buildup but will be increasingly typical if we continue to let pollution outstrip our abatement efforts.

The needs we face regarding water may force us to make some very difficult decisions in the near future. Not the least of these is likely to be an increased price for the water we use. Cost also is an obvious and unavoidable factor in eliminating pollution, one that I believe will be willingly paid in return for a cleaner world.

But even beyond economic considerations lies the possibility of drastic changes in the traditional American way of life if we are to cope successfully with our mounting water problems.

The use of water, for instance, may have to be curtailed if supplies adequate for the basic necessities are to be provided. Some areas have already had experience with reducing the consumption of water during periods of drought, and it is not inconceivable that water use restrictions could become a permanent way of life. Unrestricted air conditioning, lawn watering or car washing may become things of the past for many citizens, an ironic end product for an economic and social system that prides itself on providing an increasingly high standard of living for all people.

An integral part of managing our precious water supplies is the recycling and reuse of

water. Adoption of methods to recapture water previously disposed of would have the double benefit of reducing pollution and increasing the supply.

Then too, water supply problems could lead to an acceleration of encouraging a dispersal of population. If areas of high population concentration can not obtain adequate water supplies, then it might be necessary to restrict population growth and channel it to where there is enough water. It is further possible that companion restrictions will have to be instituted to control the location and water consumption of industry.

Radical solutions? Possibly, but the time may be approaching when the old, leisurely ways of dealing with problems are no longer valid.

The availability of good water in adequate quantities is, after all, a life and death matter. If it takes extreme measures to assure this supply, then there is no alternative but to adopt extreme measures.

Crisis situations require strong, positive actions, and I fear we are moving toward a crisis of the environment, including water, and that disaster may be avoidable only by radical action. These situations have occurred before. Most of us recall the dark days of 1933 and the trail-breaking action that was necessary to get the American economy moving again.

Government acted then, and government is willing and able to meet the new crisis.

The Federal Government has a long history of involvement in the development and management of water resources of all types. It dates when Thomas Jefferson was President and has changed in nature as water resource needs change.

Starting with the removal of snags and sand bars from the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the Federal effort during the 19th Century was devoted almost entirely to the improvement of navigational facilities. The Corps of Engineers has been involved in South Carolina since 1852, when it undertook its first navigable project in the Charleston Harbor. The 1970 Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill, now pending in the Senate and the House, would authorize a \$1½ million dollar flood control project on the Reedy River in the Greensboro area. This involves eight miles of channel enlargement.

The Public Works Appropriations Bill, now in a Senate-House Conference, includes money for two South Carolina projects, \$150,000 to plan further navigation in the Cooper River-Charleston Harbor area and \$284,000 for construction of erosion control and hurricane protection facilities on Hunting Island Beach. Flood control started to become a consideration in 1879 with the formation of the Mississippi River Commission.

The turn of the century saw further ex-