

Merchant, George S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milam, Jerry W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Bowman H. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Modell, Edward G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Jimmie E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Richard P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Freddie W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Jerry L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pellegrini, Joseph xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pendergrass, Nixon A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Piddington, Terry J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pittman, Robert G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pope, Eugene J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Potekhen, Richard P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Gary I. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinfurt, Frederick L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reuss, James E. xxx-xx-xxxx

Rhoades, Robert W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rizzotti, Joseph A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rosenhammer, Franz G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rubenstein, Stanley xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russell, Raymond B., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rylander, Roger B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sampsel, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sarabun, Charles C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlick, James M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schnorr, Dennis R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, William A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheets, Robert W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sigler, Stephen A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silvis, Daniel J., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Barry C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Melvin L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stegman, Gary C. xxx-xx-xxxx

Stevens, David R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swift, Jonathan G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tittle, John G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Torgeson, Michael G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trefethen, Michael W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turman, Bobby N. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tysdal, Craig S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Verholek, Michael G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Voshell, Keith A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagnitz, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Wendall L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wall, Deonn M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, George R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Richard B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wesloh, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winn, Joseph E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zukatis, Albert W. xxx-xx-xxxx

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 17, 1970

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

Blessed is the man who endures trial, for when he has stood the test he will receive the crown of life which God has promised to those who love Him.—James 1: 12.

O God our Father, who opens the gates of the morning and calls us to a new day, we commit our lives and our work unto Thee in the glad assurance that Thou art with us within the shadows and behind them working out Thy purpose for mankind.

In these trying times when our souls are troubled as we seek the good of man, when so much is demanded of us who would serve this present age, grant unto us insight and inspiration together with courage and confidence that we may prove ourselves worthy of the tasks our country has placed in our hands.

Confronted by problems too great for us to solve by ourselves we are driven to Thee for wisdom to see what must be done, for courage to set out to do it, and for strength to complete it.

O God, make us great enough and good enough for these challenging days. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SCHEDULE FOR REPORTING AND FLOOR CONSIDERATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Speaker's office this morning when the Speaker made some remarks about the general legislative program schedule of the House of Representatives for the coming weeks and months. It was my privilege to present the schedule of the Committee on Appropriations for reporting the various appropriation bills which must be considered at this session.

The schedule, if adhered to, will see all the regular bills for fiscal 1971—which begins next July 1—clear the House and

be sent to the other body no later than the 15th of June. This would mean that many of the bills would pass much earlier. For example, a bill for the Office of Education, which is being split off from the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, would be considered by the House during the week of April 13.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are undertaking to move the bills along. There is a spirit of cooperation between the two Houses, and I believe the prospects are good that we will be able to make progress of which we can be proud. If the House sticks to the schedule—and we have every hope of doing so—it will, I believe, thereby lay the basis for a substantial contribution to better management and efficiency in the Government generally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD and place therein the proposed schedule with a supporting explanatory statement.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock and remain in session while the House is engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR OBJECTORS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I announce that the Republican members of the Private Calendar objectors committee for the remainder of the second session of the 91st Congress will be: The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

PROPOSAL FOR AN IRISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Missouri in paying tribute today to our colleagues of Irish ancestry, and to all Americans of Irish ancestry.

St. Patrick's Day is always a joyous occasion. But I would like to make one serious proposal today—and I have just introduced legislation to achieve it—which I think is needed to promote greater understanding between ourselves and the people of Ireland, and that is the creation of a United States-Ireland Interparliamentary Group, similar to the one we have with Canada and Mexico. For while we Americans are always friendly on St. Patrick's Day, as well as the rest of the year, toward Ireland, the ancestral home of so many great Americans—and I have just come back myself from a trip to Ireland—the fact is that the official attitude of the Irish Government is not nearly as warm toward us as ours is toward them.

American warships cannot call at her ports. American planes cannot land in her capital city. American servicemen are fined if they wear American uniforms inside her borders.

The cool reception that Senator KENNEDY, for example, received the other day in Dublin, points up the difference between feelings over there and the warm glow that most of us feel back here toward Ireland.

The fact is that for far too long we have

taken Ireland for granted. As a result, Ireland is bound more closely today, both economically and militarily with Britain, her traditional enemy, than she is with the United States, her traditional friend.

Creation of the kind of interparliamentary group I am proposing today will change that situation, and I hope the legislation I have introduced will be speedily and overwhelmingly approved.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF WSB RADIO

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 15, 1970, radio station WSB, Atlanta, Ga., celebrated the 48th anniversary of its entry in American broadcasting.

During these 48 years WSB has performed outstanding public service, and has presented excellent programs and superior news coverage to the people of Georgia and nearby States.

As a clear channel station operating on assigned frequency of 750 kilocycles it has a signal strength sufficiently strong to come in loud and clear in many parts of the United States.

The original license to operate radio station WSB was issued to the Atlanta Journal Co. As the ownership of the Journal passed into the hands of the James M. Cox family, the ownership and management of WSB was transferred to that new ownership as a part of the assets of the Journal holdings.

In 1964 when the Atlanta Newspapers, Inc., divested itself of its broadcast facilities the radio and television properties were transferred to the Cox Broadcasting Corp. under which management WSB operates today.

Along with many listeners and friends who thoroughly enjoy the 24-hour service of WSB, I extend my congratulations to President J. Leonard Reinsch and Vice President-General Manager Elmo Ellis and the entire WSB family. I wish for them and for their successors many more years of wonderful service and operation in the public interest.

Happy birthday, WSB.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTING PROVISION SHOULD BE APPROVED

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this House faces not so much a constitutional issue as a question of faith—faith in the great majority of American youth—in its prospective consideration of a Senate bill allowing 18-year-olds to vote.

I support such legislation. We in this House should demonstrate to our young people that we have the faith in them that we want them to have in us and that we realize that those who rant and riot represent only a minute minority of their number.

My support is not based so much on the argument sometimes used that if they are

old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote. Nor do I support it mainly because it would be good for our youth but because it would be good for our country.

From my own observations of them, on campus and off, I believe they are willing and able to assume the responsibilities that go with helping govern this country.

We must, I believe, make our youth full participating partners on the basic questions of our national life and we must relieve the present acute frustration they feel from being left outside.

The issue is not so much whether we should do it by formal constitutional amendment or by simple statute. The important thing is that we do it.

We will on this question either give our youth a vote of confidence or we will continue to libel the great majority of them on the basis of the irritating antics of a minute minority. I think it is time this House joined with the Senate and voted to welcome these young people into full partnership in our Government.

INCREASE IRISH IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with a number of Members in sponsoring legislation to correct an unintended consequence of the 1965 Immigration Act. The purpose of that legislation is to provide more equitable treatment of immigration from countries discriminated against because of the labor certification provisions of the 1965 law.

I sponsored that amendment to the 1965 law because Ireland and the other affected countries that have provided us with so many fine people should not now be the unintended victims of unfair immigration requirements.

This amendment has not been acted upon and I feel it is now imperative that overdue relief be provided to the people of Ireland seeking to come to the United States.

I have thus chosen St. Patrick's Day to introduce legislation that recognizes the grave inequity which exists with reference to immigration from Ireland. I propose that we immediately authorize 2,000 emergency immigrant visas for Ireland because the 1965 law has virtually shut off Irish immigration.

It is indeed ironic and unfortunate that we would limit immigration from Ireland. The contributions of Irish Americans to the United States reach into every facet of our lives; our growth has been aided fundamentally by the contributions of Irish immigrants, their children and their grandchildren.

We do not seek special treatment for the Irish. But we do seek fair treatment—anything less would be a denial of our creed. When we needed strong hands and willing men to build this country; to build our railroads; to build our canals; we welcomed the Irish. How can we now permit the perpetuation of an unintentional discriminatory practice toward Irish immigration.

I hope that permanent corrections in

the 1965 law can be accomplished as soon as possible.

In the meantime I believe we should authorize additional immigration from Ireland. What I propose is just, fair, and overdue.

BLIND DIPLOMACY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the United States has turned its back on Rhodesia, and that plans have been announced to close the U.S. consulate there and to withhold recognition of Rhodesia as a nation. Apparently we have no consistent policy in these matters. Rightly or wrongly, our country worked for an end of colonization throughout much of Africa when the result was in many instances chaotic misgovernment with the United States footing the bill. We helped crowd the Dutch out of Indonesia before that nation was prepared to govern itself. A former British colony ourselves, we have stood with people worldwide who sought freedom—up to a point.

Now, with strange reasoning, we draw the line on independence for Rhodesia, a country with a stable economy and a capable government; a country which is non-Communist and friendly to the United States. Presumably, this is part of an effort to curry favor with other African governments, some of which already are alined with Russia or are working both sides of the street.

Rhodesia should be recognized as an independent country. They seek to manage their own internal affairs, as we did at the time of the American Revolution. To me, it appears poor policy—even blind diplomacy—to turn against this friendly country as we have done.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with today because, under the agreement of the objectors' committee, none of the bills is eligible.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the present work incentive program, arising from unintended deficiencies in present law, have severely interfered with its effective operation. These problems have been remedied by the President's Family Assistance Act as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under WIN, the States were required

to make substantial dollar contributions for both training and child care. These steep matching requirements slowed the entry of the States into this program. The Family Assistance Act reduces the State matching requirements for training and eliminates child care matching.

There have been gaps and lax enforcement in the referral of clients from welfare agencies to employment agencies. Some welfare agencies have held back on referrals while others have inundated the employment agencies. H.R. 14173 eliminates this discretionary and variable referral pattern by requiring that every able-bodied member of a family receiving assistance must register for work or training. The only exceptions are clearly specified in the bill.

Finally, the Family Assistance Act seeks to eliminate the confusion and conflict that has often resulted from dual agency responsibility between HEW and Labor by clearly specifying responsibility with respect to registration, training, and work.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 50]

Andrews, Ala.	Fascell	Murphy, Ill.
Annunzio	Feighan	Nix
Baring	Ford.	O'Neill, Mass.
Bell, Calif.	William D.	Ottinger
Biaggi	Garmatz	Patman
Brasco	Gaydos	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Goldwater	Pryor, Ark.
Burton, Utah	Gray	Pucinski
Button	Green, Oreg.	Reid, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan	Reid, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hanley	Reuss
Celler	Hansen, Idaho	Rostenkowski
Chappell	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Clay	Hébert	Ryan
Conyers	Jarman	Scheuer
Cramer	Kirwan	Steiger, Wis.
Crane	Lennon	Stubblefield
Daddario	Lukens	Stuckey
Dawson	McCarthy	Symington
de la Garza	McEwen	Taft
Derwinski	Macdonald,	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mass.	Tiernan
Dorn	Meeds	Tunney
Dwyer	Michel	Ullman
Erlenborn	Mikva	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Miller, Calif.	Waldie
Fallon	Moorhead	Watson

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

UNREGULATED IMPORTS FROM ASIAN COUNTRIES

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Philadelphia congress-

sional delegation have today voiced their concern to the President of the threat posed to the American men and women working in the apparel industry by the unregulated imports from Asian countries.

The members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, across the country, will leave their jobs on Thursday, March 19, to protest the threat to their jobs and working conditions and demonstrate their determination to protect those jobs.

The following is a copy of a telegram from the Philadelphia congressional delegation to the President voicing our concern:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many industries and the people working in them are threatened by unregulated imports of foreign products. This is particularly true today in the apparel industry, where unregulated imports from Asian countries pose a serious threat to jobs and working conditions of those American men and women working in that industry. Apparel imports from Asian countries has increased greatly in the past few years.

The ease with which one can acquire Asian manufactured apparel is illustrated by the fact that here in the District of Columbia, a suit made in an Asian country can be purchased for as little as \$55.00 plus mailing and duty. A suit made under sweatshop conditions.

We respectfully request that you take immediate action, using your authority and discretion, to protect the jobs and working conditions of the hundreds of thousands of Americans employed in the apparel industry. Respectfully,

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
ROBERT N. C. NIX,
JAMES A. BYRNE,
JOSHUA EILBERG,
WILLIAM J. GREEN,
Members of Congress.

BUSINESS INVESTMENTS IN PLANT AND EQUIPMENT PROVIDE STRONG EVIDENCE THAT A RECESSION IS UNLIKELY IN 1970

(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, since this session was convened on January 19, hardly a day has gone by that a Democratic Member has not predicted that a recession is just around the corner. These forecasts are probably welcome news to the Democratic National Committee because of the potential political benefits that party would derive from a downturn in the economy. As this constant parade of speeches warning of a recession has continued, I have become increasingly concerned that my Democratic colleagues might help talk the Nation into a recession.

A recent survey by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, however, provides strong evidence against the likelihood of any serious recession this year and of business confidence in the economy. Businessmen reporting to the Commerce Department and the SEC projected an increase in investment of 10.6 percent to \$83 billion. This increase in investment

in plant and equipment of \$8 billion is nearly as large as that in 1969.

As Edwin L. Dale, Jr., of the New York Times reported on March 12, it is important to note:

There has not been a recession in modern times that was not accompanied by, and partly caused by, a downturn in this kind of investment.

Mr. Dale reported further:

There was no sign of any actual slump in this important sector of the economy, even allowing for the inflationary factor. What is more, the survey projected the level of outlays would rise as the year proceeded, with the second half spending sharply above the first.

This survey demonstrates clearly that investors have confidence in the Nixon administration's economic policy and that they do not expect a recession. I hope this encouraging report will receive the attention it deserves.

The true import of the Commerce Department-SEC study, however, was omitted from the remarks of the distinguished majority leader last Thursday. I, therefore, have taken this occasion to set the record straight.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 875 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

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. 15694) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 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 (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House

Resolution 875 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15694, the Coast Guard authorization for fiscal year 1971.

The purpose of H.R. 15694 is to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for ships, planes, shore facilities, aids to navigation, and pollution control for fiscal year 1971. The total authorization is \$100 million—\$62,295,000 is for vessels; \$12,865,000 is for aircraft; \$24,840,000 is for construction.

The largest single unit item in the bill and the largest ever placed in this particular type of authorization is an amount of \$59 million for the construction of the first of a series of polar icebreakers to replace the *Wind*-class icebreakers. The Coast Guard's existing fleet of icebreakers consists of seven *Wind*-class breakers which were constructed between 1943 and 1947—only six of which are in commission—and the *Glacier* which was constructed in 1955.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 875 in order that H.R. 15694 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), has indicated, this is the bill which would authorize \$100 million during fiscal year 1971 to fund the operations of the U.S. Coast Guard. Testimony before the Committee on Rules was that this bill was reported unanimously. The gentleman from Indiana has correctly described the various categories in the bill as far as the authorizations are concerned. I see no need to repeat those facts and figures at this time, but I include at this point for printing in the RECORD the following figures:

The authorization totals \$100,000,000. This figure is broken down as follows: \$62,295,000, procurement and upgrading of vessels; \$12,865,000, procurement and upgrading of aircraft; and \$24,840,000, development and establishment of installations.

The largest item in the bill is \$59,000,000 to construct the first of a series of new polar icebreakers. Existing icebreakers are over 20 years old. The new type will have diesel engines for regular cruising and gas turbines for maximum power situations.

The bill contains authorizations totaling \$3,145,000 for modernization of existing vessels.

Six medium-range helicopters are authorized by the bill, totaling \$12,500,000. They will replace short-range models. Also authorized is \$815,000 to replace wing beams on seven C-130 long-range search planes which is necessitated because of aircraft fatigue problems.

With respect to installations, the bill authorizes \$780,000 to develop communications stations near San Francisco and in Hawaii, the initial steps in the formulation of an integrated control system in the Pacific maritime area.

The sum of \$1,760,000 is authorized for construction of waterway and navigation aids such as buoys, light and sound

markers, and so forth, in connection with Corps of Engineers projects.

The sum of \$1,390,000 is authorized for the purchase of a transportable pumping and storage system for oil pollution control which can remove up to 20,000 tons of oil from a distressed vessel and temporarily store it.

Finally, the bill authorizes \$2,750,000 for family quarters at a number of Coast Guard facilities.

The administration supports the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Members that although the bill was reported unanimously, there were additional views by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH). In these views, which I would certainly commend to the reading of the House, because I think they do discuss a very important problem—the problem of pollution as it is affected by the oil spills that have taken place off the various coasts of our country—the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated some dissatisfaction with the fact that in reporting this bill the committee authorized only \$1.3 million for the purchase of what is called an oil containment system, something that can be flown to the site of a spill and used to confine the spill within a given area.

The gentleman suggested that what should be done is that we authorize the procurement of at least two such systems, one for the Atlantic coast and one for the Pacific coast. He also indicates a view that the Budget Bureau had been unduly conservative in reducing the requests of the Department of Transportation for helicopters from eight to six.

His report indicates that these helicopters are useful in connection with the pollution problem and that therefore he intends to offer an amendment to restore the original request of the Department of Transportation in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the adoption of the rule. I would urge its support by the Members.

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. CLARK. 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. 15694) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

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

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. 15694, with Mr. FLYNT 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) will be recognized for 30 minutes,

and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my strong support for H.R. 15694, which would provide funds for the Coast Guard to operate within the wide range of its responsibilities.

This bill, H.R. 15694, "to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard" is generally referred to as the Coast Guard authorization bill.

This measure was reported by our committee in House Report No. 91-879 on March 5, 1970, with no amendments, but with additional views of one member concerning the oil pollution cleanup problem.

As presented to the committee and reported out, the total amount was \$100 million covering the needs of the Coast Guard with respect to the equipment and projects I just mentioned. The \$100 million authorization is broken down as follows: \$62,295,000 for vessels, \$12,865,000 for aircraft, and \$24,840,000 for construction.

In summary, the more important projects to be funded in this bill are as follows:

First, construction of a polar icebreaker which I shall discuss in a few minutes.

Second, high endurance cutters—improvements to 327-foot class.

The Coast Guard's six 327-foot HEC's will be operated for about 10 more years. Although old, they retain excellent sea-keeping qualities. The total cost of the project is \$2,150,000.

Third, USCG cutter *Storis*—WAGB-38—habitability and shop improvements.

Storis is a 230-foot icebreaker built in 1942. As such, the habitability of her living spaces is far below modern standards. The total cost of the project is \$175,000.

Fourth, buoy tenders—habitability improvements on four tenders.

The Coast Guard is operating 38 sea-going and 12 coastal buoy tenders which are over 26 years old and beyond normal service life. The total cost of the project is \$820,000.

Fifth, procure six medium-range helicopters.

Procure six twin-turbine, rotary-wing aircraft to replace obsolescent aircraft. The total cost of the project is \$12,050,000.

Sixth, replace center wing section on seven C-130 aircraft.

Extensive corrosion and impending structural repair problems associated with fatigue cracking necessitate center wing replacement. The total cost of the project is \$815,000.

There are a number of critical projects set forth in this year's Coast Guard authorization. Foremost among these, is the authorization of \$59 million for the construction of the first of a series of polar icebreakers to replace the old *Wind* class icebreakers. It is interesting to note that this is the largest single unit item in the bill and the largest ever placed in this particular type of authorization. The

failure last summer of the Coast Guard icebreaker, *Northwind*, to complete the transit of the Northwest Passage with the tanker, *Manhattan*, brought home forcibly the necessity of initiating a polar icebreaker replacement program.

This is especially so in view of the commercial activities which may develop in the polar regions in the next several years. I say polar rather than arctic to point out that these vessels are for use in all polar regions and not just in the Northwest Passage. It should be recognized, however, that the main purpose of this program is to begin the replacement of the Coast Guard's aging icebreaker fleet which operates in the Arctic, the Antarctic and the Great Lakes region. The Coast Guard keeps one of its best icebreakers, the *Mackinaw*, on station in Sheboygan to service the Great Lakes.

Another item of primary importance in this authorization bill is that of pollution control equipment. As the members of this committee know, we have had a rash of tragic oil spills in our own waters in the last several months. I personally led a delegation last month to inspect the serious spill in the Tampa/St. Petersburg area and right now the Coast Guard is mobilizing every available resource to combat a spill in the Gulf of Mexico which gives every indication of being as severe as that off Santa Barbara.

Thus, the item in this bill of \$1,390,000 for the first transportable pumping and storage system is of primary importance. The inspection of the Tampa/St. Petersburg spill pointed out the almost total lack of equipment available to deal with these spills. In addition to this piece of equipment just mentioned, it is noted that the aircraft items in the bill are crucial since they are all important cogs in the oil pollution fight.

I do not think it necessary for me to take the time to point out to this Committee the vast range of Coast Guard activities, nor do I feel it necessary to call your attention in a lengthy discourse to the efficiency and competence of the Coast Guard.

I believe that this bill speaks for itself and we strongly urge the House to support this reasonable Coast Guard appropriation authorization.

There are members of both the majority and minority of our committee who are present and who may wish to speak in behalf of this bill.

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

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

Mr. KYL. I would be most pleased if the gentleman could expand on the anti-pollution operations of the bill, for example, the transportable pumping and storage facilities. What kind of equipment is this; how does it perform?

Mr. CLARK. This is a transportable piece of equipment that is really made of a plastic material, a piping material, and along with the plastic piping material is an apron that goes down into the water. And what it does is to keep the oil spill from going to the beaches or into other areas where you do not want it to go.

Mr. KYL. Am I correct, then, in saying that the apron or envelope as the

gentleman calls it is intended to capture the oil slick and then the pumping operation follows to pick the oil from the water?

Mr. CLARK. The pumping operation proceeds after the plastic pipe material has been put in place.

Mr. KYL. This is the most interesting aspect of the entire discussion.

How much pilot operation experience have we had with this particular device, this technique?

Mr. CLARK. Well, we have not had very much experience in this area. Right now we have one in operation. We have in the bill a request for one more of these. It is a prototype. It is really not completely perfected. We might have to make some changes in the test operation, perhaps, after the Gulf of Mexico operation is studied further.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying that the probability of success is so imminent that this is obviously the best thing we can be doing in the particular field?

Mr. CLARK. I believe this is correct.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, along the lines of the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), is it true that this system with which we are hoping to stop pollution is also designed to permit the transfer of oil from a tanker which shows signs of trouble to some sort of temporary storage containers so that it will not be spilled upon the water?

Mr. CLARK. I think our biggest problem at least on the Atlantic coast is the fact that so many ships—and, perhaps, I am not answering the gentleman's question in the manner that he wants it answered—are emptying their bilges into the water. In other words, they are taking it and dumping it into the sea. Of course, as a result of that operation we are getting pretty good results.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further. As the gentleman in the well knows—and I raise the question only so that we may have it clearly in the Record—a part of the functioning of this particular system as I understand it is to assist a tanker when it is in trouble to offload its cargo of oil before it is spilled on the sea.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The proposed system includes a temporary pumping system and containers which will permit taking the oil out of the vessel before the oil is spilled on the sea and putting it in temporary storage containers; am I correct?

Mr. CLARK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So here again we are reaching for an attempt to stop pollution, a critically important thing, before it gets beyond our ability to control it?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15694, a bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and the construction of installations for the Coast Guard.

This bill would allow the Coast Guard to acquire a needed mix of hardware, communications systems, installations and pollution equipment in order to continue to meet its worldwide duties and commitments.

I was especially pleased to note the presence of a large line item for the first of a series of replacement polar icebreakers. For quite a few years now, my committee in hearings has been talking about the necessity of getting a replacement icebreaker program underway. We were especially interested in the possibilities of nuclear propulsion for these icebreakers. The craft under consideration in this bill will have a combination diesel-gas engine propulsion system because this system is much less complicated than a nuclear unit, less expensive and can do the job. I understand, however, that the Coast Guard has not ruled out nuclear propulsion in this area for the future.

I would also like to make the point that these polar icebreakers are for use in all the polar regions of the world, not just the recently well-publicized Northwest Passage which may or may not be used to carry oil from the north slope of Alaska to the Northeastern U.S. markets. In addition, I would like to point out that the ancient Coast Guard icebreaking fleet serves such waters as the Great Lakes.

I would like to comment on another pertinent piece of equipment covered in this authorization bill. I am referring to an item of \$1,390,000 to provide for a portable pumping and storage system which can be flown to the site of an oil spill. At the present, the Coast Guard has no facilities which would provide such a capability. If this prototype is successful, they will move forward in this area.

I feel that the amount of \$100 million in this bill is really a modest sum when considered in the context of the varied and farflung responsibilities of the Coast Guard and its contributions to the Nation. Thus, I urge the passage of this important authorization bill.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that I need not devote any time to calling the attention of this body to the activities of the Coast Guard. We know that they range from minimizing the effect of oil spills, through protection of our shipping from icebergs; from Operation Market Time off the coast of Vietnam to protecting the vast number of small-boat users in our country.

Over the years, not only has the number of missions assigned to the Coast Guard grown but virtually all of them have increased in size and importance.

During the past year, we have seen the Coast Guard coping with major oil spills in Florida, Louisiana, and California. Within the past 3 years, they have taken over the responsibility for removal of bridge obstructions which impede navigation on our inland navigable waters.

I submit too you, Mr. Chairman, that

it is not necessary to be expert in the field of Coast Guard activities to recognize the need for expenditures set out in this bill. I think that the necessity of the amount is best shown by the figures on Coast Guard equipment contained in the hearings before the Committee and supporting papers. The Coast Guard is presently operating six high endurance cutters, average age 34 years; nine high endurance cutters, average 27 years; 12 high endurance cutters, average 24 years; eight medium endurance cutters averaging 26 years in age; and seven icebreakers, the newest of which was built in 1954. Its buoy tenders are as old as 37 years.

Any of us would hesitate to travel aboard any vessel as old as these so why should we require our Coast Guard engaged in our protection to use such vessels?

With respect to shoreside installations, the same situation prevails. We are woefully short of accommodations for Coast Guard men and their families and the organization suffers by comparison with quarters furnished to men of the other armed services.

I think that it is important that we provide sufficient funds for this dedicated organization to do its job. After all, we are talking about the safety of lives and property. We are talking about providing sufficient equipment to rescue us if through bad luck or bad judgment in the operation of our small boats we get in trouble. We are talking about protecting our people and our resources from the consequences of an oil spill and we are talking about rescuing us from the consequences of major floods. These are not unusual—they are things that can happen to us any day and it is important that we provide sufficient tools to the organization devoted to protecting us from such emergencies.

I am painfully aware of the many demands on our financial resources. However, we must not ignore the needs of this useful organization so that the time can come when our failure to supply adequate equipment can result in a very serious tragedy. We must prevent this by providing sufficient money for at least the minimum needs of this lifesaving organization. I hope that all the Members will join with me in supporting H.R. 15694.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today, H.R. 15694, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for vessels, airplanes, shore installations, and such other important matters as navigation aids and oil pollution control.

It is interesting to note that of the \$62,295,000 for vessels, \$59,000,000 is allocated for the construction of the first of a series of polar icebreakers to replace the old *Wind* class icebreakers. This \$59,000,000 is the largest unit item in the bill, and the largest ever placed in this particular type authorization. The Coast Guard's present fleet of polar icebreakers consists of seven *Wind* class breakers constructed between 1943 and 1947—only six of which are in commission—and the *Glacier*, constructed in 1955. The proposed vessel will replace the equivalent of almost two of the old *Wind* class

vessels since the new icebreaker will be much more modern with a vastly improved performance capability.

This replacement vessel will embody a concept new to this class of ship and new to the arctic marine environment. It will have conventional diesel engines for normal cruising and gas turbines for maximum power situations. The Coast Guard indicates that this new propulsion system will provide available shaft horsepower which will exceed that of any icebreaker afloat, including Russia's nuclear-powered *Lenin*.

The necessity of getting on with the replacement of the Coast Guard's icebreaker fleet was brought sharply into focus by the failure of the Coast Guard icebreaker *Northwind* to complete its escort duties with the tanker *Manhattan* in its well-publicized transit of the Northwest Passage last summer. It might be noted that the Canadian icebreaker *McDonald* completed the escort of the *Manhattan* to the north slope of Alaska.

We have certainly had mounting evidence in recent years of the deterioration of American maritime capability, both military and commercial. I submit to the Members of this great body, that this humiliating incident is the latest in the tragic catalog of U.S. maritime decline. Imagine a nation with our maritime history and marine orientation being forced to rely on a foreign-flag icebreaker for the completion of the *Manhattan* project. We appear to be on the threshold of a dramatic breakthrough for commercial carriage in the polar regions, thus it is imperative that we establish and maintain a responsive icebreaking capability.

I have chosen this one item to comment on because it is the single largest expenditure and because of the critical nature of the project. Of course all the Coast Guard's work is significant since it is aimed at protecting lives and property. I will not take the time now to draw this body's attention to all the projects in this bill since the Members are aware of the Coast Guard's vast range of responsibilities.

I am fully aware of the many demands on our financial resources and of the necessity of establishing fiscal priorities. I feel, however, that the efficiency, expertise, and competence of the Coast Guard speaks for itself and fully justifies the authorizations set out in this bill. Thus, I ask the support of all the Members of this body for the passage of H.R. 15694.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15694, the bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. I am sure I do not need to remind my colleagues of the vital work which the Coast Guard performs. Nevertheless, it may be well to recall the primary duties of the Coast Guard as set forth in title 14 of the United States Code. It states:

The Coast Guard shall enforce or assist in the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws upon the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

shall administer laws and promulgate and enforce regulations for the promotion of safety of life and property on the high seas and on waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States covering all matters not specifically delegated by law to some other executive department; shall develop, establish, maintain, and operate, with due regard to the requirements of national defense, aids to maritime navigation, icebreaking facilities, and rescue facilities for the promotion of safety on and over the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and shall maintain a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war.

This is indeed an impressive list of responsibilities.

In order to carry out these far-ranging duties, the Coast Guard employs approximately 38,000 uniformed personnel and over 6,000 civilian employees. Its fleet consists of 37 high endurance cutters with three additional cutters now under construction, a variety of medium endurance cutters, 38 sea-going and 12 coastal buoy tenders, and assorted harbor craft. In the air, the Coast Guard operates a fleet of C-130 long-range search aircraft and amphibian helicopters for search and rescue missions. The icebreaker fleet consists of six commissioned *Wind* class vessels and one vessel of the *Glacier* class. Afloat and ashore, the Coast Guard maintains an infinite variety of aids to navigation and rescue stations.

To a far greater extent than any other branch of our Government, the role of the Coast Guard demands constant readiness to answer the call of those in distress whether it involves a ship on the high seas, a drowning seaman, or the victims of floods and hurricanes.

While the responsibilities of the Coast Guard have been steadily expanded, the facilities available to carry out these duties have not been augmented to the same degree. Nevertheless, in spite of the shortage of modern ships and in spite of the hazards which the personnel of the Coast Guard daily face, they have done their job.

The Coast Guard budget for fiscal year 1971 totals \$625 million, an increase of \$46 million over the 1970 budget, and an increase of \$81 million over the 1969 budget. Of this \$625 million, \$100 million is for acquisition of ships and aircraft and construction of facilities. It is this \$100 million segment of the Coast Guard budget which we are concerned with today in H.R. 15694. This represents an increase of \$32 million over the 1970 acquisition and construction budget.

Mr. Chairman, our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is heartened by this substantial increase in the Coast Guard budget. We sincerely hope that this reflects a new awareness of the tremendous responsibilities which have been placed on the Coast Guard. As you recall, last year your committee increased the budget authorization for the Coast Guard by \$60 million. However, in view of the substantially improved budget submitted this year by the Department of Transportation, the committee has not recommended any further increases.

The committee's action, Mr. Chairman, should not be construed, however, as an

indication that we are satisfied with the present state of readiness of the Coast Guard for we are indeed not satisfied. For example, the fleet of 38 high endurance cutters, which I previously mentioned, includes 10 former Navy seaplane tenders constructed during World War II. These vessels were originally designed to operate in sheltered waters to service the flying boats which were used for patrol and antisubmarine warfare during World War II.

They were not built with the thought that they would be employed for station-patrolling on the high seas. This fleet also includes six high endurance cutters constructed during 1936 and 1937. Although these ships were built to Coast Guard specifications and are far superior to the relatively newer Navy seaplane tenders, they cannot be expected to remain in service many more years. The 1971 budget contains funds to complete habitability and seakeeping improvements on these ships. With these improvements, they can be expected to remain in operation no more than 10 additional years. At that point, they will be approximately 45 years old.

The nine 378-foot class high endurance cutters now in operation and the three vessels of this class under construction form the backbone of the Coast Guard's fleet. These ships, which were begun in 1964, are excellent vessels, ideally suited to the Coast Guard's role. No funds are included in this year's budget to continue construction of these 378-foot class ships. Ultimately, 15 vessels of this class will be built. Your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries anticipates that construction of these vessels will be resumed next year. Mr. Chairman, the high endurance cutter fleet is only one example of the Coast Guard's need to continually upgrade the equipment to keep pace with its responsibilities. Nevertheless, as I have indicated, in view of the substantial increase in the budget for fiscal year 1971, as compared with last year, your committee has not recommended any further additions to the budget. I wish to assure my colleagues, however, that we will again scrutinize the budget with great care next year, and take appropriate action should it not continue to reflect this new awareness of the Coast Guard's need.

H.R. 15694 contains an authorization for the construction of one polar icebreaker to begin the replacement of the *Wind* class, which have been in continuous service for an average of 25 years in the harsh polar environment. These vessels are overage and have deteriorated. Habitability and operational improvements which have been made to this class will enable them to continue in operation no later than the mid-1970's. It is expected that four of the new icebreakers will provide the equivalent capability of the entire *Wind* class. How many of these ships will be needed, however, will depend to a large extent upon marine transportation developments in the Arctic regions and upon the future of exploration in the South Polar regions.

As the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), has indicated these vessels will employ

a new power concept for icebreakers, conventional diesel engines for cruising and gas turbines for maximum power situations. This concept has been employed successfully in the 378-foot class high endurance cutters. Power combinations utilizing gas turbines are also being introduced in the Navy. The Coast Guard has given the construction of this vessel the highest priority. Your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been working for a number of years to secure funding for such a program.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate the fact that the funds authorized to be appropriated in H.R. 15694 as reported by your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reflect a substantial increase over the budget request for the Coast Guard of last year. This increase will enable the Coast Guard to construct one polar icebreaker, a matter of urgent priority. We are aware that this bill does not reflect the total budget request of the Coast Guard, and as I have indicated there are many other areas where funds are urgently needed. We anticipate that the Coast Guard's procurement and construction budget for next year will again show a substantial increase to keep pace with the need for replacement of over-age ships and equipment. This authorization bill is certainly not an austere measure by past standards, and it will enable the Coast Guard to continue to meet its existing responsibilities. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to indicate my support for the legislation and certainly to express my appreciation to the gentleman in the well the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD), the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), and the entire committee for the consideration they gave to the radio station for the Coast Guard to be relocated at the Point Reyes-Bolinas area.

Also, I believe it would be appropriate that I pay my respects to the Coast Guard for the manner in which they have handled a very delicate situation because a number of Marin County and San Francisco Bay area conservation groups were very concerned about placing this facility in the Inverness area. I believe we have worked out a very satisfactory compromise, and I do want to compliment and thank the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD), for his excellent cooperation and assistance in advancing the authorization of the communications facility at Point Reyes and Point Reyes Station.

It is always very gratifying when we can work out an acceptable compromise that satisfies all parties—this appears to be one of those rare cases.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in support of H.R. 15694, the bill to authorize ap-

propriations for vessels, aircraft and shore installations for the Coast Guard. The total amount authorized under this bill is \$100 million to supply what are the minimum needs for this agency which serves the people of the United States so well.

There is no need at this time to run through the responsibilities and accomplishments of this old and dedicated agency. I would, however, like to take this opportunity to comment on several factors affecting the Coast Guard which are a cause for concern.

In the present administration budget there is a move to phase out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve, allegedly because it will result in a saving of \$25 million. I submit that this is a short-sighted view and that such an attitude is pennywise and pound foolish. My colleagues know that the mail is very, very heavy on this subject, almost all of it being in opposition to this phaseout. I hope the appropriate committees of Congress having jurisdiction over the Armed Forces Reserve components will see fit to authorize appropriations for the continuation of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve. I am confident that this will be the case.

One way we can manifest our support for the Coast Guard is to pass this authorization bill now under consideration. It does not involve an inordinate expenditure, especially when considered in terms of the return to the American people. Thus, I urge passage of the 1971 Coast Guard authorization bill.

Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a brief word in support of H.R. 15694. More than half of the coast line of the State of Oregon is within my district. As a result of this, as well as my service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have had an opportunity to see in actual operation, as well as to learn in broad scope, the operation of the Coast Guard. I have the highest regard for its personnel and what I consider to be the exceptionally fine job they do. We cannot, however, expect the men in this fine service to perform into the future as they have performed in the past without giving them the equipment they need with which to perform.

This bill has some areas that I would see personally increased even further. I speak particularly to the remarks that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) made from the well earlier about the equipment to control pollution. Certainly the broad thrust of the bill is in the right direction. I earnestly hope that the House will pass this bill today and give this service the equipment it needs to go forward in doing a vitally important job, vitally important to this Nation.

Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I plan to offer an amendment that would provide for an additional transportable oil pollution control containment system.

In order to acquaint the Committee with that motion and to shorten the debate that will take place at that time, I am now going to read my statement in connection with the need for this.

Mr. Chairman, even since the *Torrey Canyon* broke up off the coast of Great Britain in 1967, spilling oil over hundreds of miles of coastline, the prospect of similar disasters had been very real for the millions of people who live near our Nation's coastlines.

In large measure, their fears have become fact, as the total number of major oil spills in U.S. waters rose from 371 in 1966 to 714 last year. No State with a coastline has been immune from this menace, and the damage caused by spilled oil has mounted into many millions of dollars.

Prime recreation areas from Cape Cod to St. Petersburg have been scarred by spilled oil; the delicate ecological balance of our coastal areas has been violated time and time again, from Santa Barbara to Tampa; birds by the thousands have died in tragedies stretching from Maine to Martha's Vineyard; and rich shellfishing areas have been closed for years, from Falmouth, Mass., to Louisiana, and most recently in Texas, largely because of our inability to prevent and clean up oil spills.

The Coast Guard, ever since the national multiagency oil and hazardous materials contingency plan was drawn up in 1968, has been given the immediate operational responsibility for controlling such oil spills.

Even under the Water Quality Act on which my colleagues on the Public Works Committee have reached agreement the Coast Guard still retains this responsibility, in the absence of immediate and effective action by the shipper involved.

To better implement this responsibility, the Coast Guard has developed a major oil containment system, which can be flown to the site of an oil spill. They have held extensive tests on this system, and are satisfied with its performance to the extent that they have requested—and the committee has authorized—\$1.4 million for the purchase of one such system.

In its original request, the Coast Guard had asked for funds to purchase two of these systems, but the Budget Bureau had cut it back to one. In my view, the problem of oil spills is too great for such timidity. I am offering an amendment to this bill, restoring the original Coast Guard request for two such systems—one for each coast.

The committee will recall that earlier in my remarks I pointed out that last year we had 714 of these oil spills. The chances are very, very good, of course, that there will be two or three of them at the same time. Hence the need for the additional system.

These systems are designed to be flown to the site of a disabled tanker in danger of leaking oil. They can be quickly rigged up to transfer the tanker's oil into several collapsible plastic bags. In this manner, 140,000 gallons of oil can be removed—before it has a chance to seep into the sea and endanger nearby coastlines.

The additional cost of acquiring one

more such system is approximately \$1.5 million. As I said in my additional views published in the committee report on this bill:

This is a small price to pay for the ends such added equipment would produce: If even one major oil spill is prevented from reaching our shores, these added expenses will have been more than justified.

All of our country's coastline is vulnerable—and unless we do more, and do it soon, the time will inevitably arrive when nearly all our country's coastline will have experienced the devastation of oil spills.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that these oil spills also take place on inland waterways, and therefore it is a nationwide need to which my amendment will speak.

I hope the committee will act favorably on the amendment at the time it is offered.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the bill, H.R. 15694, the Coast Guard authorization bill for fiscal year 1971. This bill, as reported by your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, will enable the Coast Guard to begin replacement of its aging polar icebreakers with a new class of ships which will be superior to those now in the fleet in every respect. It is indeed unfortunate that mechanical breakdown on board one of the Windclass icebreakers in the Coast Guard compelled that ship to turn back while accompanying the tanker *Manhattan* through the Northwest Passage late last year. That breakdown received widespread attention in the press and highlighted the fact that these ships have reached the limits of their endurance. They have aged to the point where it is foolhardy to invest funds in them, and only the most essential work to keep them operating until the first of the new class of icebreakers comes in service will be undertaken. This discovery of oil on the Alaska North Slope, and the possibility that there will be large vessels navigating the Northwest Passage in the future will indeed impose greater burdens upon the Coast Guard in this part of the world.

Even if we do not, however, transport Alaska's oil through the Northwest Passage, the need for a new class of icebreakers will continue to be urgent. Polar exploration in the Arctic and Antarctic is increasing year by year. We cannot send ships to these regions nor expect our scientists to live in these regions without the prospect that they can be adequately supplied by ship. A fleet of at least four modern polar icebreakers will be necessary to meet these basic needs regardless of the future of the Northwest Passage for commercial transportation purposes.

The Coast Guard's high endurance cutter program hopefully will be resumed next year, along with continued funding of the icebreaker program. As a Representative from an area which is deeply concerned over fisheries and the protection of our fisheries zone, I am acutely aware of the great need to ex-

pand our Coast Guard's capability to patrol our fisheries zone, and to insure that the various conventions which the United States has signed are adhered to by the other parties. This budget does provide funds for six additional modern turbine-powered helicopters which will substantially augment our patrol capability. While it is somewhat short of the Coast Guard's budget request, it will be borne in mind that this budget is a vast improvement over that which was submitted last year, and I fully expect that this improvement will continue in the years to come so that ultimately the full capability in fisheries surveillance work which the Coast Guard seeks will be funded by the Congress as rapidly as possible, consistent with the other needs of the service.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard deserves the praise and support of this Nation. I urge the passage of this authorization bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it proposed to provide icebreakers as escorts for tankers running through the polar regions?

Mr. PELLY. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that in the pioneering of the possible use of the Northwest Passage, of course, we did use our icebreaker. It did break down. Thanks to the Canadians, we were able to have a successful experiment. But in general in the development of the areas in the north where they are icebound part of the year, yes, we will have to have icebreakers now as we have had in the past.

I am not indicating by this that it is my opinion we should subsidize this particular industry, what I think is that the Coast Guard has a responsibility to assist our merchant ships when they need help, and, as in the case of the tanker *Mauballeu*, to cooperate in a research project and voyage of exploration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I can understand an icebreaker accompanying the tanker *Manhattan* on the exploration trip it made, but I cannot understand the Federal Government and American taxpayers subsidizing the oil companies to get their tankers through the Northwest Passage to the oilfields and back again as a steady diet.

Mr. PELLY. I know what the gentleman feels. I think probably the private company put in approximately \$40 million at least in this experiment. I do think, as once we aided our railroads in developing the West, we have some responsibilities as a government in doing the same thing in the Northwest Passage; but I doubt whether this may be economically feasible, and I do not know that on a regular basis we are going to utilize any icebreakers to subsidize private industry. I doubt that very much.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the inquiry made by

the gentleman from Iowa by saying the request for new funding for icebreakers for the Coast Guard has nothing to do with the *Manhattan* or any other tanker which would be plowing through the Arctic waters. The original escort service provided by the Coast Guard was done primarily to make sure the operation of icebreaker-tanker was feasible. When we have multiyear ice that has not been broken and that salt has gone out of over the years, it is extremely compact and a difficult thing to plow through.

First- and second-year ice breaks apart quite easily by comparison, and could be negotiated by the icebreaker-tankers without need for Coast Guard icebreaker escort. The Coast Guard request is for other purposes.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman from Alaska that I cannot read the committee report without coming to the conclusion that the necessity for a polar icebreaker is for the purpose of providing some kind of service to the oil companies transiting the passage through the ice fields to the newly opened oil fields.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I should like to respond by saying very briefly that the Coast Guard does have a function and a responsibility for rescue work. If there are tankers going through that area and get into trouble, the Coast Guard would be needed and would be there to perform the rescue. They would not be accompanying them on the trips to break ice for them or anything of that nature.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, may I add to what I said before. I understand the position of the gentleman from Iowa.

So far as I am concerned and my district is concerned, we should like to see this oil brought down the west coast and available at Puget Sound. I am not for subsidizing any transportation of oil to the Atlantic coast. At least, I have a preference for utilizing a pipeline and then bringing it down to our refineries on the west coast.

I do believe, on the other hand, that we do need, as we have traditionally, icebreakers to provide for our merchant ships, our private enterprise privately owned ships, in the event that ice intervenes in the course of their transportation efforts.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will recall that I served on the committee a good many years ago when we went through this discussion of replacement of icebreakers. There is no question in my mind that the Coast Guard and this country need some new icebreakers. But I am unalterably opposed to the construction of an icebreaker or icebreakers for the purpose of sending them through

the polar ice fields to help bring out oil. It seems to me that the oil companies, if they want that kind of help, can construct their own icebreakers.

Mr. PELLY. I assure the gentleman that is not the purpose of the construction of these icebreakers.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. To answer the gentleman from Iowa, these polar icebreakers today support the following requirements:

First, DOD logistic support in Canada, Greenland, and the Antarctic.

Second, classified DOD support.

Third, DOD oceanographic research in polar regions.

Fourth, SAR assistance along the Alaskan coast.

Fifth, support to science in polar regions, for the NSF, the ONR, Navoceano, universities, State agencies, and museums.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Washington an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. To continue, Mr. Chairman, I wish to read from page 2 of the committee report:

In view of the probability of greatly increased polar operations in the next decade and the continued deterioration of the present icebreaker fleet, it is abundantly clear that this replacement program is extremely urgent.

This is true not only in respect to oil but in respect to maritime activities and our merchant marine fleet.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would say further that the Coast Guard has a worldwide responsibility which, of course, includes the northern waters where there is ice, but it is certainly not the intent of this authorization bill to provide any special benefits to the oil industry, which I think can look after itself.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1971 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

VESSELS

For procurement and increasing capability of vessels, \$62,295,000.

A. Procurement:

- (1) one replacement polar icebreaker.
- (2) design of vessels.

B. Increasing capability:

- (1) increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters of the three hundred and twenty-seven foot class.
- (2) improve habitability on cutter *Storis* and selected buoy tenders.

AIRCRAFT

For procurement and extension of service life of aircraft, \$12,865,000.

A. Procurement:

- (1) six medium range helicopters.

B. Extension of service life:

- (1) replace center wing box beam on seven HC-130 aircraft.

CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$24,840,000:

- (1) San Francisco, California: complete radio station construction;
- (2) Washington and Oregon: relocate and improve communications facilities;
- (3) Portsmouth, Virginia: consolidate and improve facilities;
- (4) Neah Bay, Washington: improve station facilities;
- (5) Barnegat, New Jersey: improve station facilities;
- (6) Barbers Point, Hawaii: improve air station facilities;
- (7) Governor's Island, New York: improve base facilities;
- (8) Western Long Island, Connecticut and New York: improve station facilities;
- (9) Curtis Bay, Maryland: modernize and replace yard equipment and utilities;
- (10) Various locations: transportable pollution control equipment;
- (11) Various locations: aids to navigation projects on selected waterways;
- (12) Various locations: automate light stations;
- (13) Various locations: modernize Loran C equipment;
- (14) Various locations: modernize Loran A equipment;
- (15) Alaska: improve and rehabilitate selected Loran stations;
- (16) Various locations: public family quarters; and
- (17) Various locations: advance planning, survey, design, and architectural services; project administration costs; acquire sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 2, line 9, strike out "\$12,865,000" and insert "\$29,765,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike out "six" and insert "eight".

On page 2, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(2) three long range aircraft.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not do anything for the district I have the privilege of serving. It will do a great deal for the Coast Guard of the United States. It will do a tremendous amount for those living in coastal areas. It will do an enormous amount to help protect the commercial fisheries and fishermen from foreign encroachments into our coastal fishery zone which are by law reserved to the fishermen of the United States inside the 12-mile limit. It will also do a great deal for our concern with oil spills. As my colleagues will recall, the Coast Guard originally wanted something like \$190 million for fiscal year 1971.

This bill provides \$100 million for the Coast Guard of which something like

\$59 million is for the construction of an icebreaker.

Mr. Chairman, my amendments to the bill, H.R. 15694, would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the procurement of aircraft for fiscal year 1971 by \$16.9 million. My amendments would have the effect of providing the Coast Guard with two additional medium-range helicopters at a cost of \$2 million each and three long-range aircraft at a cost of \$4.3 million each.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the aircraft I am requesting were included in the proposal originally submitted by the Coast Guard to meet minimum needs for fiscal year 1971, but were subsequently denied by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, based on information furnished me by the Coast Guard at my request, there is an immediate need for one additional long-range aircraft to meet the present deficiency in flight time and an urgent need for two additional long-range aircraft and two medium-range helicopters to improve operational capability and provide some flexibility to respond to fluctuations of demand, such as for the Tuna patrol surveillance of our 12-mile fishery zone, oil spill detection and transporting of oil pollution control set, and other similar needs.

Mr. Chairman, my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation held 2 days of hearings in Alaska last year and witness after witness expressed great concern over the increased violations of our 12-mile fishery zone. In fact, one witness testified that he had observed a Japanese fishing vessel fishing off the end of one of the runways just before my subcommittee arrived in Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, it is very obvious that violations of the 12-mile fishery zone are on the increase and violators are going undetected. Coast Guard witnesses at the Alaska hearings admitted that only about 10 percent—or perhaps less—of foreign vessels that illegally fish Alaskan waters are apprehended.

Mr. Chairman, in Alaska for example, to cover its entire coastline consisting of approximately 20,000 miles, the Coast Guard has three long-range aircraft stationed in the area. When I was there last year, one was on the ground for general repairs, another was grounded because a prop had been damaged on a landing, and the other aircraft was out working trying to cover the entire Alaskan coast.

The aircraft now provided to cover this area is woefully inadequate. It is my understanding that one of the long-range aircraft that would be authorized by my amendments would be assigned to the Alaskan area. Increased surveillance requirements associated with the commencement of a high seas salmon fishery by South Korea in the Bering Sea are expected to create even greater needs beginning this summer. Ice reconnaissance patrols of the Northwest Passage will undoubtedly compete for the available aircraft time. It will be impossible to meet even minimum requirements in this area without this additional long-range aircraft.

One of the other long-range aircraft would be assigned to the Atlantic Coast

where the need is equally as urgent. A full-time vessel patrol is conducted off the New England coast to enforce regulations implementing the International Convention for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. The vessel's activities are complimented with a weekly aircraft flight over areas of known vessel concentrations. Recent agreements with the Soviet Union and Poland are the subject of three vessel and one aircraft patrols per week between New York and Cape Hatteras, N.C. These units cover the high seas abatement area established by these agreements along with areas within the fisheries zone in which loading and fishing by foreigners are allowed from time to time. Mr. Chairman, foreign fishing activities off these coastal waters also are on the increase. Just for the month of August of last year, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries reported a total of 325 foreign vessels observed fishing off the coast of New England. These included ships belonging to the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Rumania, Bulgaria, Israel, Iceland, Spain, and Norway. These statistics make it quite obvious that we must have additional aircraft, such as that authorized by my amendments, if we expect to protect our valuable fishery resources.

Mr. Chairman, there is a major deficiency in one other area—the Pacific coast and extending into the eastern tropical Pacific. In 1969, the Coast Guard was called upon for the first time to enforce regulations implementing the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention. The convention area, covering millions of square miles of the eastern tropical Pacific, is so vast that it can be efficiently covered only with long-range aircraft. This recent and impromptu demand requires 480 flight hours to meet minimum requirements of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, nearing the yearly limit of 520 mission hours that are available from one long-range aircraft. This additional aircraft would probably be stationed in San Francisco where it would assist in meeting enforcement requirements centered in the area of Clipperton Island, off the Pacific coast of Mexico, and off the Washington-Oregon coast enforcing our conservation agreements with Japan and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, as previously stated, my amendments also call for two medium-range helicopters. These helicopters are mostly needed to respond to complaints of violations of our fisheries zone, particularly around the New York and New England coast. It is most essential that the Coast Guard be able to respond immediately to information received from U.S. citizens that a violation of our fisheries zone is in progress. These helicopters could, of course, be used in other law-enforcement missions—as well as rescue missions—when not needed for the fisheries.

It is also anticipated that these helicopters will be used in areas with a high oil spill potential, such as the gulf and southern California coasts. Offshore pollution patrols could also be run in conjunction with scheduled patrols of the fisheries zone.

Mr. Chairman, my amendments to

H.R. 15694 would supply the aircraft that the Coast Guard has indicated there is an urgent need for and I urge their adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, much as I hate to do this as chairman of the subcommittee, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The DOT has asked for an austere program. The Budget Bureau has asked for an austere program. And our committee felt that it would be wise this year to keep this authorization down in order to get this authorization through as quickly as possible.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not quarrel at all with the motives of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, and obviously these additional aircraft could be usefully employed. But let me point out that while it is true that originally the Coast Guard asked for eight medium-range helicopters, which the Bureau of the Budget reduced to six, and the two that are contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, would bring that back to the original Coast Guard request, they did not request the three long-range aircraft. When the overall budget was reduced, the Coast Guard was given opportunity to establish the priority of items. Also I would like to point out that three of the six helicopters which are contained in the bill are intended for the very use which my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, alluded to, primarily in Alaska.

We could add a great many things, as I said during general debate. The Coast Guard has some very critical needs, and it is stretched pretty thin, but let us face up to the fact that this represents almost a 30 percent increase over similar budgetary requests last year. And in this day of very stringent budgetary competition everyone has had to sacrifice its less urgent requirements during this fiscal year.

This was never offered to the committee as an amendment. We discussed these matters, but it was never presented as an amendment in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the amendment be defeated.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

We have critical problems and massive responsibilities that we place upon the U.S. Coast Guard, and then refuse to adequately provide them with the tools to do the job.

As the gentleman from Michigan indicated earlier, the hearings we had in Alaska pointed out a situation which is almost intolerable. That is, we have some 34,000 miles of Alaskan coastline that is the responsibility of the U.S. Coast Guard to protect, and they have absolutely inadequate aircraft and surface craft available in order to do the job.

This is a matter of international im-

port. We have fishing incursions by the Russians, the Japanese, and the Koreans. We are given to understand that soon we will have the same problem from Red China.

What happens is that these vessels sail illegally into the territorial waters of the contiguous fishing zone of U.S. waters and when they spot a Coast Guard aircraft or vessel in the area, they weigh anchor and hastily head out to sea. The equipment that the Coast Guard has today is simply inadequate to perform those responsibilities which devolve upon the Coast Guard to protect the shorelines of this country.

I know that we have a very serious fiscal and monetary problem in the United States today. But somewhere we have got to begin to reorient our priorities and put first things first.

Thus, it would seem to me, from a national and international point of view, this is a very significant area in which we should be providing support to the Coast Guard which they so desperately need.

I dislike very much to oppose the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member. I think that this does not happen very frequently in our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I want them to know, and I think they do know, that we have an honest difference of opinion here. I have great respect both for their integrity and their interest in the Coast Guard, but I do urge that the amendment be adopted. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his very astute observations and for his learned remarks.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the experience I have had off the fishing coasts of New England corroborates all that has been said by the gentleman from Alaska and the gentleman from the Great Lakes region. We have a desperate need for these helicopters. They are not only for recreational safety, but for surveillance of oil slicks, for search and rescue work, and for transporting oil pollution containment systems—all of which we must have if we are going to have the capability to protect our ocean environment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully differ with the report of the committee and support these amendments.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the need for these amendments is undeniable. The facts and figures regarding oil spills are really appalling. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that there were 2,000 oil spills in the U.S. waters in 1966, and the Coast Guard recently estimated that we may be experiencing a spillage of polluting materials to U.S. waters approaching 10,000 incidents annually, with oil leading all other categories by a ratio of about three to one.

Needless to say, oil pollution has not been confined to any one geographic area. Of course, due to the major leak in the Santa Barbara Channel last year,

attention has been focused on the west coast. But both coasts of the Nation have felt the devastating effects of oil pollution. Huge oil slicks have recently washed ashore on the eastern and gulf coasts, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration reported more than 42 sizable spillages on the New England coast alone in the first 5 months of 1969. The additional aircraft, and particularly the two helicopters authorized under the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) are really needed, and were requested by the Coast Guard to patrol the coasts, watching for oil and other pollution.

You know it is not just the tankers that spill oil. The ships that empty their bilges as they come into our ports are really the worst offenders. They are the ones that are doing a great deal of damage to our beaches and many go undetected. If we have additional aircraft, coupled with the law that is now in conference, and which I am sure will pass, which will make the ships absolutely liable for these oil spillages, then I think we will have a more effective policing agency and we will be able to cut down the amount of damage to our coast due to oil spillage considerably.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, in addition to the fact that the helicopters will serve a useful function in watching the contiguous fishing zones for violations of fishing laws by foreign nations and, of course, they can be used for search and rescue operations—for all these reasons, despite the fact that this authorization would be greater than the authorization recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, I think that we need to have this amendment to this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I live in the coastal area of the United States where we have a lot of people who go to sea for pleasure purposes, and for fishing, where they harvest some of the great fishing resources of this country and of the open seas. I have had a personal opportunity to observe the work of the Coast Guard. I know from having observed them that they need additional air support. It was only last year that two or three very fine coast guardsmen were killed in my own district, or right off the coast of my district because a helicopter literally fell apart on them, it was so old and dilapidated. I have seen the equipment that they use, and I know that they need more equipment. I am often on the sea coast in the evening sometimes during the summer when Congress is in recess and there is not an afternoon that goes by that you do not see those helicopters out working to save lives, to save property, and to do the kind of things that are so necessary to make this country more attractive.

I am constantly aware that fishermen from my district go great distances to harvest the shrimp crop of the oceans. They often call upon the Coast Guard to be of service to them in search and rescue missions, in fighting the terrors of nature that lurk at sea. Helicopters, the long-range planes and the patrol vessels that we have now in the Coast Guard are not sufficient. I think this amendment

should be supported. A large amount of money is not involved, but the additional money would certainly serve a whole lot of people in a very constructive way.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 51]

Annunzio	Garmatz	Ottinger
Ashley	Gaydos	Pepper
Aspinall	Gilbert	Pike
Baring	Gray	Pirnie
Bell, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Biaggi	Gubser	Preyer, N.C.
Broomfield	Hagan	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Calif.	Hanley	Pucinski
Button	Hanna	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	Reid, Ill.
Carey	Harsha	Reid, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hastings	Riegler
Clay	Hébert	Rivers
Conyers	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Corman	Kirwan	Roudebush
Coughlin	Leggett	Ryan
Cramer	Lennon	Satterfield
Crane	Long, La.	Scheuer
Cunningham	Lukens	Smith, Calif.
Daddario	McCarthy	Springer
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Steiger, Wis.
Dawson	McMillan	Stubblefield
de la Garza	Macdonald,	Stuckey
Derwinski	Mass.	Taft
Diggs	Martin	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Meeds	Tiernan
Dwyer	Meskill	Tunney
Eckhardt	Michel	Ullman
Erlenborn	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Evans, Colo.	Mollohan	Vanik
Fallon	Morton	Waldie
Feighan	Murphy, Ill.	Watson
Ford,	Nix	
William D.	O'Neill, Mass.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, 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. 15694, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 332 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Michigan to briefly review his amendment for the edification of some of those who were not here before the quorum call. Do I understand that this amendment would add \$17 million to the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. It is \$16.9 million. Mr. GROSS. Well, \$16.9 million.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. It would authorize the procurement by the Coast Guard of three additional long-range aircraft and two additional medium-range helicopters for research, rescue, fisheries patrol, and for carrying out our responsibilities under a number of treaties and for protecting our coast against intrusions and incursions by unauthorized vessels.

Mr. GROSS. Are the aircraft in question not procurable through the military?

Mr. DINGELL. I have explored that question. At this time there are no aircraft of the kind desired which can be secured by the Coast Guard from the

military. I very much wish I could tell my good friend that there were. We have explored those questions in our effort to try to get the Coast Guard the equipment they need to do the job for which they are responsible.

Mr. GROSS. What would the amendment add by way of antipollution expenditure?

Mr. DINGELL. It would not add anything directly as such but my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) intends to offer an amendment which would make available one more of the big rubber bags that they use to unload oil from a sinking vessel in our coastal waters. One of the aircraft would be available to carry the bag around the country, and it would add to the capacity of this country to handle major oil spills that are now beginning to afflict our coasts.

Mr. GROSS. So in that one respect it would have something to do with pollution?

Mr. DINGELL. It would, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Would the polluter—say the oil company that polluted the water—would it be charged for the expense of operating these planes to get the rubber or plastic contraption, or whatever it is, to the scene of the pollution?

Mr. DINGELL. We shall shortly be having legislation before the House of the kind to which the gentleman alludes, which would require that persons who are responsible for oil spills of this kind pay the cost of cleaning up. I cannot tell my good friend precisely the form of the language, because the report on this subject has not yet been made available. But if facilities are made available for the Government to remove pollutants of this kind, I feel that those responsible for the pollution could be assessed the costs of removal.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that this bill calls for \$100 million.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. That is \$42 million less than last year.

Mr. GROSS. Is this approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DINGELL. The amount that is in the bill now is approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but the amount that would be included through adoption of the amendment, the \$16.9 million, was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget, though most of it was originally requested by the Coast Guard.

Mr. GROSS. Now I would like to ask some member of the committee, not necessarily the gentleman from Michigan—and I thank the gentleman for his responses—how many icebreakers it is proposed to obtain through expenditure of the funds authorized, and how much money would be set aside for the construction of the icebreakers?

Mr. CLARK. One icebreaker. \$59 million.

Mr. GROSS. One icebreaker, for \$59 million?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The icebreaker would not be nuclear-powered, would it?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. GROSS. One icebreaker?

Mr. CLARK. The vessel has a combi-

nation diesel-gas-turbine-powered propulsion system.

Mr. GROSS. What else is put into an icebreaker to make it cost \$59 million?

Mr. CLARK. It is a large vessel with a displacement of 11,000 tons which is needed to break up ice in the polar regions.

Mr. GROSS. Is it planned to do as they did with that yacht that was given to Emperor Haile Selassie: paper it with gold wallpaper, or whatever it was?

Mr. CLARK. No, I am sure that would not be done.

Mr. GROSS. Is that not a lot of money for one icebreaker? Is it proposed to use a \$60,000,000 icebreaker on the Great Lakes or where?

Mr. CLARK. The icebreaker will be used wherever it is deemed necessary by the Coast Guard—the polar regions, off the coast of Greenland, the Arctic, and Antarctic regions. The Coast Guard keeps an icebreaker permanently stationed in Sheboygan for use in the Great Lakes.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean if there was a ship iced in over in the North Sea, around Finland, for instance, we would send this icebreaker over to liberate it?

Mr. CLARK. It would be better to liberate it than to lose many lives.

Mr. GROSS. I do not argue about that, but I do not understand one icebreaker costing \$59 million.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure they would be using an icebreaker in the vicinity of a ship was in trouble, but they would not necessarily be using this one particular icebreaker.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this stops me. One icebreaker costing \$59 million, and not even nuclear powered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is the first one of its class, and the cost breaks down as follows: The housing and superstructure will be \$18,780,000; the propulsion system will be \$11,460,000; the auxiliary systems will be \$11,300,000; and the outfitting and equipment and furnishing will be \$11,405,000; and indirect shipyard costs will be \$6,055,000. This is the breakdown. I would also like to add that the combustion propulsion icebreaker under consideration is much less expensive than one with nuclear propulsion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to spend \$59 million for one icebreaker for the Coast Guard, there will be no money left to buy icecrushers for the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were—ayes 26, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 1, immediately after line 10, insert the fol-

lowing: "None of the vessels authorized herein shall be procured from other than shipyards and facilities within the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment for this side of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio for this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEITH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEITH: On page 2, line 21, strike out "\$24,840,000" and insert "\$26,340,000"; and

On page 3, line 15, immediately before "transportable" insert the following: "two complete sets of".

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier in general debate, this amendment would increase the authorization by an additional \$1.5 million.

As Members will recall, the cost of the transportable pollution control system is \$1.39 million. The difference between that amount and the \$1.5 million increase is allotted to administrative costs.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the *Torrey Canyon* broke up off the coast of Great Britain in 1967, spilling oil over hundreds of miles of coastline, the prospect of similar disasters has been very real to millions of people who live near our Nation's shorelines.

In large measure, their fears have become fact, as the total number of major oil spills in U.S. waters rose from 371 in 1966 to 714 last year. No State with a coastline has been immune from this menace, and the damage caused by spilled oil has mounted into many millions of dollars.

Prime recreation areas from Cape Cod to St. Petersburg have been scarred by spilled oil; the delicate ecological balance of coastal areas has been violated time and time again, from Santa Barbara to Tampa; birds by the thousands have died in tragedies stretching from Maine to Martha's Vineyard; and rich shellfishing areas have been closed for years from Falmouth, Mass., to Louisiana—all because of our inability to prevent and clean up oil spills.

The Coast Guard, ever since the National multi-agency oil and hazardous materials contingency plan was drawn up in 1968, has been given immediate operational responsibility for controlling such oil spills.

Even under the Water Quality Act, on which my colleagues on the Public

Works Committee have reached agreement, the Coast Guard still has the immediate operational responsibility for cleanup in the absence of effective action by the shipper involved. To meet this responsibility, the Coast Guard has developed a transportable oil pollution control system that will make it possible for us to cope with such major oil spills that have been inflicted upon our coastlines over the past few years.

The Bureau of the Budget turned down the Coast Guard request for two of these systems, allowing only one. As I pointed out, we have had over 700 major spills in a year, and the chances are very good that two or three of them will be taking place at the same time. We must have two of these systems in order to more adequately protect our marine ecology, our marine environment and our shore recreational areas.

Mr. Chairman, I move my amendment, which will provide an additional one of these transportable systems so that we can better cope with this problem.

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

I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I believe the answer to the gentleman's amendment is that an operational prototype of this system is scheduled to be tested in fiscal year 1970. The Coast Guard has tested this type system on February 5 and also March 11, 1970, and is scheduled to test it again in April. Thus, it is plain that they are just now gaining some knowledge as to how effective this system will be.

It was felt it would be premature to include funds in the authorization bill for the purchase of more than one such system at this time under these circumstances. Therefore, I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. HATHAWAY. If this is proposed to be tested before this fiscal year is over, would we not be wise in authorizing the additional funds? If something should happen before June, before we get the appropriation on it, we could knock it out. We do have two coasts to patrol. We cannot fly one of these from one coast to the other in time to do any good.

It would seem to me it would be sensible to authorize both at this time, since the prototype the gentleman mentions will be fully tested before the end of the fiscal year and we would have ample opportunity to strike it from the appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK. To answer you, there is one now in the bill and they have one that they are testing at the present time. So another one is not necessary. One is now in the bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. But that is the prototype you are talking about that is in the bill, if the gentleman will yield further, and that will be fully tested before the 1st of July. Undoubtedly we will not make appropriations for it until that time and we will have ample opportu-

nity at that time to see whether or not we want actually to fund it. However, if we do not authorize it now, we will not have the opportunity until later on, and if they are good, we will certainly need them on both coasts.

Mr. CLARK. If the prototype is good, there is money in here for another one. The money is in here now for one more of these prototypes, if that is what you want to call it.

Mr. HATHAWAY. If the gentleman will yield further, you mean an additional \$1.3 million to cover another one, if this turns out to be all right, and you say it will be tested before the 1st of July?

Mr. CLARK. There is one being tested now, and they will have that one. There is one in the bill, also. So that means there will be two.

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

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. It is my understanding the prototype that is being tested is not the entire unit but its component parts. It is not the 20,000-ton type as provided for in the items in the authorization.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in recommending that this amendment not be adopted. It was offered in the committee, and at that time it was defeated overwhelmingly not because we disagreed with the gentleman from Massachusetts, because there is a critical need, but as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, testing is only partly complete. We do not have any assurance that there will be complete testing before the end of the fiscal year.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts has properly said, the first production item will be something different from the prototype. The majority of the committee felt that with something new such as this there was a very substantial probability that a second set would be a much improved set. The gentleman from Massachusetts said there were 700 oil spills. Let me make it perfectly clear that this equipment is not for the purpose of cleaning up oil spills but, rather, for pumping out up to 20,000 tons of oil from a distressed tanker so that the danger of leakage will be far less, because it will reduce the stress and strain on the ship by reducing the cargo it is carrying. If the spillage is occurring at a certain level of the ship's hold, the oil can be pumped down to that level so that it will not spill. However, this is not for the purpose of cleaning up spilled oil but, rather, for the purpose of minimizing the spill.

What we are providing in the bill, for a new scheme like this, is one set, which is quite adequate, I believe. I hope by the time we find how well it works we will have an improved model available. I feel confident that we will order the necessary number of units if it works successfully.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank

the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Admittedly this transportable system is not for the purpose of cleaning up oil spills, but a spill invariably follows when a vessel runs aground, and it takes some time—3 or 4 days—to break up. As the oil starts to spill, in the process of the ship's breaking up, something can be done, and that is why we have this system. This system would be used to unload the oil from the ship that is breaking up so that we will not have an oil spill.

For examples, we had the disasters of the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Ocean Eagle*. These were caused by ships running aground and gradually breaking up. By transloading the oil from ships that have run aground, you can then prevent the oil spill. Had this system been available at the time of the *Torrey Canyon* disaster, it would have been a godsend to those people.

It took weeks for all that oil to leak from that vessel and the same applies to the other vessels in Puerto Rico, in Florida, and in Cape Cod.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, as long as we are still in the experimental stage on this proposition, I think it is folly to approve more than one unit. Therefore, I oppose the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to address a question to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) and ask the gentleman if it is true, as the gentleman stated—at least as I recall he stated—that the prototype will be tested this fiscal year which ends on the 1st of July, and why should we authorize more money until we are sure the prototype worked and why would it not be wise to wait until the prototype is proven. As I understand the situation from talking with people of the Coast Guard, we should have one for each coast which could be built without any great difficulty.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think we have a perfectly honest disagreement as to the prudent manner in which to proceed. My best information is that we do not have a guarantee that the testing will be completed by the end of the fiscal year. But I still think that is not the point, whether it goes into the next fiscal year. I think we should still hope that the Committee on Appropriations would provide the money that would permit one complete set or a prototype to be ordered, and if it is successful—and, hopefully, perhaps improved—you could order more. But at this stage—this experimental stage—it would be my personal judgment that ordering one set to be actually put into operation would be prudent because in my opinion we could vastly improve the amount of oil that this set is prepared to take off a tanker, 20,000 tons.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) is more of an expert on this than am I. However, I am not at all sure that a capacity like that would have been of any major assistance in something like

the *Torrey Canyon* case and that they would have been able to pump with this gadget the oil into another tanker. Otherwise, I feel the damage would be done which would be well beyond the capacity of this system.

Mr. HATHAWAY. If the gentleman will respond to one additional question, Does the gentleman know how long it takes to construct one of these so-called systems?

Mr. MAILLIARD. No, I am sorry to say I do not really know. But I do not think it is a terribly complicated process insofar as design is concerned. As I understand, it is made of plastic which is usually not a very difficult material with which to carry out a construction job.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, one further thing is this: It bothers me as to whether the amendment is accepted. As I understand it the Coast Guard previously requested two such systems as they were confident they would work, but that the Department of Transportation would not approve the construction of two systems and that the Bureau of the Budget for budgetary reasons cut out one because of inflation.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think that is quite the sequence of events, if I understand them correctly. It is my understanding that the testing of the prototype fell quite a bit behind what they originally contemplated and the Bureau of the Budget did not cut out this relatively minor item. The Coast Guard itself cut it out not because of the general budgetary situation but because they have not moved as fast as they had anticipated.

The representatives of the Coast Guard, as I remember their testimony before the committee, stated that with the progress that had been made this was not the ideal end result of the program.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, all I can say in conclusion is that it is too bad that there is a dispute as to the facts, because I understand the facts to be different than does the gentleman from California and that is that the Coast Guard does want both of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In my opinion, the committee has already gone one step too far in the matter of providing for one system of this equipment. I know of no obligation on the part of the taxpayers of this country to clean up oil spills that are the responsibility of private interests. Why should not the oil companies or the shipping companies that are responsible for oil spills take care of their own mess? Why should this be saddled on the taxpayers of the State of Iowa and elsewhere?

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, I would state that this is a very important point, and one that our committee has been struggling with. There is no ques-

tion but that whoever actually causes the spill, whoever it is, is responsible for it, and is legally responsible for it, and financially responsible for it, but if for some reason they are unable to gather the necessary equipment or take the necessary steps to protect our coastline and our fish and wildlife, then the present responsibility for coordinating and cleaning up and billing the responsible people, if necessary, has been placed in the hands of the Coast Guard. Because it does not make any difference what the cause is, it is the damage that is done, and if that is not immediately controlled in some way then that damage can be tremendous, as we know from what happened in England, and as we know from what happened at Santa Barbara, and recently in Alaska, and so forth. So we and clean it up, and we will bill the responsibilities for the U.S. Government, but we are telling the agency that if nobody else cleans it up, then get out there and clean it up, and we will bill the responsible parties for it later.

Mr. GROSS. But if it is not the taxpayers who are paying for this first control system, then who is paying for it?

Mr. MAILLIARD. The gentleman is correct, but we are trying to have the equipment available to protect our fishing and wildlife.

Mr. GROSS. Why do not the oil companies have such equipment?

Mr. MAILLIARD. They should have it, but supposing they do not? Supposing it is a tanker company that has tankers moving around the world. It cannot have equipment at every beach.

Mr. GROSS. Neither do I think the taxpayers of the entire country should have to assume the responsibility of providing protection for every beach. Nor do I think we should provide assistance all over the world to back up the operators of tankers.

Mr. MAILLIARD. We are not proposing to do that.

Mr. GROSS. What are you proposing to do?

Mr. MAILLIARD. We are proposing to protect our own beaches, to the extent we can, and to see that whoever is responsible for the damage pays the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not see why private interests should not take care of such a system themselves. They should have the equipment and have it on standby basis if they are going to drill oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico. Incidentally, there has been much talk about two coasts. There are more than two coasts to be taken into consideration in connection with oil pollution. But for the life of me I cannot understand why those who pollute—and I understand that there is more than one way to pollute the waters off our coasts—cannot be held responsible for the damage and the cleanup.

Why should not the companies that are involved in the transportation of oil or the drilling for oil take care of these situations without coming to the Congress for assistance?

Mr. MAILLIARD. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I would think that where it is within the control of the U.S. Government, such as where we make the oil leases and give them the authority to drill, I would think they should be required to have the necessary equipment. But I do not quite see how we can get an international oil tanker that flies a foreign flag and that might not even be intending to come into one of our own ports, but passes near Florida and possibly goes on a reef, I do not see how you can compel them to have the necessary equipment available.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we could assess damages against them. We could prohibit them from coming into our ports, which could have quite an effect on them.

Mr. MAILLIARD. But the very largest tankers in the world for the most part do not come into our ports, but they still come by our coasts, and they are quite a great risk to us.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH). The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, 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. 15694, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and off-shore establishments for the Coast Guard, pursuant to House Resolution 875, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TULELAKE AREA DURUM WHEAT ALLOTMENTS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 874 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 874

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 858) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to wheat. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, 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 California (Mr. SISK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. 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 874 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 858 to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to wheat.

The purpose of S. 858 is to increase permanently from 8,000 to 12,000 acres the aggregate wheat allotments in the irrigable portion of the Tulelake area of California. Increased allotments would be available only to privately owned farms which agreed to plant their entire allotment to Durum wheat.

Durum wheat is commonly utilized in making pasta products and quality manufacturers have steadfastly refused to substitute other types of wheat in these products. There is a great demand for Durum on the west coast and if its production in the Tulelake area was terminated, it would have to be shipped from the Dakotas, Montana, or Minnesota at prohibitive rates and the consuming public would, of course, bear the brunt of the cost increase.

The Durum wheat in the area is milled domestically, subject to a processing tax of 75 cents per bushel, which would result in a savings of \$16,300.50 for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 874 in order that S. 858 may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Latta).

Mr. Latta. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make permanent the wheat acreage in the irrigable part of the Tulelake, Calif., area.

The acre increase would be from 8,000 to 12,000 acres and would be available only to privately owned farms which agree to plant their entire allotment in Durum wheat.

Previous Congresses have recognized the special circumstances of the area and passed legislation to provide such wheat allotments on a temporary basis. This will make the allotments permanent and set the acreage at 12,000 acres.

The committee report points out that this type of wheat is needed on the west coast and that the farms in the area

are small and that most of the farm owners have a total income of less than \$4,000 per year. The report also notes that the Department of Agriculture will save \$16,300 in fiscal 1971, if the legislation passes.

The Department of Agriculture opposes the bill because it gives favored treatment to a few producers. It points out that national production of Durum wheat is sufficient to meet both domestic and export requirements.

My only regret about this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that there are no benefits to our Soft Red Winter wheat producers. I have many of these producers in my district and they are in dire need of some additional help and it cannot come too soon.

Mr. SISK. 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.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 874, the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 858) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to wheat.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 858, with Mr. FLYNT 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 Texas (Mr. Purcell) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Kleppe) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I only want to say I think the gentleman from Washington has explained the bill. I may add just one point. The United States Durum Growers Association has as its president a resident of my State of North Dakota. He is not from my district, but he is from North Dakota. That organization has sponsored and does approve and support this legislation. I think it is important for the Members to know that this legislation has their support.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 858. This bill would extend to a deserving group of wheat farmers in California the opportunity to grow more high quality Durum wheat for a localized market.

It would not add any Government expense to the wheat program. There is no authority in the bill for certificate payments or for diversion payments on the additional acreage granted to these California producers.

Now, it might seem strange to some of my colleagues to hear me advocate the passage of this bill, in that I have the privilege of representing America's No. 1 Durum State. But I say that as a representative from a great Durum wheat area, my constituency has raised no objection to California growers expanding

their production to reach a market which at this point is inaccessible to North Dakota Durum.

Under this bill the Tulelake growers could plant up to 12,000 acres of wheat—or approximately 4,000 acres more than presently allowed. The extra production on this increased acreage will be marketed without subsidy from the Government and with jeopardizing the Tulelake's farmers' eligibility for the program benefits they enjoyed in the absence of this privilege to increase their production.

As I said, the Government cannot lose on this bill. It may, in fact, even profit from the bill. It will, to the extent that increased consumption of Durum wheat as food occurs. You see, the Government collects 75 cents from processors for each bushel of wheat changed into human food. Thus, the estimated production of 543,000 bushels will yield some \$408,000, all of which will be retained by CCC.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which gives wheat farmers in the Tulelake area of California a choice—a choice to grow more wheat for the market and without Government assistance.

It is a good bill and it deserves the support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Johnson) such time as he may consume.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 485, a bill to increase Durum wheat allotments in a limited area of Siskiyou and Modoc Counties of California, both of which I represent here in Congress. This bill applies only to these areas and does not affect any other region, either in California or throughout the Nation. The Tulelake Basin, of which we are concerned, is the only area in California in which Durum wheat suitable for milling is produced. All of the Durum wheat grown here goes into macaroni production, and the Pacific coast producers of pasta products can use whatever Durum can be grown in Tulelake. It should be emphasized that this market for Durum was developed largely by the growers themselves over the years, but acreage allotments have not kept pace with consumer demand.

For those of you who are not familiar with our area, we are located in the northeast corner of California where Siskiyou and Modoc Counties join the State of Oregon. This is a high—slightly over 4,000 feet—desert area surrounded entirely by mountains. Frosts can, and all too often do, occur any month of the year. The soil is highly productive but due to climatic conditions and distance from markets, only the hardy type crops such as malting barley, Durum wheat, alfalfa hay, and potatoes can be raised.

Prior to the time we started growing Durum wheat in 1953, the Tulelake Basin farmers were famous for growing malting barley which was marketed throughout the United States, England, and South America. But with the advent of acreage allotment controls on cotton, rice, and wheat the acres previously pro-

ducing these crops in the Midwest started raising malting barley on the diverted acres. We lost our Midwest malting barley markets. Today the market for what malting barley we do produce is limited exclusively to the west coast.

In H.R. 485, we seek a permanent Durum wheat allotment of 12,000 acres. Much of the land in the basin is publicly owned, but this legislation deals only with some 40,800 acres of land under private ownership, land acquired largely by ex-GI homesteading after World War II. No other land in this area can be brought under cultivation.

In 1956 and 1957, Congress granted a 2-1 acreage increase in Durum wheat to North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, and the Tulalake Basin. In 1958, Congress approved special legislation granting a minimum of 8,000 acres of Durum wheat to the Tulalake Basin. Subsequently, other special, temporary legislation was enacted for the purpose of building up permanent wheat allotments in Tulalake. Unfortunately, this has not been accomplished.

Instead of obtaining permanent allotments of up to 12,000 acres as Congress had intended, Tulalake farmers have only 4,698.5 acres of allotments on private-owned land.

West coast consumption of pasta products is 2,099,064 hundredweight. Planting the entire acreage allotment and assuming a high yield of 4,800 pounds per acre will produce 225,528 pounds of Durum. On the basis of 71.5 pounds of Semolina from 100 pounds of Durum we need 2,600,000 hundredweight of Durum to meet the west coast need alone.

It should be emphasized that Tulalake Durum wheat has never been put under loan. Actually, this Durum is always sold within 4 months of harvest.

The Department of Agriculture mentions that the wheat program is a voluntary one and the growers can forgo program benefits and plant unlimited acreages. This restricts the raising of Durum to only allotted acreages. The profit made by farmers now is reflected in the price paid by millers for the domestic milling certificates which will not be issued on the increased acreage, according to the provisions of the bill before us. This means that the U.S. Government makes a profit on all of the Durum that is milled under existing programs and I estimate it will make an additional \$360,000 a year under the program as extended.

With small Tulalake homesteads of 70 acres or less the barley substitution program is profitable. Most farmers in Tulalake have only a small barley base and they cannot afford to leave 20 percent of their farms fallow to qualify under the barley substitution program.

The Southwest Miller reports that Durum acreage planted in 1969 was 9 percent less than in 1968. The U.S. Durum Wheat Growers also report on July 1, 1969, record exports of Durum for the past 12 months. Exports exceeded 50 million bushels compared to 31 million bushels last year. This is 163 percent of last year compared to 110 percent for Hard Red Spring wheat, 62 percent for Hard Red Winter wheat, 33 percent for Soft Red Winter wheat, and 57 percent for White wheat.

Mr. Chairman, it should be emphasized

again that the demand for Durum wheat to meet the needs of the manufacturers on the Pacific coast is such that the entire area could be planted to Durum wheat without satisfying the complete demand and, therefore, a 12,000 acre allotment is not unreasonable in that there will be a permanent market for this product.

I feel that the earlier legislation, the most recent of which is found in Public Law 88-64 approved by the House of Representatives on July 8, 1963, and signed into law 9 days later, establishes the precedent which we base our hopes on today. The 1964 crop, by that legislation, was increased to 12,000 acres, but for that year only.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the National Durum Wheat Growers Association have gone on record approving H.R. 485. This association is comprised of midwest Durum farmers. They can see the need for this legislation which will not hurt their sales of Durum due to freight rates from the Midwest to the west coast. There is no surplus of Durum wheat on the west coast, in fact there is a shortage.

This bill will not cost the Government a dollar—in fact, the Government will make a profit.

Since there is a need for additional west coast Durum wheat, there is no cost involved for the United States and no other area will be hurt by H.R. 485, I respectfully ask for your approval of this legislation.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

S. 858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That subsection (j) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1334), is amended to read as follows:

Mr. PURCELL. 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 Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the Clerk read the bill, H.R. 485, or the bill, S. 858, which was made in order by the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will respond to the gentleman from Missouri that the Clerk is reading from the bill, S. 858.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. How long is the Senate bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that the Senate bill, S. 858, is approximately two and a half pages long.

Mr. HALL. Under the circumstances, not having it before us, I ask that the Clerk read it. I object to the unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

“(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall increase the acreage allotments for the 1970 and subsequent crops of wheat for privately owned farms in the irrigable portion of the area known as the Tulalake division of the Klamath project of California located in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, as defined by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and hereinafter referred to as the area. The increase for the area for each such crop shall be determined by adding, to the extent applications are made therefor, to the total allotments established for privately owned farms in the area for the particular crop without regard to this subsection (hereinafter referred to as the original allotments) an acreage sufficient to make available for each such crop a total allotment of twelve thousand acres for the area. The additional allotments made available by this subsection shall be in addition to the National, State, and county allotments otherwise established under this section, and the acreage planted to wheat pursuant to such increases in allotments shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments except as may be desirable in providing increases in allotments for subsequent years under this subsection for the production of Durum wheat. The Secretary shall apportion the additional allotment acreage made available under this subsection between Modoc and Siskiyou Counties on the basis of the relative needs for additional allotments for the portion of the area in each county. The Secretary shall allot such additional acreage to individual farms in the area for which applications for increased acreages are made on the basis of tillable acres, crop rotation practices, type of soil and topography, and the original allotment for the farm, if any. The increase in the wheat acreage allotment for any farm under this subsection (1) shall not be taken into account in computing the farm wheat marketing allocation under section 379b, and (2) shall be conditioned upon the production of Durum wheat on the original allotment and on the increased acreage. The producers on a farm receiving an increased allotment under this subsection shall not be eligible for diversion payments under section 339.”

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 858, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to wheat, pursuant to House Resolution 874, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 485) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

GILBERT BILL TO ESTABLISH A SENIOR CITIZENS SKILL AND TALENT UTILIZATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the executive branch last year went part of the way toward relieving the unfair burdens on senior citizens when it passed the 15-percent increase in social security benefits.

There is much more yet to be done and I would hope that my bill to increase social security benefits by 50 percent would receive consideration by the Congress this year.

Nevertheless, there are other actions we can take to ease the financial plight of our elderly who live on fixed incomes, while at the same time providing means by which these skilled and talented people can perform a vital service to the communities in which they live.

I have today introduced a bill, the Senior Citizens Skill and Talent Utilization Act, which I believe will go a long way toward making better use of our senior citizens in communities all over our Nation.

My bill would provide Federal grants to local community groups to employ senior citizens to perform community improvement projects. Those of us who have been actively working on behalf of senior citizens in the past have been amazed at the wealth of talent available. We have been equally amazed at how underutilized it is in so many communities.

If by utilizing the talents of people whose skills have been sharpened, over decades of experience, we can at the same time lift these citizens above the poverty level, I see no reason why Congress should not act immediately.

My bill proposes that Congress appropriate \$50 million in fiscal 1971 to begin this program, and within 2 years, increase the level of funding to \$125 million. I would hope by then that the benefits of this program, to the communities as well as to the senior citizen participants, would be so well documented that we could fund the program at a much higher rate.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress too many times have had to consider programs against something. My program is perhaps unique in that it is for something. It is an enrichment program for the young and for local communities. And at the same time it allows our older citizens to perform needed valuable services within their communities. These people have worked for years and deserve to spend their golden years in dignity and useful service.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker. This seems an appropriate time to pay tribute to one of the finest Members and most complete Irishman this body ever had, our good friend MIKE KIRWAN. It seems to me St. Patrick's Day would be a good time, and a tribute to the Irish the best way, to show MIKE our esteem for him.

St. Patrick was a gentleman,
Who through strategy and stealth,
Drove all the snakes from Ireland—
Here's a bumper to his health.
But not too many bumpers,
Lest we lose ourselves and then
Forget the good St. Patrick
And see the snakes again.

Pure water is the best of gifts that man to man can bring.
But who am I that I should have the best of everything?
Let princes revel at the pump, let peers with ponds make free,
Whiskey or wine, or even beer, is good enough for me.

—Neaves.

O'SLATTERY'S LIGHT DRAGOONS

You have heard of Julius Caesar and of great Napoleon, too,
And how the Cork militia beat the Turks at Waterloo.

But there's a page of glory that as yet remains uncut,
'Tis the immortal story of O'Slattery's mounted foot.

This gallant corps was organized by O'Slattery's oldest son,
A noble minded poacher with a double-breasted gun,
And many a head was broken, aye, and many an eye was shut
In learning to maneuver with O'Slattery's mounted foot.

Then down the mountains came the squadrons and platoons,
Those four and twenty fighting men and a couple of stout gossoons.

The band was playing merrily those patriotic tunes
Secure that fame would gild the name of O'Slattery's light dragoons.

First they'd reconnoiter 'round Shanahan's old shebeen;
It used to be a chop-house, but we called it the canteen,
And there we saw a notice that the bravest heart unnerved:
All liquor must be settled for before the drinks are served.

So on we marched but again soon each warrior's heart turned pale.
For rising high forinst us we beheld the county jail.

And when the army faced about 'twas in time to find
A couple of policemen had surrounded it from behind.

"Across the ditch," our leader cried, "and take the foe in flank,"
But yells of consternation then arose from every rank;
For posted high upon a tree we very plainly saw:
Trespassers prosecuted in accordance with the law.

"Foiled again," cried O'Slattery, "here ends our grand campaign,
'Tis merely throwing life away to cross yon raging drain;

I'm not so bold as lions but I'm braver nor a hen,
And he who fights and runs away will live to fight again."

So back to the mountains went the squadrons and platoons,
Those four and twenty fighting men and a couple of stout gossoons,
The band was playing cautiously those patriotic tunes,
To gild the fame, tho' rather lame, of Slat-tery's light dragoons.

We reached the mountains safely tho' all stiff and sore with cramp,
Each took a neat of whiskey straight to dissipate the damp;
And when their pipes were loaded up O'Slat-tery up and said:
Today's immortal fight will be remembered by the dead.

"I never will forget," said he, "while this brave heart shall beat,
The eager way ye followed when I headed the retreat,
Ye've heard the soldier's maxim when desisting from the fight;
'Best be a coward for five minutes than a dead man all your life.'"

So there in the mountains rest the squadrons and platoons,
The four and twenty fighting men and a couple of stout gossoons.
They march no more so martially to patriotic tunes,
But all the same they sing the fame of O'Slattery's light dragoons.

SHANAHAN'S OULD SHEBEEN

(By Gerald Brennan)

This is the tale that Cassidy told
In his halls a-sheen with purple and gold;
—Told as he sprawled in an easy chair,
Chewing cigars at a dollar a pair.
—Told with a sigh and perchance a tear
As the rough soul showed through the cracked veneer;
—Told as he gazed on the walls near by,
Where a Greuze and a Millet were hung on high,
With a rude little print in a frame between—
A picture of Shanahan's old shebeen.

"I'm drinkin' me mornin's mornin'—but it doesn't taste the same;
Though the glass is iv finest crystal, an' the liquor slips down like crame;
An' me cockney footman brings it on a soort of a silver plate,—
Sherry and bitters it is; whiskey is out iv date.
In me bran' new brownstone manshin'—
Fift' av'noo over th' way,
Th' Cathedral round th' corner, an' the Lord Archbishop to tay,
Sure I ought to be sthiff with grandeur, but me tastes are mighty mean,
An' I'd rather a mornin's mornin' at Shanahan's ould shebeen.

"Oh! well do I mind th' shanty—th' rocks, an' the field beyant,
The dirt floor yellow wid sawdust, an' th' walls on a three-inch shlant.
There's a twelve-story 'flat' on th' site now—('twas meself that bulded the same),
An' they called it "The Mont-morincy"—though I wanted the good ould name.
Me dinner-pall under me oxther, before th' whistled blew,
I'd banish th' drames from me eyelids wid a noggin', or maybe two;
An' oh! 'twas th' illigant whiskey—its like I have never seen
Since I went for me mornin's mornin' to Shanahan's ould shebeen.

"I disremember the' makers—I couldn't tell you th' brand;
But it smiled like the golden sunlight, an' it looked an' tasted gr-rand.
When me throat was caked with morthar an' me head was cracked wid a blast,
One drink o' Shanahan's dewdrops an' all me troubles was past.

That's why, as I squat on th' cushins, wid
divl a hap'orth to do,
In a mornin' coat lined wid velvit, an' a
champagne lunch at two,
The' mem'ry comes like a banshee meself
an' me wealth between;
An' I long for a mornin's mornin' in Shana-
han's ould shebeen.

"A morin' coat lined wid velvit—an' me
ould coat used to do
Alike for mornin' an' evenin' (an' some-
times I slep' in it, too),
An' 'twas divl a sup iv' sherry that Shana-
han kept—no fear;
If you couldn't afford good whisky, he'd
take you on trust for beer.
Th' dacintest gang I knew there—McCarthy
(Sinathor since),
An' Murphy that mixed th' morthar (sure
th' Pope has made him a Prince),
You should see 'em, avic, o' Sundays, wid
faces scraped an' clean,
When th' boss stood a mornin's mornin'
round Shanahan's ould shebeen.

"Whist!—here comes his Grace's carriage;
'twill be lunchtime by an' by;
An' I dasn't drink another, though me
throat is powerful dry;
For I've got to meet th' Archbishop—I'm
a laborer now no more,
—But, ohone! those were fine times, then,
lad, an' to talk o' 'em makes me sore.
An' whisper—there's times, I tell you, when
I'd swap this easy chair,
An' the velvit coat, an' th' footman, wid
his Sassenach nose in th' air,
—An th' Lord Archbishop himself, too, for
a drink o' th' days that ha' been,
For th' taste o' a mornin's mornin' in
Shanahan's ould shebeen."

MIGRANT HOUSING

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, migrant labor housing standards promulgated by the Department of Labor are being rigidly enforced in the fruit- and vegetable-producing areas of southwestern Michigan. The unrealistic and impractical application of the standards, from the growers' point of view, has resulted in an organization intent on obtaining Federal aid in the construction of migrant housing. Their position is that if the Government requires housing for migrants beyond the financial ability of the grower to provide, the Government should bear a part of the burden. Illustrative of the manner in which the standards are being applied is the reported case of a grower who just completed a new house for his family, but found that if the house had been built for migrants it would not pass inspection—the windows were not properly spaced. In other cases, shower facilities which passed the requirements of distance from the dwellings at the time of construction now are declared too far away.

There is a growing opinion that the Government seeks to discourage the use of migrant labor in the area, though such labor is presently essential to the harvesting of crops.

A principal complaint of the growers is that they need to obtain individually and annually the housing permit required before they can utilize the services of the

U.S. Employment Service in obtaining essential farm labor.

A year ago I was asked to come to their assistance and I arranged to have a Labor Department official, armed with authority, go into the area and there act upon individual applications.

Today these growers are faced with the same problems they experienced last spring. The following editorial, from the March 10, 1970, issue of the Benton Harbor, Mich., News-Palladium describes the present situation:

CURING A HEADACHE BY CHOPPING OFF HEAD

Southwestern Michigan bankers are joining forces with the area's fruit and vegetable growers to pry off a housing lid imposed by the U.S. Labor Department on migrant facilities.

Before a grower can recruit outstate migrant workers, he must now obtain a license from the Department specifying the housing to be provided for the work crews.

If the reader might ask why should a farmer seek out a labor force from the southern states where there is a large available employment pool in the county's welfare rolls, the answer is simple.

The growers gave up on that one years ago. Michigan's unemployed are not interested in the farm.

The complaint is that the Labor Department is imposing unrealistic housing requirements as a round about means to phase out all migrant work in the U.S.

Ostensibly the regulations on minimum housing are to eradicate the pig pen accommodations which in the past have all too frequently characterized the rural living scene.

In practice, say the bankers and their farm customers, the costs for the upgraded housing in relation to farm prices are becoming unbearable.

Last week, the growers proposed a solution: let the federal government assume some financial responsibility for migrant housing.

It's unlikely either the growers or their bankers really want the U.S. to set up a bunch of Hilton hotels for migrants. More probably they just want to jolt the bureaucrats and the public into a realization of how serious the local situation really is. Possibly, thereby, the Labor department will ease its headlong rush to abolish migrant labor.

Fruit growers are turning increasingly to mechanical harvesting as a replacement for scarce farm workers. But the mechanical harvesting technology is far from being so advanced it can replace human harvesters now.

Many growers say without migrants, they'd have to give up growing strawberries here. The fresh market outlet for peaches, apples and other tree fruit could be erased, too.

This could spell catastrophe for the entire Fruit Belt, coming on top of what two local bankers say is a 50 per cent drop during the past five years in the net value of farming in Southwestern Michigan.

Judging by the fact that migrants still want to come here, local conditions can't be too bad. It's questionable whether the Labor department is helping anyone by substituting overnight social action for reasonable regulation of migrant housing.

The migrants will sit all summer on welfare with no jobs. The growers will suffer, perhaps catastrophically. And the housewife will pay more for fruit.

On the other hand, adjustments by all parties involved could be made painlessly if the Labor department would simply set a realistic time schedule allowing improved housing, technology and social philosophy to mesh smoothly during conversion.

REINSTATING RESPONSIBILITY IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's decision by the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold a stay of a lower court desegregation plan in Charlotte, N.C., must be recognized as a move toward reinstating responsibility in our judicial system. The decision will relieve the city of Charlotte from complying with a ridiculous court order until the judicial process has been completed.

The city of Charlotte is faced with an order that, if enforced, will almost assuredly destroy its school system. The school board in that city has been ordered by a Federal judge to carry out a plan that would require the busing of more than 15,000 students daily in order to meet certain standards. The cost of compliance would be astronomical. The city of Charlotte simply cannot afford such a financial burden.

The Charlotte situation is not unique, however. The same type of irresponsible decisions are facing many major cities across the Nation. The best known case is in Los Angeles, Calif., where the courts have required the busing of more than 150,000 students per day and at a phenomenal cost. Under these orders, the neighborhood school concept is totally destroyed, and those who should benefit the most from our educational system suffer the most; those being the students, the young people who have to face the brunt of our problems.

Yesterday's decision by the High Court is an indication that a more rational approach is being taken toward our school problems by our courts. The decision was a complete reversal from one made by the Supreme Court last fall requiring immediate, complete desegregation, no matter what the judicial status of the case may be. It is now time for the Congress to take action that will assure that no more of these ridiculous, irresponsible decisions are imposed by our lower courts. We must have nondiscriminatory education, but it must be accomplished in a responsible and rational way. Three weeks ago, I introduced a bill that I feel will accomplish this goal. I would like to take the opportunity to call on the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee to take immediate steps to bring to the floor for action by the House, a bill that will preserve our public school system.

ST. PATRICK

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on this day when we all share in the great tradition of the Irish, it is fitting that we pause to remember some facts about St. Patrick whose day this is.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in today's Washington Post on the subject of St. Patrick's

life and insert the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

ST. PATRICK

We really do not know so much about Saint Patrick when legend and ebullient afterthought have been winnowed out of the chronicle. We do know, or can safely assume anyhow, that he did not wear a green hat or march in parades, and there is also grave doubt among scholars as to his banishment of the serpents from Ireland. Still, in this day of the paper shamrock and the vegetable-dyed commemorative green bagel, we think we could all do worse than to consider the few facts that are known about Saint Patrick and that make his life so well worth celebrating.

He was born toward the end of the fourth century and grew up on the west coast of Roman Britain. His family were Christians—his father a medium-ranking civil servant and deacon—and he was provided with a modest education. He lived in a time of great disorder, uncertainty, danger and change; the Imperial army was disengaging, as we should now say, from Britain and western Gaul to defend Rome against the invasions; increasingly independent and ambitious Roman military leaders, local despots and brutal raiding tribes presented a constant threat to life and livelihood. When he was 16, Patrick was kidnaped by Irish pirates in a coastal raid and sold into slavery in County Antrim. It was during the six desperately lonely slave years as a herdsman, by Patrick's own recorded account, that his faith came first to sustain him and then to consume his feelings and his thoughts. He escaped when he was 22, hired on to a ship (tending a cargo of ferocious Irish hounds) that took him to Gaul, and at some point appears to have gone home to Britain for a brief sojourn and decided that he wished to return to Ireland in a missionary role.

His apprenticeship was, to put it mildly, prolonged. He went back to Gaul and studied and served at the famous bishopric of Auxerre where he was ordained a deacon, but he did not acquire the mission to Ireland he sought until he was nearly 50 years old. Impudent snobbery, so as to say, on the part of his colleagues and superiors appears to have had something to do with it, proceeding from a weakness that Patrick, with his rustic training, was quick to acknowledge: "I am despised by many. I have been afraid to put what I want to say into writing, for Latin is still to me a foreign tongue; anyone can see that, from the way I speak and write it. I am still seeking that skill which should have been mine long ago."

In the year 432, Patrick was finally sent to Ireland to preach, teach, convert, and to organize the church. It was his life's goal, but it was anything but a comfortable or easy lot ("Daily, I expect for myself either murder or capture or slavery"). Unlike the great lonely, wayfaring Celtic saints who were to follow and whose mission—back to continental Europe—did so much to preserve and enhance both learning and faith during Europe's subsequent agony, Patrick was heir to a more bureaucratic role. But it was largely his effort and his passion that produced the original conversions and, ultimately, the generations of wandering Celtic saints. And although he was not, in their sense, *peregrinus*—the exile, the stranger—in another sense his mission made him one. "I live among untaught clansmen," he writes, "a stranger and exile for the love of God."

We bring all this up for no other reason than that it is Saint Patrick's feast day, and we think he must have been a splendid man.

NEWS PRESENTATION

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW's criticisms of news presentation by virtually all media.

Whether or not one agrees with the Vice President may depend on the individual's past personal encounters with reporters, his political philosophies, his employment, social status or any of a myriad of factors which consciously or subconsciously influence his views.

What is news to the small rural weekly often is not news to the large metropolitan daily. Subjects that are explored in depth by the broadbased urban dailies often must be relegated to distant observations by the smaller publications with limited staff and resources.

Thus, many factors may contribute to the identification of any given event as newsworthy. Similarly, many personal characteristics of the individual reader or viewer will prompt him to conclude that the report did or did not warrant the coverage it received, or was or was not distorted by the presentation.

In the final analysis, for any event or situation to warrant substantial attention from the media, it must stand on its own two feet as a matter which is newsworthy. Once it has attracted attention of the media, whether the news is good or bad, appropriate or inappropriate is determined largely by the vantage point of the reader, listener, or viewer.

Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden very effectively made this point during a recent radio commentary on the subject of "good news and bad." For those of my colleagues who may not have heard the dialog, I insert a transcript in the RECORD:

MANKIEWICZ-BRADEN DIALOG

TOM. Frank, I have been worrying lately about good news and bad news. The reason is that VP Agnew seems to have struck a popular chord with his denunciation of the media. It seems clear that a lot of people don't like what they're seeing, or hearing or reading.

FRANK. But that's not the fault of the media, Tom. That's the fault of the world or the times. And even so, how can you tell what's good news and what's bad. Take for example the story about some demonstrators. That's good news for people who don't approve of demonstrators. It's bad news for the demonstrators or for those who agree with them. Or take a story about a 12 year old child hooked on heroin. That's bad news for everybody in the country, but in one sense, it's good news because the publication of it may wake up parents and teenagers to the dangers of drugs and the government to the job of getting after the people who supply them.

TOM. Aristotle once said that the word "good" had two meanings: that which is good absolutely and that which is good for somebody. News which is good absolutely is extremely rare. So perhaps news which is good for somebody is given to us as a kind of consolation for the fact that this is not the best of all possible worlds.

FRANK. Sometimes, it's hard to tell the difference between good news and bad news. For example, most of us were brought up to think that unemployment was bad news but over at the Treasury Dept. unemployment is a sign that the administration's anti-inflation measures are taking hold. For that reason,

it is regarded as good news. To illustrate the point, Tom and I thought we'd try to show you how an "over the coffee" conversation might go one of these mornings among the administration's anti-inflation fighters.

FRANK. "Chief, what's the news?"

TOM. "Housing starts are down again. That's a good sign—and the rate of bankruptcies is up for the 4th straight month. I think we've turned the corner."

FRANK. "Well, that's good news, Chief. I was out in Detroit and the Chrysler people announced that they're making plans to lay off more men."

TOM. "Yes, but you have to watch those fellows. They tell you that to your face and then the minute you get out of town they hire them back. Anybody can get a headline by laying off a few thousand people in one day. But that's not real progress. We want that steady day-to-day increase in unemployment. None of these seasonal layoffs. We've seen that before. What's the rest of the news?"

FRANK. "Well, gross carloadings are down. Bethlehem says 4th quarter profits will be off and you'll be happy to know that department store sales continue soft. That's pretty good."

TOM. "Straws in the wind, you can't rely on them. Some clown will come along and talk about lowering the interest rates—and all our work is undone. Try as we will, we'll have prosperity again. What's your press release say today?"

FRANK. "I think you'll like it, Chief. I borrowed a phrase from Herbert Hoover: 'Depression is just around the corner.' And another from Robert MacNamara. It says 'We think we see darkness at the end of the tunnel.'"

PLANNING FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN A NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as concern about the quality of life has intensified in recent years, thoughtful Americans have been urging that both the public and private sectors must begin preparations to meet the problems, challenges, and threats the future will present. These concerns of thoughtful Americans found eloquent expression in the President's state of the Union message. The President said:

Between now and the year 2000, over one-hundred-million children will be born in the United States. Where they grow up—and how—will, more than any one thing, measure the quality of American life in these years ahead.

This should be a warning to us.

For the past thirty years our population has also been growing and shifting. The result is exemplified in the vast areas of rural America emptying out of people and of promise—a third of our counties lost population in the 1960s.

The violent and decayed central cities of our great metropolitan complexes are the most conspicuous area of failure in American life.

I propose that before these problems become insoluble, the nation develop a national growth policy. Our purpose will be to find those means by which Federal, state and local government can influence the course of urban settlement and growth so as positively to affect the quality of American life.

A national growth policy is vitally needed if we are to escape being engulfed in any one of a number of massive

megalopolis stretching, for example, from Boston to Washington or Chicago to Pittsburgh. Such gigantic clusters of urban areas will be unbroken areas of people, homes, factories, highways, shopping centers, railroads, and powerlines—hundreds of square miles of urban sprawl.

Because of the threat such a state of affairs will pose for the quality of life, I am particularly pleased that this Republican administration has been the first to place the priority on a national growth policy that it deserves. The President's concern about the need to act in this area has already been clearly demonstrated by his actions—creating a national goals staff in the White House to help generate the data needed for intelligent policymaking; and recommending a Commission on Population Growth and America's Future.

It was highly appropriate that the House of Representatives' first major act of the new decade was the passage of H.R. 15165 establishing the Commission on Population Growth and America's Future. By the year 2000, the United States will have a population of 300 million compared to our present 204 million. Population growth of that magnitude is going to place a tremendous strain on our social and governmental institutions and on our physical environment. Coping with these strains will require comprehensive data on trends and future conditions. The Commission on Population and America's Future will be a tremendous help to providing the comprehensive information needed to make effective public policy between now and the year 1980.

PROVIDING FOR TRANSPORTATION IN A NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY

As chairman of the House Republican task force on transportation, I believe that one of the most critical aspects of any national growth policy is its transportation component. Transportation is not an end in itself—but it is a means with tremendous potential for improving the quality of life. A balanced and well planned transportation system can have a tremendous impact on the distribution of population within the country. The right kind of transportation system may hold the key to reversing the trend toward overcrowding in our largest urban centers, the beginning of a dispersal of population, and the growth of the new cities President Nixon called for in his state of the Union message.

As this Congress looks to the future and begins to think in terms of a national growth policy, I believe it must give a high priority to transportation. Certainly, the administration has given transportation a prominent place in its legislative program. Congress is presently considering two important initiatives of the President—the \$10 billion public transit bill and the 10-year program to improve air transportation. All indications are that these important measures will become law before the end of this session.

I am, however, concerned about what I see as an imbalance in our current transportation programs. Post-World War II programs in the highway and

air transportation fields stand out as legislative landmarks in terms of the improvements they have achieved. But, while spending vast sums improving these modes of travel, we have allowed surface transportation—particularly rail passenger service—to deteriorate to a state where we are now threatened with the elimination of rail passenger service in most areas of the Nation.

The balanced transportation system which experts and laymen say the Nation requires cannot be achieved so long as we have unbalanced Federal programs which provide aid to two important modes of transportation and ignore rail passenger service. In short, I believe that as we plan for a national growth policy, special attention should be given to rail transportation.

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS FOR 1980

There are serious potential transportation crises just around the corner unless we begin now to prevent them. By 1980 our transportation needs will have doubled. The transportation requirements of the rail industry alone will be 50 percent greater than today. In the developing population corridors of the Nation more and more people will turn to rail transit as a safe, efficient, and reliable form of transportation. Government programs should be geared to helping provide the safe, reliable and efficient transportation that these people will need.

RESEARCH NEEDS

Special priority should be given to the contemplated test facility to be located in Pueblo, Colo., which will serve as a proving ground for both conventional rail and advanced systems. Research should also be accelerated to improve rail equipment since the present high incidence of derailments is due in substantial degree to equipment failures. We need urgently research in wheels, suspension systems, brake systems, and improved automatic couplers. This research should involve joint industry and Government communication, direction, and leadership to prevent accidents especially where they involve transportation of hazardous materials.

ADDITIONAL METROLINER-TYPE PROJECTS

The public response to the Metroliner in the crowded northeastern corridor demonstrates that good trains can provide a third alternative mode of corridor transportation. Given the success which this program has had, even though it is not yet operating at the speed and efficiency envisioned for it, I believe that it is time plans were made for additional Metroliner-type programs in other crowded transportation corridors. Under such a program, the Government could provide the necessary startup cost and purchase the equipment. During the demonstration period the railroad would collect the revenue and deduct its operating expenses. The Government and the railroad would then share the remaining revenue. At the end of the demonstration period, should it prove successful, the railroad would be able to purchase the equipment at the purchase price, less depreciation. Such a program would not only provide a mechanism to improve rail passenger service, but would also

serve to alleviate our existing transportation problem.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH TRANSPORTATION

In our desire to restore and reclaim our environment attention should be given to the environmental quality problems resulting from the scattering of rail facilities—shops, stations, yards, and so forth—within urban areas. Rail corridors dissect city core areas and cause serious problems for the safe and efficient mobility of the public especially at grade crossings. Urban renewal programs are often stymied and must await rail relocation or centralization of routes and facilities. In many smaller cities, the scattering of rail facilities results in the necessity of maintaining duplicative emergency and hospital services.

Currently, there is no Federal program to deal effectively with rail relocation and consolidation. I think communities should be able to participate in a program that will allow them to improve the quality of life in their communities through the consolidation and relocation of rail facilities.

As we start this decade and begin the development of a national growth policy, I hope that transportation development will be given a high priority. The time is at hand when we must really follow through on our past rhetoric about having balanced transportation systems and actually develop the Federal programs that will make balanced transportation a reality.

THE WASHINGTON POST'S DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was quite interesting to read the Washington Post's lead editorial in Sunday's paper indicating their oh-so-self-righteous concern for the plight of children under President Nixon's education program.

Rather than exploring a bit slowly how we, as a nation, can get the most of our dollars spent on education, the Washington Post would have us continue pouring countless billions into past programs dreamt up by social manipulators who feel the only solution to the world's problems is to spend money. The fact is, these programs have not produced the results desired, nor have they guaranteed that money would be spent where Congress intended.

The Post editors make the very accurate statement that there is an inequality of spending per child in the country. Middle and upper class areas—particularly in suburbia—spend in some cases twice or three times as much as urban or rural areas.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act was designed to remove this inequity, but it has failed. Even the Post admits that. But rather than finding a better way to correct the inequity, they argue, let us go right on spending more billions of the taxpayer's money.

As victims of the spend syndrome, the

Post editors only measure success in terms of dollar value—the more money spent, the better off we are. How utterly absurd.

But, the greatest comment in the editorial bears marked resemblance to the refrain of many southern school administrators. In justifying continued reckless spending rather than finding out what we are spending our money for, the Washington Post stated:

To say we cannot do anything at all about this situation because we do not yet know everything about the learning process—and to say it to inner city children whose learning time and opportunity are irrecoverable—seems to us an unconscionable irresponsibility. (Emphasis added.)

Where, I ask, was the Washington Post when massive disruption of southern school systems, through mid-term, court-ordered redistricting, caused great loss of the children's "irrecoverable learning time and opportunity?" Where were they then? I will tell you. They were sitting in their pristine offices contemplating the state of the world and national affairs and applauding the Supreme Court order in their typical holier-than-thou fashion. Never mind the loss of irrecoverable learning time and opportunity where southern children are concerned. Apparently the Washington Post feels that is entirely justified.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is just another example of the Washington Post's double standard of viewing things through a one-track corporate mind.

THE FOREIGN TRADE POLICY OF THIS COUNTRY HAS BEEN RUNNING ON A SINGLE ONE-WAY TRACK FOR 35 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLYNT). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the foreign trade policy of this country has been running on a single one-way track for 35 years. The so-called reciprocal trade program was first enacted in 1934. Under it our average tariff level has been reduced upward of 80 percent.

Far-reaching economic changes have occurred in this country and in other parts of the world during this long period of time. Yet the national trade policy continues with very little change, thus ignoring the altered conditions that have in the meantime greatly affected international competition.

The President seeks further tariff-cutting authority even though our average staff is less than 20 percent of what it was 35 years ago, when the tariff cutting was inaugurated. The full cuts agreed to under the Kennedy round still have 60 percent of the way to go before their final installment is completed. Therefore the full effects of these cuts have not made themselves felt. Why then extend further authority now to cut what will be left of the tariff in 1972?

The principal economic changes that have transformed the competitive standing of this country in point of both imports and exports in recent years can no longer be successfully concealed, as they

have been over the years by false governmental reporting of trade statistics. The competitive tide has been running so strongly against us in recent years that efforts to conceal our weak international competitive standing have come a cropper. Today the handsome trade surplus that measured from \$4 to \$7 billion annually until the past 2 years has all but disappeared despite the padded statistical device used by the Department of Commerce under which it included foreign aid shipments as exports.

The inclusion of goods paid for by the American taxpayer as exports made it possible to point to our trade policy as a great success whereas we were falling increasingly behind in our competitive exports. At the same time the official statistics showed our imports at their foreign value without including ocean freight and other charges. This practice is contrary to that of nearly all the other leading trading nations. The practice understates the actual costs of our imports by some 10 percent.

Today what appears to be a trade surplus of the magnitude of about a billion dollars is really a deficit in terms of competitive goods. This deficit is in the magnitude of \$4 to \$5 billion.

By hiding or ignoring these uncomfortable facts, the present administration is able, no less than the preceding administration was able, to propose further tariff reductions, as if other countries needed further inducement to increase their sales in this country. That no such inducement was or is necessary may be concluded from the upward surge of imports in recent years, especially in the form of manufactured goods.

One of our heaviest export items consists of machinery. From 1960–68 our exports of this item doubled—moving from \$4.4 billion in 1960 to \$8.8 billion in 1968. Imports of machinery, by contrast, increased over fivefold—moving from \$0.7 billion in 1960 to \$3.7 billion in 1968. This still left a high margin in favor of exports, but the trend is unmistakable, and it has been running very rapidly. Indeed machinery, including the sophisticated products of electronic origin, together with chemicals and aircraft, represent the only important surplus items in exports. An astoundingly wide variety of other products are incurring deficits in varying degrees. The public is little aware of our very weak competitive position.

Such buoyancy as our exports show today is virtually confined to the narrow sector just mentioned. In 1968 we enjoyed an export surplus in these few products of \$9.3 billion. Little wonder that some of these industries support the continuing tariff-cutting program.

Compare this record with that of the products classified by the Bureau of the Census as "other manufactured goods." In that group, which includes iron and steel mill products, textiles, clothing, paper and manufactures, rubber manufactures, metal manufactures, photographic supplies, glassware, pottery, boots and shoes, clocks and watches, bicycles, toys, sporting goods, motorcycles, and so forth, a deficit instead of a surplus was shown in 1968. This deficit was

one of \$5.473 billion. As recently as 1960 this deficit was only \$760 million, or about one-seventh of its 1968 magnitude.—Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1969.

At the same time our surplus in the machinery, chemicals, aircraft exports grew only a little over 60 percent from 1960 to 1968.

This simply means that while we had a moderate increase in our trade surplus in the front-running group we suffered a disastrous increase in our trade deficit in the much broader group of "other manufactured goods."

These realities of our changing trade trends are wholly ignored by the thrust of our continuing trade policy.

In 1968 the number of workers employed in turning out the "other manufactured goods" was nearly 2 million higher than those engaged in manufacturing machinery, chemicals, and aircraft. Yet it was in the former group that we suffered the heavy trade deficit. A deficit of this magnitude—that is, of over \$5.4 billion—having widened since 1960 so dramatically—sevenfold—reflects a sharp deterioration of our competitive position.

Evidently the trade advisers of the White House have failed to bring these facts to the President's attention. Otherwise the President could not propose further tariff reductions.

Beyond the trade trend in recent years represented by the statistics cited here, which pose a threat of disaster to industries that employ over 7½ million workers, another shift in our trade mix has taken place. It too carries ominous implications. In 1950 only 27½ percent of our imports consisted of manufactured goods. During the 1936–40 period the share was 32.8 percent. In 1968 the share was approximately 65 percent. In other words, our imports have shifted heavily toward goods incorporating a full complement of labor application. The impact on unemployment is therefore twice as great as formerly. In this country employment in manufacturing is of a ratio of about 3½ to 1 in relation to employment in agriculture, mining, fishing, and lumbering, which produce our raw materials. Our imports today therefore offer a sharper threat to our employment than in the past.

Measured in relation to exports of all other countries, American exports, including foreign aid, have lost ground in recent years. This means simply that exports of other countries have expanded more rapidly than U.S. exports. In turn this suggests that their goods are more competitively priced in world markets. In 1960 our share of world exports was 15 percent; in 1967 it was 14.5 percent. Had our exports in 1967 enjoyed the same proportion of world exports as in 1960 we would have exported \$4.6 billion more in 1967 than we did export, or \$35.8 billion instead of \$31.2 billion—see United Nations Statistical Yearbook, 1968.

The irrefutable fact is that we are in a weak competitive position in world markets and in our own market vis-a-vis imports.

The trend since 1960 is unmistakable.

A trade policy that was based on competitive conditions as they existed before 1960 is no longer in focus. It is unrealistic.

What does our weak competitive position suggest with respect to our trade policy?

The problem of import competition would be more acute than it is were it not for the \$30 billion annual boost to our economy provided by our Vietnam involvement. Since our tariff has been cut to an ineffective level without present hope of reversal some other instrument for control of our market-and-employment erosion attributable to imports must be provided.

The establishment of import ceilings with a backstop of import quotas as provided in the fair international trade bill, represents one. That bill provides for expansion of imports in proportion to domestic consumption, and in most instances, calls for acceptance of the attained level of imports. However, this is a useless exercise unless the level of imports is measured by individual industries and products. No foreign product must be allowed more than 10 percent of U.S. market—or less for some definite type.

It has been introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and in the House by over 45 Members, including four committee chairmen.

Enactment of this legislation would provide assurance that imports, despite their cost advantage resulting from lower wages, will not be allowed to run wild and thus disrupt industry after industry. Instead of relying on first-aid administration in the form of adjustment assistance, the injury to our employment and industrial expansion would be controlled ahead of time. Imports would not be awarded the right of eminent domain in our market but would be given the opportunity to grow in proportion to domestic consumption.

We face an opportunity to adopt a trade policy that would achieve the undoubted benefits of world trade without incurring its unfair and destructive impact on a widening front.

The weakness in this lies, of course, in surrendering our presently crippled industries to a nongrowth future if we allow further percent inroads in the U.S. market.

This phase must be tailored to individual industries and products rather than on an across-the-board formula.

OIL IMPORT CONTROLS VITAL TO PENNSYLVANIA ECONOMY

A warning that unlimited foreign oil imports could deal a "crushing blow" not only to Pennsylvania oil producers but to the State's coal industry as well has been voiced by Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury, State secretary of mines and mineral industries.

In a letter addressed to Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel, as a member of President Nixon's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls, which is currently reexamining the mandatory oil import control program established by President Eisenhower in 1959, Dr. Charmbury stressed the economic importance of the

import quota program to Pennsylvania. He said:

As you know, Pennsylvania in 1859 became the world's first major oil-producing area, and today—after 110 years—this state is still known for the high quality, if not the quantity, of the oil it produces.

A characteristic of Pennsylvania's oil production today is that 83 percent of its present volume comes from 43,925 of the so-called stripper type of wells, each averaging less than a barrel a day.

These, like the 377,000 such wells in the nation, which collectively produce one-fifth of this nation's domestic crude, are marginal operations which would be the first to feel the impact of unrestricted foreign imports. Many of them would undoubtedly be forced to close down, never to be reopened again, since their future depends largely upon uninterrupted operations for as long as they continue to produce.

One classic example of long-time survival of an ancient Pennsylvania well in old "McClintock No. 1," near Oil City, Pa., which is still pumping oil today, after 108 years of continuous operation.

In the Pennsylvania Grade oil region in District 1, comprising portions of four states, there are over 2,000 independent producers operating over 100,000 producing wells whose output averages less than 1/3 barrel per day. Collectively their average daily output in 1968 was 33,000 barrels per day, with recoverable reserves estimated at upwards of 200 million barrels.

The crude oil from this four-state area is processed by nine small refineries with throughput capacities ranging from 1,000 to 10,000 barrels per day. These refineries, especially designed to process Pennsylvania Grade crude oil, which is noted for its high lubricating content and quality, are part owners of the pipe lines and gathering systems used for transporting this particular type of crude.

There are no other special markets for this type of oil, and if there were, it undoubtedly would have to compete with other domestic or foreign crudes selling for considerably less than the \$3.76 to \$4.63 a barrel Pennsylvania Grade crude commands.

Although high quality lubricating oil is the bread and butter product of these refineries, about three-quarters of each barrel refined by them consists of gasoline and distillate fuels, by-products which do have to compete on the market with the gasoline and distillate fuels refined from crude from other sources, foreign or domestic.

Pennsylvania's lube oil refiners today are said to be marketing these other products largely at a loss. But there is a limit, of course, to how much loss on gasoline and distillate fuels they can absorb. The import quotas allocated to them is an important factor in keeping them alive. Without it, they could very well cease to exist. And without these special type refineries, not only would the Pennsylvania producers lose their market but the nation would lose a valuable natural resource.

The Mandatory Oil Import Control Program has not really been costly to the American consumer, as some of its critics assert. It has achieved its purpose of providing a reasonable balance between imports and the levels of domestic production necessary to keep this nation from becoming dependent upon foreign sources of oil—either by wantonly exhausting its own domestic reserves on the one hand, or by drying up its own productive capacity through actions tending to render it unprofitable.

Unlimited foreign oil imports would immediately deal a crushing blow, first, to Pennsylvania's dwindling anthracite coal industry and eventually to the bituminous industry, too.

The argument that foreign crude is today

slightly cheaper than oil produced in the United States loses much of its appeal when one realizes that this is a condition which could quickly change. Only for so long as the United States continues to maintain its own productive capacity at a high level does it pay those foreign nations to offer their oil for less.

Foreign oil can be expected to remain cheap only for so long as we do not need it. Once we let ourselves become dependent upon foreign nations, many of them not particularly friendly to the United States, not only will the costs rise but the availability may become less certain.

Under those circumstances, the United States could one day learn to its sorrow that it has paid the price—both economically and in terms of national security—for its own shortsightedness in abandoning an import policy which has well served the best interests of the national as a whole.

COAL THREATENED BY OIL AFTER MAKING GREATEST COMEBACK IN INDUSTRIAL HISTORY

"King Coal" may again feel the impact of oil imports after giving up over 300,000 jobs by automation to meet oil competition.

For the first time in history, foreign residual oil is attempting to penetrate the Midwestern part of the United States, thereby threatening major markets for coal. Also in this area utilities, industry, and others consume nearly a hundred million barrels annually of domestic residual oil.

This could be the opening effort toward bringing foreign residual oil into the whole midcontinent area accessible to the Mississippi and tributary streams as well as to the other Gulf of Mexico ports stretching from Alabama to Texas. In this area, composing districts II, III, and IV, residual oil is considered a product and currently can be imported only by special permit from the Oil Import Appeals Board together with a supplemental application in the amount to be permitted by the Secretary of the Interior. Such a supplemental application presumably would have to be over and above present limitations on the imports of crude oil and products which are 12.2 percent of domestic production of crude oil—overland shipments from Canada and Mexico are exempt.

The applications now pending are for total imports of 21,862,500 barrels of low-sulfur foreign residual annually into areas served by the Mississippi River system. Up to now, only the petition of Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago for a 6-million-barrel-per-year allocation has been heard, and a decision is expected soon. The Commonwealth petition was tied to the alleged need of the company to burn the imported oil in its Ridgeland station in place of coal as an air pollution control measure.

The four other petitions, filed by oil distributors and involving a minimum of 15,862,500 barrels of imported oil per year, are also tied to the alleged need for more low-sulfur fuel in the geographic area involved. If the Commonwealth petition is approved, it is difficult to see how the Oil Import Appeals Board can turn down the other four petitions and the many others which would undoubtedly follow.

Deeper and more fundamental issues than the need to make more low-sulfur

fuel available to meet air pollution requirements are involved. These include:

First. Approval of the petitions would set a precedent that could open the heartland of the country to a foreign fuel to compete directly with indigenous domestic fuel. The amount of domestic fuel which could be threatened by widespread imports of foreign residual are indicated by the table on the following page. This shows that in 1968 districts II and III, which would be accessible to foreign shipments, consumed about 288 million tons of coal and about 90 million barrels of domestic residual oil. With the anticipated tremendous growth in demand for power, however, principally electricity, the billions of tons of coal reserves in many of the Western and Midwestern States have been expected to provide substantial new amounts of energy and major boosts to the economy of these States. A substantial shift to foreign residual oil, however, could have a serious impact on the degree in which the development of these western coals takes place.

Experience on the east coast has demonstrated the degree to which imported residual fuel can replace domestic fuels in a relatively short time. In 1969, residual imports totaled more than 400 million barrels and constituted about 85 percent of all residual consumed in the area.

CONSUMPTION OF COAL AND RESIDUAL OIL IN 1968 IN DISTRICTS II & III

	Electric utilities	Industrial	All other	Total
COAL (1,000 tons):				
District II.....	157,423	54,576	46,479	258,478
District III.....	17,666	2,027	8,518	28,211
RESIDUAL OIL (1,000's barrels):				
District II.....	3,256	21,901	37,159	62,316
District III.....	330	2,578	25,076	27,984

Second. Permitting electric utilities and other industrial plants in districts II to IV to become dependent upon imported fuel would create serious national security problems. The Nation would be hard pressed to supply east coast utilities and other essential industries with fuel in the event developments outside the control of this country should cut off foreign sources of supply. If utilities and other industries in the middle of the Nation become dependent upon fuel from these same foreign sources, the problem of assuring uninterrupted power and industrial production would be greatly compounded.

Third. The Nation's already serious balance-of-payments problems would be further distorted. In 1968, this Nation suffered a deficit of \$1.8 billion in its foreign trade account for energy—despite a contribution of half a billion dollars to a favorable trade balance by coal exports. This unfavorable situation will deteriorate even further if we permit the interior of the Nation to become substantially dependent upon imported fuel, as is the case of the east coast. This proves the point that all industries must be compared on an individual basis and not as part of total picture.

Fourth. Imported fuel is not the answer to any fuel problem which might be

created by air pollution control regulations. As far as utilities are concerned, the ultimate answer is the installation of processes to remove the pollutants from the stack gases. A number of reputable companies say the technology is presently available for installation. Other processes are in the late development stage. They can achieve the same result with domestic coal as would be achieved with imported fuel, without further complicating national security of our balance-of-payments situation. If plants needing low-sulfur fuel are now permitted to import this fuel, the incentive to try available technology or to complete the development of new technology will be destroyed. In the long run, the Nation's clean air program would be retarded or set back.

Fifth. Granting of quotas to import residual fuel oil would mean: the 12.2 ratio of imports to production in districts II to IV would have to be breached; or the amount of crude oil or other products imported would have to be reduced by an amount equal to residual imports. In the first instance, approval would amount to a significant deterioration of the oil import program. In the second instance, while the total amount of fuel available would not be affected, traditional marketing patterns for domestic residual and coal would be disturbed, causing serious economic dislocation in many areas.

For these and other reasons, there is no justification for breaking with precedent and permitting residual fuel oil to be imported into districts II to IV. Certainly, where air pollution problems exist, we must all work to find solutions to them. However, these solutions would not have to come through the importation of low-sulfur foreign fuel. Alternatives include desulfurizing domestic residual, utilization of domestic low-sulfur coal where available—and it is known that Commonwealth Edison, for example, has been offered low-sulfur coal from both Wyoming and eastern Kentucky—or the development and installation of stack emission control devices. Several companies now have such devices commercially available, and in very few situations does an immediate emergency exist which would preclude the granting of sufficient time for the installation of such devices to control pollutant emissions.

Either or several of these alternatives would avoid the serious national security and balance-of-payments implications which a precedent-setting decision opening up the Midwest to an insecure foreign source of energy fuel would involve.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY PAYNE IBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, recently retired as athletic director and basketball coach of Oklahoma State University is one of the Nation's towering figures in intercollegiate athletics, Henry Payne Iba, a leader in his profession for 43 years, the last 36 years at Oklahoma State University.

Iba's international stature is based primarily on his achievement of coaching the U.S.A. Olympic basketball team to all-victorious championships in the Tokyo Olympic games of 1964 and 4 years later to the Mexico City Olympic games title, an unblemished series of 18 victories in world competition. He is the first coach of the U.S.A. team to be called back for a second time to direct the Nation's basketball representatives in the Olympic games.

Over the years, Iba-coached intercollegiate teams scored 767 victories, third highest total to be recorded by any coach of his sport, but more important has been his contribution to American athletics and to the youths who have been associated with him who have known him as coach.

Iba has served as president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches and worked in committee for the improvement of the athletic structure of the colleges and universities of the Nation. Honors bestowed upon him attest the acclaim and admiration that has been his, including his inclusion in the National Basketball Hall of Fame at Springfield, Mass., the National Helms Foundation alltime Hall of Fame in Los Angeles, twice National Coach of the Year honor, and his inclusion, also, in both the State of Missouri and the State of Oklahoma alltime Halls of Fame for outstanding citizenship.

Iba was native to the small town of Easton, Mo., attended Westminster College of Missouri, coached 2 years at Clasen High School of Oklahoma City, 4 years at Maryville College of Missouri, 1 year at University of Colorado, and the last 36 years at Oklahoma State. His Oklahoma State teams of 1945 and 1946 were the first to win national championships consecutively. Just before starting his long coaching career, he was married to Doyne Williams, then a student at University of Missouri, a daughter of the late Congressman Clyde Williams and Mrs. Williams of Missouri. The Iba's have one son, Henry W. Iba, who played for his famous father, and now coaches.

Iba's greatest moments in a tremendous career came at the Olympics for, as he so well expressed it, "those victories were for the country." The great Midland area has known great men in the coaching profession for many years but none ever was held in higher esteem for his qualities of honor, integrity, and sportsmanship, and his ability to inspire youth than Henry Payne Iba.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join with my distinguished colleague, Mr. CAMP, in paying a well-deserved tribute to one of the most outstanding basketball coaches and finest men in the business, Coach Henry Iba, who is retiring as head basketball coach and athletic director at Oklahoma State University after 36 years of service.

"Mr. Iba," as he is fondly known to basketball fans throughout Oklahoma and the Nation, has had a magnificent coaching career. Among his many accomplishments, he was the first coach ever to achieve the distinction of leading a team in winning two consecutive National Collegiate Basketball cham-

pionships. He was also the first to coach back-to-back winning U.S.A. Olympic basketball teams, in 1964 and 1968. In 1968, it was thought that the U.S. team could not possibly win. Several of our top basketball players signed professional contracts before the Olympics and it was generally agreed that the United States did not have a chance in basketball. But Henry Iba was the coach. In only a short time, with the skill of a master at his trade, Iba molded the small, relatively inexperienced U.S. team into champions, who brought home the Olympic medals for our country.

With a record of over 750 wins, Henry Iba will go down in basketball history as one of the best. I am proud to salute Henry Iba. I am proud of him; Oklahoma is proud of him; and his country is proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert into the RECORD an excellent article on Coach Iba which appeared in the March 2 Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 2, 1970]

"Mr." IBA'S PRINCIPLES INTACT
(By Nick Seitz)

STILLWATER, OKLA.—Mr. Iba is retiring.

Henry Payne Iba has been head basketball coach and athletic director at Oklahoma State University for 36 years. He was the first to coach back-to-back national collegiate champions, in 1945 and '46, and the first to coach back-to-back Olympic champions, in 1964 and '68. His teams here have won more than 750 games.

And in those 36 years, he has been Mr. Iba to his players, who completely respect his strict, disciplined methods, and give him credit for putting their lives on a more meaningful plane.

"I know him pretty well—I played and coached for him," says John Floyd, the city recreation director in Stillwater, "but I would never call him anything but Mr. Iba, and I can't to this day light a cigarette in front of him and not feel guilty about it." Floyd is in his 40's.

It started early in Iba's career, when a flip young player asked Iba, "Is this the way to release that shot, Hank?" Iba glared as only he can glare, and said, "Son, you don't know me well enough to call me Hank. Give me the ball and go on in." He has been Mr. Iba ever since.

A standing joke among Iba's former players concerns two of them who were reunited after several years and were catching up on each other's progress. "We've just had a son and we named him after Mr. Iba," said one.

"Named him Henry, eh?" said the other. "Nope. Named him Mister."

Iba is a tall, no-foolishness man of impeccable fairness and manners. He parts his hair straight down the middle, and approaches life in the same way.

"A boy must develop self-discipline and eliminate selfishness," he says in a voice now perpetually hoarse from the decades of rasping instructions at his teams. "We're all happier and live a better life if we do."

Iba's teams have always been among the most tightly disciplined in the game. Offensively they pass the ball snappily until they gain a close-in, unguarded shot even if it takes five minutes. Defensively they play a conservative, aggressive man-for-man style with rare switching, because individual responsibility is easy to assign.

"You should never let a boy get beaten badly," says Iba. "That's why we use this system. When a boy is beaten badly he has

a long hill to climb before he's ready to play well. The idea is to eliminate mistakes."

The patience of his clubs has always irritated opponents, who frequently—and unjustly—have accused him of stalling.

The 65-year-old Iba's career is heavily laced with highlights. His Bob Kurland, a seven-footer, was the first mobile really big man, and led the Cowboys to the two straight national titles, in New York City.

There were 13 Missouri Valley Conference championships, then a Big Eight crown. The greatest rivalry in the Midlands for a long time was Henry Iba against Dr. F. C. (Phog) Allen of Kansas.

Twice Iba has been national college coach of the year, and he has been inducted into every basketball hall of fame deserving of the name.

His son, Moe, played for him and then became head coach at Memphis State.

Iba worked hard to build other sports at OSU as athletic director, and the school has one of the best-rounded programs in the nation, with top teams in everything from riflery to wrestling.

But the biggest thrill of Iba's life came in 1968 in Mexico City, when his United States Olympic squad won when it was generally agreed that it was not good enough. Players like Lew Alcindor and Neal Walk had decided not to go to Mexico. The team was generally small.

But it was, ultimately, a typical Iba product; crisply efficient, confident, an aesthetic pleasure to watch interworking so smoothly. "This was just an overwhelming thing," Iba said, "to win for your country."

It would be nice if Iba could retire to his hobbies of fishing, hunting, and golf with another, last championship. Unfortunately, Oklahoma State is rather an ordinary team, only playing .500 ball and no better than a spoiler in its league.

Oklahoma State has not been a national power in some time, and the main reason is Iba's principled stubbornness. He refuses to subscribe to the oppressive pressure of modern recruiting on a broad scale, and, with high-school basketball talent in Oklahoma mediocre at best, has been left behind by more aggressive and younger coaches who do not mind avidly pursuing prep players in all 50 states and a few foreign countries.

It must, though, be a great satisfaction to him to leave the game he loves with his principles intact, with a magnificent overall record, and with the hundreds of men who played for him for all those years still respectfully addressing him as "Mr. Iba."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to join with the other Members of our Oklahoma congressional delegation today in paying tribute to Mr. Henry P. Iba, the outstanding director of athletics and basketball coach at Oklahoma State University.

Mr. Iba has had a long and distinguished career in athletics, with a brilliant record of well over 700 victories, two national championships, 15 conference championships, and has twice led the U.S. basketball team to victory in the Olympics. His skillful coaching, intense patriotism, and his high sense of loyalty to his school and his friends have won him the respect and admiration of all. The "Iron Duke" has been a fine example to the young men he has coached—expecting the best from them and in turn giving the best of himself to those who have played for him. His integrity has never been challenged, and his fine character and influence in sports in Oklahoma over the past 36 years will long be

remembered. Henry Iba has been a true champ in every sense of the word. He will be missed and will long be remembered as "the finest basketball coach—or friend—his former players have ever known." We salute him for a job well done and wish him the best in his eminently deserved retirement.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in paying tribute to one of the legendary figures of sports history, Coach Henry P. Iba, whose teams have made Oklahoma State a basketball power for 36 years.

His remarkable coaching record will always stand among the best—336 victories in 1,179 games during a career of 43 years. In his 36 seasons at Stillwater his teams won 655 games while losing only 316.

Back-to-back national championships, Olympic successes—list of his accomplishments is lengthy and impressive. His name has long since become synonymous with athletics at Oklahoma State. It is hard to imagine basketball without him.

Many press tributes have appeared within the last few weeks. Among the most interesting was a series by sports columnist Volney Meece, of the Oklahoma City Times, to whom Coach Iba gave these characteristic comments:

I've always figured this way: For a moment when I get beat, I probably get as low as anybody in the world. But I've been able to bounce back in the next three hours.

I hate to lose. But if I can just figure out why we lost I can get out from under it pretty quick. I imagine what bothers most coaches the most is not being able to shake off a loss. I've been able to.

I don't know who taught me, but I've always had a policy: When you lose, forget that one. When you win, tell your friends about it and forget it, too. You're not going to get either one back, that's for sure.

I think you learn something from losing. I think you do a better job with the next group of boys you get. Of course, the name of the sports world is winning. There's not any question about that.

A lot of people have learned from Henry Iba. We all congratulate him and wish him the best.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding Oklahoman and one of the coaching giants of this Nation.

Hank Iba put Oklahoma State University on the sports map as one of the winningest basketball coaches in the country during his long career as coach and athletic director there. I have known Hank ever since he came to Oklahoma, and I know that he is not only one of the winningest coaches around, but one of the winningest people I have ever met.

As is common with successful coaches, one of the things that made Hank successful was that his players genuinely loved and respected him. And so does everybody who knows him.

It has been a great privilege to share Hank's friendship. He and I were inducted into the Oklahoma Hall of Fame on the same night several years ago, and he has been a fine personal friend. I am truly sorry to see him leave, and I want to wish him the very best of everything now and in the future.

He has brought honor and glory to himself and to Oklahoma, and all Oklahomans bask in that reflected glory.

Good luck, Hank.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Henry Iba as head coach at Oklahoma State University marks the close of the greatest amateur basketball coaching career ever.

The record compiled by "The Iron Duke" of basketball during his 36 years as head coach at OSU speaks for itself. The many conference, tournament, and national championships, the seemingly endless list of All-Americans that he coached to greatness, the victorious 1964 and 1968 American Olympic teams which he assembled, all stand as proof of Henry Iba's unmatched record in the amateur basketball world.

Aside from his great abilities on the court, Henry Iba served as counselor, father, and friend to countless numbers of young men. The things that were taught on Henry Iba's court—perseverance, honesty, and above all else, the selfless camaraderie of team effort—produced not only great athletes, but great Americans.

I want to join my colleagues from Oklahoma, as well as the millions of other Americans who have followed the "Aggies" these many years under Coach Iba, in wishing him and his wife the very best of happiness and good fortune in their retirement. His dedication and unselfish contributions to the university and the game of basketball will long be remembered by us all.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the retirement of Henry Payne Iba and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY IS SKATING ON THIN ICE TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is no military secret the Nation's economy is skating on thin ice today. There are a number of reasons for this but one, I believe, is our policy concerning the importation of foreign products.

For many years after World War II it was thought there was room enough for all in the world market of fair competition. The effect of imports on the American worker and the American economy were not discernible.

But now, the picture has changed. Our own industrial giants are struggling and if they fall through the thin ice, the resulting splash could drown the Nation, economically.

In recent years we have seen a pattern traced in the fancy figure skating per-

formed by our foreign import policy-makers. It resembles a figure 8, a double circle, and both of them vicious.

Going around the top loop, Mr. Speaker, is the American tax dollar, chasing itself toward its own destruction. It was the American tax dollar which was spent to crush our enemies in World War II. It was the American tax dollar which was spent to rebuild those devastated nations, and their industries, to make them competitive again.

Just how successful our dollars were in this endeavor can be illustrated by the fact that the world's largest blast furnace now is located in Japan. So is the largest steel-rolling mill. Two Japanese firms are merging to create a company which will replace United States Steel Corp. as the world's largest steel manufacturer.

It also was American tax dollars which helped build American plants overseas where the manufacturer could take advantage of the cheap labor and low production costs. The product then was sold at a lower cost here than a similar article produced at home.

It is the American tax dollar now being spent in increasing amounts to pay soaring salaries on the home front as a life preserver to keep our workers afloat in the rising flood of foreign imports.

It will be the American tax dollar which will have to support Americans who go under in the flood and find their jobs eliminated and themselves in the pool of the unemployed.

That is the top circle, Mr. Speaker; now let us look at the bottom half of the vicious figure 8.

Numerous articles in the RECORDS have proven imports are costing Americans jobs now, today. They may not be the sole reason for our climbing unemployment rate but, certainly, they are a major contributing factor.

The more foreign products we import to this country, the fewer we build at home. The fewer we build at home, the less need we have for our factories. The less need for the factories means the less need for the workers to run them. The less the factories run, the less American goods are turned out for the domestic market. The less American goods produced for our market, the more we import to fill the gap.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that some of the nations who are reaping the benefit of this fancy figure skating were our military enemies three decades ago. It appears they are accomplishing today with manufactured goods what they could not do with guns—gaining worldwide dominance—and bringing our country to its knees economically.

REPAIR AND PROTECT THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT FOR ALL GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the new decade that we have embarked upon is

certain to be the pivotal period in the ecological history of the Nation. The United States has attained its status as the pinnacle of economic power by a thorough and frequently ruthless exploitation of our natural resources. Only recently has the Nation recognized that our natural resources exist in finite quantities, and that we have already seriously depleted existing sources for raw materials. We are just now comprehending that the physical well-being of our people is inextricably related to the ecological integrity of the Nation. The industrial prowess which has so ably guided our economy to its great position of strength has left the environment a casualty to the extent that we enjoy our high standard of living in the midst of polluted water, toxic air, and ravaged forests. In the name of technological advancement, we have contaminated the natural environment with lethal chemicals which, if left unchecked, threaten to replace the balance of nature with a timetable for certain destruction.

The country is caught up in an unlimited depletion, unlimited consumption, and unlimited pollution cycle. Concomitant with the unrestrained exploitation of our natural resources has been the creation of a source for disposal of the resultant commodities. The industrial community, frequently acting in concert with the Federal Government, has succeeded in educating the American public with a consumer-waste philosophy to the extent that our present high standard of living is dependent upon the capacity of the public to consume products and generate wastes.

Industry has educated the consumer public to use and discard, and has almost made one-way nonreturnable containers a way of life. This consumer philosophy is in fact a pollution philosophy and if allowed to continue to its logical, albeit absurd conclusion, will finally succeed in creating the disposable, one-way, nonreturnable consumer, who buys and expends more products than any other person in the world, pollutes his environment more than any other person in the world and eventually succeeds in extinguishing himself much before his time.

The inability of the communities to cope with the consumer-waste philosophy fostered by industry and government is graphically illustrated by statistics contained in a recent report on solid wastes problems by the President's Office of Science and Technology. The report recites that urban and industrial wastes generated in the United States average 10 pounds per capita per day, whereas collected wastes average only 5.12 pounds per capita per day, or only 51 percent of the total amount produced. The report identified the uncollected 49 percent as "an unknown factor in urban life." That means that no one knows where virtually half of the wastes generated in this country go. We are learning that it rapidly finds its way into our air, water and soil, and that this "unknown" factor is an uncontrolled lethal agent. The same report also states that a recent literature search by the Public Health Service indicated association between solid wastes

and 22 human diseases. These facts alone demand that our present policies be re-examined, if only to assure the continued survival of the populace.

The assault perpetrated upon our natural resources, although only a byproduct of our industrial achievements, could not have been more destructive if the Nation had set out intentionally to destroy the environment. We find ourselves in a position of either turning the corner in the direction of a healthy environment or of confronting much of the plant and animal life in this country with destruction and possible extinction.

My interest in preserving the natural environment is not new. In 1963, in carrying out the objectives of the pioneering Jones Commission, I chaired hearings on the pollution of the national water supply for the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The hearings concerned the increasing water pollution in the Connecticut River Basin, the Delaware River Basin, lower Lake Michigan, Texas, the Southwest, and the Midwest. I am grateful that at the hearings held in Hartford, Conn., the committee had the benefit of the observations and comments of Gov. John N. Dempsey, William S. Wise, then director of the Connecticut Water Resources Commission, Mrs. Elizabeth K. Roper, chairman of the New England League of Women Voters ad hoc committee on water resources, and Dr. Franklin M. Foote, the Connecticut State Commissioner of Health, and many others who have joined in the common effort to combat pollution.

The hearings created a heightened awareness of the overall problem on the part of Government officials, both State and Federal, who are responsible for heading up and formulating water pollution control programs. The startling evidence of a deteriorating water supply that was gathered by the hearings served as a mandate for pollution control legislation and action.

In 1963 I proposed an amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to substantially increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works. At the time that I introduced my amendment I noted that the national interest required a tremendous stepping up of research and construction of pollution abatement facilities and, above all, of increased enforcement of pollution control laws if the Nation's resources were to remain equal to the tremendous demands to be made upon them in the future. My forewarning in 1963 has proved to be all too true, and now at the start of the seventies we are faced with a "now or never" situation where we must act effectively and quickly, or forgo the luxury of a healthy environment. My bill to increase grants for the construction of pollution abatement facilities was not acted upon in 1963, but the need remained and I re-introduced the bill in the next Congress. Fortunately, in 1965, my recommendation was accepted. In 1965, I noted that the principal solution to the evils of pollution was money, and that statement stands true today. I have never hesitated

to support substantial appropriations for pollution control legislation, and I continue to believe that this is one area where we can afford sizable appropriations. In the first session of the 91st Congress, I supported the full funding for programs under the Clean Water Restoration Act. The final amount approved was substantially above the figure which the Nixon administration requested for these programs.

The Federal Government has spearheaded the movement for construction of pollution abatement facilities, and I am proud to have been an early advocate for the necessary Federal spending in this area. I recall that in 1963-64, while my own State of Connecticut appropriated only \$99,950 for the operation of the State water resources commission, which had the major responsibility for implementing the water pollution control program in the State, and the State health department was operating on a budget of only \$65,000 for its water pollution control activities, I was recommending in Congress that existing grant limitations for sewage treatment works be raised from \$600,000 and \$2.4 million, respectively, for a single and combined sewage project, to \$1.2 million and \$4.8 million in 1965.

In 1964 I introduced a bill to amend the Refuse Act of 1899 to provide penalties against boatowners in instances of negligence substantially endangering desirable marine, aquatic, or other plant and animal life of the navigable waters of the United States. Since 1964 when I first introduced the bill, occurrences of the environmental tragedies toward which the bill is directed have increased at an alarming rate. My bill, by setting forth in clear and precise terms the liability for causing an environmental disaster would insure that wrongdoers pay for their negligence and damage. The bill, if enacted, will be a great step toward protecting the environmental rights of communities contiguous to navigable waters from careless and willful pollution by boats and ships. I am hopeful that action on my bill will be taken in this session of the Congress.

In 1965 I introduced legislation to encourage the construction and installation of air and water pollution control equipment by providing tax writeoffs to businesses and industries for that purpose. Upon introducing the bill I expressed my belief that the enactment of the bill would be a good supplement to other proposals and would be another step in bringing all possible resources into the effort to curb and correct the critical natural resources problem.

In the first session of this Congress, in addition to supporting the full funding for programs under the Clean Water Restoration Act, a measure which I cosponsored, and introducing my bill fixing the responsibility for polluting navigable waters of the United States, I gave my full support to the Water Quality Act of 1969 and introduced H.R. 13826, a bill to provide for the creation of a Council on Environmental Quality to develop a comprehensive national program to improve the environment. I was pleased

that the substance of H.R. 13826 was included in the bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent Presidential Council on the Environment which passed the House with my support on November 23, 1969, and was signed into law on January 1, 1970.

Upon introducing H.R. 13826 I stated the basic premise for my initial and continuing activity in the area of pollution control, which is that human beings have environmental rights as much as social and economic rights. The environmental rights of man include, but are not limited to: First, the right to breath uncontaminated air; second, the right to have clean, healthy water for both consumption and pleasure; third the right to enjoy nature in an untrammelled state; fourth, the right to insist upon the maintenance of nature in a condition reasonably conducive to the continued existence of all forms of plant and animal life. Just as in the case of social and economic rights, duties flow from the assertion of environmental rights. It is to insure that citizens and the Nation fulfill their duties to each other and to the land that I will continue to initiate and support all necessary antipollution legislation. Our antipollution laws must be as stringent as our environment is ravaged.

In October 1964 I had the honor to give the keynote address at the fourth annual bioenvironmental engineering symposium at the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., and at that time I insisted that everyone has the responsibility to deal with the problem of pollution. I stated that while we are conducting research on pollution control we must always keep aware that endeavors to halt pollution cannot wait upon the development of all the answers. We must proceed to implement solutions with what we have. The statement has even more validity today than it did 6 years ago. To date we have not fully applied existing technical know-how to environmental problems. If we had dealt with the problems as they developed, we would not be attempting to deal with the 1970 pollution crisis with techniques which were available in the 1950's. We now find ourselves not only dealing with the more subtle though no less devastating threat caused by the most recent technological advancement, but also the cumulative threat of decades of mismanagement.

To date, the Nation's pollution control efforts have consisted of programs which divide the environment into separate components of air, water, and land, and others which are geared to specific environmental crisis. While programs dealing with land, water, and air as several components of the total environment were good starts in combating pollution, we must develop programs which approach the environment as one integrated unit. Pouring money and programs into combating water pollution will do little good if the land and air are neglected. Why create forest preserves if polluted air and water will reduce the areas to wastelands? As an adjunct to existing crisis orientated programs we must develop an anticipatory capability

to prevent environmental tragedies before they get started and to treat effectively a pollution hazard before it develops into a pollution disaster.

While I was gratified that a Presidential council on the environment, as recommended both by my bill and the bill considered by the House, has now been established, I am hopeful that sections of my own bill which were tailored to developing an anticipatory capability will be the subject of future legislation. To achieve this anticipatory capability I recommend that that Secretary of the Interior be authorized to conduct studies of natural environmental systems in the United States, to document and define changes in these systems, and to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects which may make significant modifications in the natural environment. Further, I recommend that the Secretary of the Interior be directed to establish a clearinghouse for information on ecological problems and to disseminate information about programs related to those problems. Also, I recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to establish a comprehensive solid waste management program which would coordinate all such research now being done under a number of different Federal programs. Another recommendation of mine directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to compile a national inventory of solid waste management needs and problems of solid waste management technology. In addition, I recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a clearinghouse for information on all aspects of air, water and soil pollution and solid waste disposal. This information would be made available to business, industry, municipalities, and the general public. These are the kinds of provisions which would help to develop an anticipatory capability.

In the last session of Congress I also spoke out on the threat of pesticide contamination.

Unless constructive action is taken to reduce the environmental contamination a very large percentage of the world's remaining plant and animal life faces extinction during the next 20 years, and human life may be endangered. Much of this wanton destruction has been attributed to pesticide contamination and misuse. It is chilling to realize that certain food additives and residues which we ingest may kill, cause cancer, create fetal deformities in animal-mammalian life and also be hazardous to humans.

I have criticized the Department of Agriculture for consistently ignoring potential health hazards in freely allowing the use of pesticide compounds dangerous to human health. I recommended that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be given the legal authority to ban or limit the use of pesticides wherever the use of such substances is hazardous to public health. I also recommended that the Secretary of the Interior be given greater statutory authority to participate in decisions regarding pesticide compounds which constitute a

danger to fish and wildlife and contaminate the environment.

It is my firm position that the highest priority in the registration and re-registration of pesticide compounds should be the potential hazard to human life and the environment rather than the Department of Agriculture's priority on the benefit to food and fiber. There must be a balancing of risks and the potential hazard to health cannot be continually ignored as the Department of Agriculture consistently has done.

On December 10, 1969, I cosponsored H.R. 15191, a bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The proposed Commission will conduct studies and research, and will make recommendations to all levels of government in the United States regarding a broad range of problems associated with population growth and their implications for America's future. One of the major objectives of the Commission will be to determine the impact on population growth on environmental pollution and on the depletion of our natural resources. This type of long-range planning is vital, and I was pleased that on February 18, 1970, the House passed H.R. 15165, a bill identical to my own H.R. 15191. The bill is now in conference, and I am hopeful that it will be signed into law this year.

Environmental pollution recognizes no political boundaries, and the problems now confronting us do not admit of political solutions. Of course, the cost of this immense task is formidable and we would do well not to expect overnight miracles or anything more than a gradual turn in the right direction. In addition we must balance the cost to our industries and the effect that added abnormal expense would have on their viability and their capacity to provide jobs and pay taxes.

I stand ready to support all necessary and proper legislation which will repair and protect the natural environment for the present population and for all generations to come.

NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the renewed disturbances in Northern Ireland remind me that prospects are not good for a just and lasting settlement of the problems that have clouded the future of this lovely and troubled place.

I do not wish to dwell on the tensions and divisions that exist in Ulster and that are well known here. Nor is there much point in recapitulating the troubled and tragic events that led to the partition of Ireland and the establishment in the south of an independent state, the Republic of Ireland, composed mainly of Catholics; and to the adherence to the United Kingdom of the six counties in the north, Northern Ireland, populated mainly by Protestants.

What I do want to emphasize is the responsibility of the Government of Great Britain for bringing justice and

peace to the people of Northern Ireland. Constitutionally, Northern Ireland has a character unlike any other part of the United Kingdom, and the problems of making the writ of the Central Government run in a province with wide powers of self-government is not unknown to Americans. Indeed, our own difficulties in implementing Federal law throughout the Union make it clear how unfair it would be to blame Westminster for injustice and violence in Northern Ireland.

But despite constitutional problems, nothing can excuse the failure of the British Government to do much more, much sooner. That Government bears a large measure of responsibility for allowing the injustices inflicted on the Catholic minority to have festered for so long.

In the past few months, following the recommendations of various commissions, the British Government has exerted pressure on the Government of Northern Ireland to institute some reforms and to attempt to redress some of the major grievances of the Catholic minority. A major problem arises, not with the theory of these reforms, but with their actual implementation in the face of dogged opposition from those who are determined to maintain the status quo with all that that implies.

The following is a brief review of the reforms proposed or instituted so far.

Under pressure from Westminster, the Government of Northern Ireland transformed the Royal Ulster Constabulary—RUC—formerly the paramilitary bastion of Protestant control in Ulster, into a civilian force. More important, the RUC is no longer subject to political control.

Future recruiting for the RUC is to include Catholics.

All arms and weapons, previously under the control of the police, are now under the jurisdiction of an English inspector-general and are to be issued only at his discretion.

The "B Specials"—a political police force that has aroused especially bitter resentment among the Catholic population—are to be disbanded by March 31.

Catholics have been promised a fairer deal in regard to housing. The Central Government will henceforth be charged with allocating available housing on the basis of need rather than religion, a criterion that has been dominant with the local governments which have until now exercised this authority.

The problem with these reforms, laudable in theory, is that there is little indication so far of how they will work in practice in the face of determined opposition.

I am especially disturbed about the situation as it pertains to a major grievance of the Catholic minority; namely, the question of voting rights. The ostensible purpose of the reform in question, the "Electoral Act No. 2 of 1969," is to eliminate weighted votes for property holders and to give everyone over 18 the right to vote in local elections. In practice, however, it does something less than this, since the local elections scheduled for 1970 have been indefinitely suspended by Government decree. In the meantime, the Government of Northern Ireland will have completed its redefinition of ward

boundaries, as permitted under the Local Government Act of 1969, redefinitions that may well result in a manipulation of electoral boundaries on a scale unique even to Northern Ireland. The voting power of the Catholic minority will be diminished, rigged elections will continue, and one-party government will be maintained as in the past.

A right to vote in elections that have been canceled can hardly be described as a right. A voting right that cannot be exercised is no voting right at all. As long as local elections remain canceled by Government decree, there is a suspension of the democratic process. Local government still remains, and apparently will remain, in the hands of those who were elected under the old inequitable system that gave businessmen six votes for each business they owned, while one-third of the electorate was in effect voteless.

It has been said that the British Government has done more for Northern Ireland in the past 5 months than in the 50 years since partition; and I do not mean to belittle these efforts by noting that they are the least that can and should be done, and that they should have been undertaken many years ago. Only time will tell whether they are enough to help heal the divisions in Ulster. What a paradox, what a tragedy if it should turn out that there is just too much religion in Northern Ireland for Christianity to prevail.

But no degree of religious intolerance can justify the retention by the British Government of the Special Powers Act. The effect of this act can be appreciated by quoting the then Minister of Justice of South Africa, now the Prime Minister, who said in 1963, when introducing a new coercion bill in the South African Parliament, that he would—and I quote—"be willing to exchange all the legislation of that sort for one clause of the Northern Ireland Special Powers Act."

This act, which has been in existence since 1920, empowers the authorities to—

- First, arrest without warrant;
- Second, imprison without charge and deny recourse to habeas corpus;
- Third, forcibly enter and search homes without a warrant at any hour of the day or night;
- Fourth, declare curfews and prohibit meetings, assemblies, and marches;
- Fifth, punish by flogging;
- Sixth, deny right to trial by jury;
- Seventh, forcibly detain witnesses and compel them to answer questions, even if their answers incriminate them;
- Eighth, violate the right of private property;
- Ninth, deny prisoners contact with relatives or lawyers;
- Tenth, prohibit the holding of an inquest after a prisoner's death;
- Eleventh, arrest a person who "by word of mouth" criticizes the Government;
- Twelfth, close down newspapers offensive to the Government;
- Thirteenth, prohibit the possession of films or tape recordings; and
- Fourteenth, arrest anyone who commits an act judged to be "prejudicial to the preservation of peace or the maintenance of order in Northern Ireland, and not specifically provided for in the regulations."

This act is surely an enormous irritant and an almost insuperable barrier to reconciliation and an effective settlement of the difficulties that pockmark Northern Ireland. The original intent of the act was to "deal with" Catholics and Nationalists. The Special Police Force—the hated "B" Specials—were recruited on an entirely sectarian, Protestant, basis specifically to enforce this act. These "B" Specials carried out their duties with absolute ruthlessness on countless occasions; and during the Belfast riots last August, this force, instead of impartially maintaining peace, participated in the persecution of Catholics. It was as a result of these actions that the "B" Specials were disarmed on direct orders from London. It is ironic that the Special Powers Act is now being used against its greatest proponents, but that does not change its essential injustice.

Both the Government of Northern Ireland and Westminster will have to take more decisive action than they have thus far if the overall situation is to be improved on a lasting basis. The time has passed when it could be handled locally. Westminster must finally accept its full responsibility for establishing justice and maintaining law and order; for assuring equality of opportunity in jobs and housing; and for abolishing sectarian discrimination. Above all, there can be no case for the retention of the uniquely oppressive Special Powers Act.

It is not enough for Britain to send in troops and armored cars to maintain, at best, an uneasy truce. She must also seek to alleviate the root causes of the discontent by rooting out the inequalities that still exist. An effort must be made at last to bring democracy to Northern Ireland.

At a minimum, the following steps should be taken:

- First, restore civil rights and liberties, which can only be achieved by repealing the Special Powers Act and the Public Order Act;
- Second, proclaim a bill of rights to guarantee individual liberties;
- Third, outlaw discrimination on grounds of race, color, or creed, a goal that can be achieved simply by extending the Race Relations Act to Northern Ireland;
- Fourth, end gerrymandering of election districts;
- Fifth, call early elections based on the one-man, one-vote principle;
- Sixth, legislate to give aggrieved parties the right to sue for damages when their civil rights are violated; and
- Seventh, restructure and overhaul enforcement procedures against housing, job, and legal discrimination.

This is, in one sense, an internal matter for Britain to handle. But the renewed rise in tensions and the terrorist bomb attacks on Catholic Members of Parliament in Northern Ireland in recent weeks suggest that the reforms have been inadequate or have been inadequately implemented. Fiery speeches will not ease the situation, nor will further resort to arms. Firm, impartial, and decisive action by Britain is essential

this week when the Northern Ireland Parliament must act one way or another on these problems. I cannot believe that Britain will fail to insure that the reforms already promised and theoretically instituted, as well as those additional reforms so long overdue, will be speedily and effectively implemented. Surely it is clear that time is very short if lasting disaster is to be averted.

There is a temptation to regard confrontations between Catholics and Protestants as an almost comical anachronism. But the strife and hardship resulting from confrontations between Catholics and Protestants is no less bitter for its archaic overtones, and persecution of Catholics by Protestants—or of Protestants by Catholics, as in Spain—is not made less objectionable because it has gone on for such a long time.

What is wrong in Northern Ireland is of course not unique. Racial and religious bigotry continue to inflame and pollute the human situation almost everywhere. Americans can speak with authority and shame on these matters. So can Russians, Indians, Africans, Malaysians, as, in sad fact, who cannot. But no one who has visited this lovely island, and whose heart beats gladder for this opportunity, can fail to feel distress about the sad turn of events there that threatens to destroy for decades to come the high hopes of so many gifted people for the chance to live in security and freedom in their own land.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTED SCHOOL BOARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a proposed constitutional amendment to provide for the establishment of public schools.

Nowhere in the Constitution, nor in the amendments adopted to it, are there references to public education. However, there are numerous court decisions on the operation of public schools, many of which are contradictory.

Hundreds of school districts throughout the United States are under court order requiring school boards to make particular student and teacher assignments and nearly every court order is different. There is no uniformity, nor has the Supreme Court laid down any standards under which school districts should operate.

My proposed constitutional amendment would require each State to create public school districts in such number as is necessary to provide public education at the elementary and secondary school level. Further, it would provide that the population and geographic limits of each school district shall be such as to insure the most efficient operation of schools and to provide for the highest quality of education possible.

I propose that the Constitution require that each school district shall be governed by a board of education, consisting of five members, elected by the residents of the school district.

I feel that my proposal is elementary democracy. Each school district would be operated by an elected board; consequently, the parents of the school district would be the ultimate decisionmakers in regard to school matters.

My amendment would give exclusive authority to the board of education in the matter of employment and assignment of teachers and the assignment of pupils.

Under my proposal, no child may be denied admission to a public school because of his race, creed, color, religion, or national origin; and no child may be compelled to attend a school because of his race, creed, color, religion, or national origin.

Everyone is aware that there are conflicts and tensions in our public schools. I feel that much of this is caused by the fact that demands and requirements are made on local school districts by State and Federal agencies and courts.

In my considered opinion, an amendment to the Constitution of this nature is imperative if we are to preserve the neighborhood school concept, eliminate existing confusion and maintain a high level of quality education for the children of America who deserve our full efforts toward achieving that goal.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"Each State shall create public school districts in such number as is necessary to provide public education at the elementary and secondary school levels. The geographic and population limits of each school district shall be such as to insure the most efficient operation of schools and to provide for the highest quality of education possible. Each such school district shall be governed by a board of education consisting of five members elected by the residents of the school district who have attained the age of twenty-one. The term of office of each member of a board of education shall be two years. The employment and assignment of teachers within a school district shall be within the exclusive authority of the appropriate board of education; and each such board shall have exclusive authority to assign pupils: *Provided*, That no child may be denied admission to a public school because of his race, creed, color, religion, or national origin; and no child may be compelled to attend a school because of his race, creed, color, religion, or national origin."

WAGE AND HOUR STANDARDS FOR POLICE AND FIREMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today three of us, the gentlemen from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI and Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) and myself, are introducing legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to bring policemen and firefighters under its terms, both as respects minimum wages and overtime.

These defenders of the public safety, who are often required to work long hours, whose jobs are among the most hazardous conceivable, cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered overpaid—or even adequately paid. They should not, in all fairness, be excluded from the wage and hour standards protection which Federal legislation has long extended to private employees, and recently has begun to extend to public employees.

There is legislation pending, specifically H.R. 10948, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) which would have the effect of bringing these hard-working people under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and would indeed, do much more for many other segments of the American people.

Since this bill has been referred to the General Subcommittee on Labor, which is chaired by the able gentleman from Pennsylvania, I know that the proposal will receive sympathetic and knowledgeable handling.

The bill my colleagues and I introduce today will, however, serve to highlight the importance of paying special attention to the very difficult economic situation faced by a group of men whom we could not possibly compensate adequately, but whom we should at least relieve of the occasional necessity of moonlighting to make ends meet.

At the conclusion of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a table taken from the Law Enforcement Journal of the Police Officers Association of Michigan, showing police salary ranges—from minimum to maximum, in a number of American cities.

A word is in order about the origin of this legislation.

Several days ago, Mr. Carl Parsell, president of the Police Officers' Association of Michigan, wrote to several members of the Michigan delegation.

He did not demand, he did not denounce, he did not excoriate.

He simply asked if we could not amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to include law enforcement officers—citing in particular the desirability of letting them collect at least time and a half for overtime.

I receive a lot of letters urging the enactment of this or that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

But there was something about Mr. Parsell's quiet and reasonable communication which compelled me to think about what could be done above and beyond simply indicating my support of the pending broader legislation.

After discussing the letter with some other members of the Michigan delegation, the bill we are introducing today was prepared.

It is my understanding that Fair Labor Standards Act hearings may be scheduled in the near future, and I commend

this legislation to the earnest consideration of the able chairman of the subcommittee and his colleagues.

The material referred to follows:

POLICE SALARY SURVEY

A survey of police salaries conducted by the DPOA shows Chicago in first place with the highest maximum salary scale of \$12,120. Pontiac is a close second with \$11,915. Detroit is fifth with \$10,800.

The chart below shows the salary ranges for a number of cities in the United States and Canada. The columns show the minimum and maximum salaries and the number of years it takes to attain the maximum.

City	Maximum salary	Number of years to attain	Minimum salary
Chicago.....	\$12,120	4	\$9,600.00
Pontiac.....	11,915	5	9,665.00
San Francisco.....	11,796	4	11,019.60
New York.....	10,950	3	9,499.00
Detroit.....	10,800	4	8,000.00
Los Angeles.....	10,668	4	9,060.00
San Diego.....	10,644	3	8,772.00
St. Louis.....	10,011	-----	7,800.00
Minneapolis.....	9,660	6	7,800.00
Cleveland.....	9,426	2	8,430.00
Baltimore.....	9,252	5	7,452.00
Buffalo.....	9,225	4-5	7,015.00
Milwaukee.....	9,200	4	7,700.00
Philadelphia.....	9,000	2	8,478.00
Washington D.C.....	8,940	5	8,000.00
Cincinnati.....	8,807	3	7,744.00
Houston.....	8,712	5	7,800.00
Pittsburgh.....	8,700	3	7,763.00
Dallas.....	8,400	3	7,356.00
Boston.....	8,320	3	6,344.00
San Antonio.....	7,560	2	6,000.00
New Orleans.....	7,320	6	6,600.00
Montreal.....	7,300	2½	5,000.00

ABM—SECURITY OR ABSURDITY

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, administration plans to expand the Safeguard ABM system should come as no surprise. For years, the Defense Department has had only to mention "security" to answer all questions and eliminate all concern about specific weapons systems. For years the Pentagon has cried, "Damn the torpedoes, the cost, the research, and the reliability. Full speed ahead." For years anyone who has dared to question Defense Department spending practices has been branded "unpatriotic" or worse.

We have seen the results of this self-righteous attitude, Mr. Speaker. We have watched the unnecessary waste and misuse of billions of tax dollars for "cost overruns." We have seen countless sophisticated weapons systems, supposedly "vital" to our national defense, rushed into premature production before all research questions have been answered. We have seen a long line of weapons meant to provide us with "ultimate security" become obsolete before production is completed. I have only to mention the F-11 airplane as an example. Most tragically, we have seen the American people lose confidence in our Defense Establishment and create a new wave of antimilitarism which rivals that of isolationist times.

There are many of us in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and our numbers are growing, who have become disillusioned with the annual blank check appropriation which the Defense Department requests each year. If this Government is to invest billions of dollars in weapons systems, we

believe that Congress has a duty to determine if such investments are justified. We can no longer accept promises of "ultimate security" instead of proper research and development. We can no longer condone the waste of billions of dollars on cost overruns because we are told it is in the national interest to waste money on defense. We can no longer tolerate the premise that the Pentagon budget is untouchable while all other budgets are subject to the most intensive scrutiny.

None of us are "enemies of the military" or unpatriotic. On the contrary, we believe that the safety and security of every citizen must be our first priority. We want to provide the best possible defense for this Nation, but we do not think that unlimited appropriations, insufficient research and hurry-up production will provide us with that defense.

All of the errors, the waste and the arrogance which have typified the Pentagon approach to national defense in recent years are exemplified by the continuing attempts of this administration to ram the ABM system down our throats. The Pentagon wants to expand the ABM system now, regardless of the tactical justification for such a step, regardless of its possible adverse effect on the arms race and the strategic arms limitation talks, and, most importantly, regardless of the progress of the vital research work which is necessary to perfect the system.

Fortunately for this Nation, Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are no longer willing to accept Pentagon pronouncements at face value. My colleagues and I will no longer accept "because" as an answer to our questions about national defense. We demand to know why certain weapons systems are necessary, where they will go, when they will be ready and how much they will cost. No longer are we willing to wait for these answers until after the weapons become obsolete, after they fail because of lack of proper research, or after billions of dollars are wasted and misused. This is our responsibility and our duty, Mr. Speaker, and we can no longer ignore it.

To push forward with expansion of the ABM system at a time when the Pentagon itself admits to the need for millions of dollars in additional research is totally irresponsible. I do not believe that Congress will approve this expansion and I do not believe that the American people, once they become aware of the real issues involved, will support it.

Mr. Speaker, the New York newspaper *Newsday* recently published an outstanding editorial on ABM, an editorial which refutes many of the generalities and myths which the Pentagon has used to justify the expansion of ABM. In a few concise phrases, *Newsday* underscores the basic fallacy of the ABM proposal:

It would be totally unrealistic to argue that the U.S. can ignore the need for a strong defense posture in the face of two such powerful rivals as Soviet Russia and Red China. But it is in the matter of the "sufficiency" of this defense that a fundamental irrationality begins to overwhelm all pretense of logic in the program. . . .

In order to be credible, the enormously complex ABM system of defense—which depends on a precise, chain-reaction sequence of detection and destruction of attacking missiles—must function at 100 per cent efficiency, with no margin for error. It is no use to talk of knocking out, say, five of eight enemy ICBM's, because the thermonuclear warheads of the other three would wreak death and damage of catastrophic proportions. The ABM is thus unlikely to deter a fanatic enemy unless he is convinced he cannot possibly penetrate its defenses. There is a deep division of opinion within the scientific community over whether the ABM can ever provide such a guarantee. Yet we continue to posit that guarantee as our goal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those who seek to fight inflation and those who seek to provide the United States with a truly effective defense to take note of this editorial, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

[From *Newsday*, Mar. 3, 1970]

ABM: THE FAR SIDE OF MADNESS

"In my view, the President's decision to go forward with a modified Phase II of the defensive Safeguard program will, in the long run, enhance the prospects for the success of SALT because, in the short run, it allows us to exercise greater restraint in matching a continued Soviet buildup of offensive systems with actions involving our own offensive systems. . . ."

"Communist China has continued to test nuclear weapons in the megaton range and could test its first ICBM within the next year. However, the earliest estimated date that they could have an operational ICBM capability now appears to be 1973, or about one year later than last year's projection."—Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird in his annual defense report to Congress.

Heaven help us, it is here again: the perennial missile madness, with its exquisitely wrought doublethink ("will, in the long run, enhance the prospects for the success of SALT because, in the short run. . ."), its methodical alternation of the Soviet and Chinese threats, its automatically updated estimates of enemy potential ("about one year later than last year's projection"). Soon we will have those familiar learned debates in the political journals, bandying terms like "first strike capacity," "weapons sufficiency," "number of kills," and the rest of that second rate sports argot so dear to the ABM aficionados.

For over a decade the scenario has replayed itself with little variation—ABM decisions marked by shifting rationales, outright duplicity, swiftly obsolescent "CIA intelligence estimates," overt and covert political pressures. The result has been a self-canceling multi-billion dollar collection of heroic project names—Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, Nike-X, Bomarc, Nike-Zeus, Sentinel, Safeguard—some of which inadvertently suggested the mythic aspects of the whole program and none of which, evidently, has brought us measurably closer to the promised land of "weapons sufficiency."

From the beginning, the defense establishment and its congressional allies have lobbied fiercely for deployment of a sophisticated ABM system on the seductive premise that ultimate security from enemy attack lay just beyond the next missile silo. The apparatus of persuasion has been trundled out so often that it has begun to creak: the scare stories leaked to certain newspapers, in which "high Pentagon sources" reveal some startling new development in Soviet or Chinese strength; the closed-door testimony of Defense Dept. officials informing a congressional committee of the newest "grave new threat" to the nation's defenses; and so forth. (The Chinese threat, or "yellow peril" as it was once known,

is the Pentagon's ace in the hole these days; it can loosen appropriations committee pockets almost without a question being asked.)

RESISTANCE COLLAPSES

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy resisted the pressure for deployment, first of a Nike-Zeus and then of a Nike-X system. President Johnson, heeding his scientific advisers, resisted until September, 1967, when Defense Secretary McNamara reluctantly announced the administration's decision to deploy an ABM system. At the time, McNamara took pains to acknowledge the fallacies of an ABM defense, but then added that it would be "marginally useful" against the Red Chinese threat of 20 to 30 ICBMs expected to materialize by the mid-1970s.

And so Sentinel was born, a 17-site system designed to protect major U.S. cities from obliteration by Red Chinese missiles yet unborn. Unfortunately, the city fathers whose legions had thereby been spared not only failed to express any gratitude but were distinctly hostile to the notion of accommodating missile complexes on their borders. This prompted incoming President Richard Nixon to halt the Sentinel program pending a review.

It was just over a year ago that Sentinel re-surfaced, with a new name and a whole new reason for being. Now it was to be a "thin" system, called Safeguard, to be deployed not near cities but near missile sites, to protect not the lives of civilian populations but the retaliatory capacity of U.S. minuteman ICBMs, not from the distant Chinese potential but from the immediate Soviet threat, which, President Nixon explained, had suddenly grown "larger than was envisaged in 1967."

So we had entered the era of missiles to protect missiles. But the special virtue of the new system, it seemed, was that Safeguard was not merely a weapon; it was a diplomatic coup. As the President put it: "The program is not provocative. The Soviet retaliatory capacity is not affected by our decision. . . . In other words, our program provides an incentive for a responsible Soviet weapons policy." Thus, to the arsenal of clean hydrogen bombs was added a new instrument for harmony among the nations—the unprovocative antiballistic missile. And lest the logic of this unique claim be lost on the general public, "White House sources" offered this illumination through the obliging medium of the *New York Times*:

"It was not, they insisted, cause for concern to the Russian leaders because, by not protecting the cities, it would do nothing to diminish Soviet capability of a counterattack on the cities; and because it would not diminish this capability, there was no reason for the Soviet Union to embark on new efforts to improve their retaliatory capacity."

THE NEWEST PLOY

There, in a single paragraph, was a fair paraphrase of all the shamming, misleading rationales foisted on a credulous and excitable public over the long course of the ABM's existence. If this intelligence could be accepted at face value, it appeared that now we were to be handed over to the Russians as a burnt offering to gain their indulgence for our desire to protect our missile sites. But in truth, it looked like nothing more than a ploy, a vast wink from our side signalling the other side that we were merely reinvesting the growth stock of our Pentagon portfolio—nothing, really, to be alarmed about, fellows.

And like so many other Pentagon ploys, it was serviceable for only a year. Two weeks ago, the President unveiled the new, expanded, dual purpose 1970 Safeguard system, a versatile number that will not only afford protection to both civilian population and missile sites but will deter both the Soviet and Chinese threats. As Defense Secretary

RULES OF THE GAME

Laird urgently explained to Congress: "In view of the continued growth of the Soviet threat and the prospect of Chinese deployment of an ICBM force in the mid-1970's, we could not justify delaying a further step to protect ourselves against these dangers."

This sounds very much like the clear and present danger that has sent us rushing to the barricades every time an ABM I.O.U. has fallen due in the past 10 years or so. The administration nevertheless plans to spend \$920,000,000, just for openers, on the Safeguard expansion. Aside from protection of two additional missile sites, the new wrinkle is "area defense"—advance preparation work on missile installations in five regions of the country, "without a commitment to deployment"—which, it can be assumed, leaves wide latitude for next year's Pentagon maneuvers.

The total costs of this missile-mania to date are not merely staggering. They induce the sort of "psychic numbing" that according to psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton has dehumanized many of our combat soldiers in Vietnam. Stuart Symington, a veteran member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reported last March, for example, that up to that point the Pentagon had invested over \$23 billion on "what are now acknowledged to be unworkable or obsolete missiles." This presumably included some \$6 billion lavished on the old Sentinel before it was finally junked in 1968.

Safeguard already stands on a plateau by itself. When it was first announced a year ago, the total cost was estimated at \$6 to \$7 billion. A few months later, this was raised to \$10.3 billion, on the basis of "additional costs" omitted from the original estimate. When the current expansion was announced last month, Deputy Defense Secretary Packard upped the ante to \$11.9 billion, an increase of \$1.6 billion which he attributed to inflation, delay of the program, and "certain design changes found necessary and advisable during the year"—no doubt, the same sort of necessary and advisable changes that ultimately deposited Sentinel and its predecessors on the scrap heap.

Nothing in the past history of the ABM encourages a belief that the spending will stop there. By authoritative estimates, the "thick system" toward which Safeguard is steadily evolving will cost something beyond \$30 to \$40 billion.

Any range of billions is a no-man's land for most men. Who can grasp the meaning of such figures? They begin to have significance only in the simplistic, but legitimate exercise of placing them alongside more palatable realities. The fact, for instance, that President Nixon dramatically vetoed an education bill a few weeks ago because he regarded the appropriation of \$1.2 billion more than he had requested as "inflationary." The fact that five days before the President announced his new program for a cleaner environment, a federal agency denied a fund request from New York City to demonstrate pollution-free cars because, "there will not be sufficient funds available to meet our commitments for the continuation of existing demonstration projects." Or the fact that the entire, loudly trumpeted war on pollution calls for Federal expenditure of only \$4 billion over a four-year period. Or all the facts of underplanned, underfunded environment, transit, poverty, health and welfare programs in America.

But more basic than how much is being spent on ABM is the question of why it is being spent at all. It would be totally unrealistic to argue that the U.S. can ignore the need for a strong defense posture in the face of two such powerful rivals as Soviet Russia and Red China. But it is in the matter of the "sufficiency" of this defense that a fundamental irrationality begins to overwhelm all pretense of logic in the program.

In the realm of missilery, the arms race is a deterrence race, a flaunting of plumage by hostile peacocks. One must understand to begin with that nuclear missiles are weapons of phantom warfare, calculated, that is, to insure that they will never be used. It is not what they can do, but what they are capable of avoiding that makes them mighty. If the enemy trusts in that capability, then the missiles become an effective deterrent to warfare, and they will not be used otherwise if the enemy has a comparable deterrent.

In order to be credible, the enormously complex ABM system of defense—which depends on a precise, chain-reaction sequence of detection and destruction of attacking missiles—must function at 100 per cent efficiency, with no margin for error. It is no use to talk of knocking out, say, five of eight enemy ICBMs, because the thermonuclear warheads of the other three would wreak death and damage of catastrophic proportions. The ABM is thus unlikely to deter a fanatic enemy unless he is convinced he cannot possibly penetrate its defenses. There is a deep division of opinion within the scientific community over whether the ABM can ever provide such a guarantee. Yet we continue to posit that guarantee as our goal. It is presently estimated that the U.S. has about 1,700 "deliverable" nuclear warheads, as against Russia's 950. These totals do not include the rapid development in converting warheads to MIRV use (Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicle), which permits a single missile to carry multiple warheads. When MIRV is completed late in this decade, we will have over 8,000 nuclear warheads at the ready.

The arithmetic of destructive power becomes as awesome as the sums of dollar cost. McNamara once estimated that a mere 400 warheads of one megaton each (a megaton being equal to 1,000,000 tons of TNT) would kill 74,000,000 people in the Soviet Union and destroy 76 per cent of that nation's industrial capacity. Within a few years we will have a missile arsenal of 20 times that potential—enough, surely, to wipe out any moving or breathing object west of Hawaii and east of Bermuda.

But will it be sufficient? If the present script runs true to form, the Chinese will be spurred by the Safeguard expansion to step up their budding nuclear arms development program; the Russians, perhaps unconvinced by our reassurances about long range expansion for short term restraint, will redouble their development of offensive systems in an attempt to overmatch it. (Indeed, they have just declared that they now have the ability to knock down any ballistic missile we may send their way.) The U.S. defense establishment will then ask for more weapons to balance the Soviet development, and so on, to the far side of madness.

This is the dynamism that fuels the nuclear arms race. It is the underlying absurdity of a game whose only operable rule is that if it is once commenced it is instantly forfeited. Even as they prepare to resume their Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, the United States and Soviet Russia continue their cost accounting for Armageddon. And in our own country at least, one no longer hears any effective voice or chorus of voices raised to demand an audit of that account.

SPEECH BY RAY GALLAGHER OF VFW BEFORE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last week to introduce my very distinguished constituent, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield, S. Dak., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, when he appeared before the House Veterans Affairs Committee on March 10.

I would like to share with my colleagues his very meaningful presentation to the committee. His testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF RAY GALLAGHER, COMMANDER IN CHIEF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: Permit me to express my deep appreciation, as well as that of my fellow officers, and all the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for this opportunity to meet with your Committee.

As veterans we are especially grateful to this Committee for the programs it has initiated through the years. We are grateful to the Congress for the legislation it has enacted in recognition of the unique status and the specific needs of those who fight this nation's wars. As members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars we are equally grateful to this Committee for the cooperation it has given to our organization in our mutual efforts to assist all veterans.

This is the Seventieth Anniversary of the organization I have the honor to represent. Seventy years of service to America and to her people is the proud tradition we bring with us today.

For seven decades of American history—through wars and rumors of wars—the Veterans of Foreign Wars has grown and prospered through its dedicated service to this nation in both peace and war. Through all those years our members have extended the hand of comradeship to the American veterans who return from war. We have been their advocate and the watchdog of their rights. We have been the guardian of their widows and orphans—the helping hand to their dependents. We are proud of that record. We are equally proud of our long association with this Committee.

We are also proud of our many patriotic and youth programs. Accompanying me this morning, just a few rows back, are the 53 winners of the V.F.W. Voice of Democracy Contest from the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Panama Canal Zone, and the Far East. These young Americans represent the future leaders of this nation. They are here today because of one of our patriotic youth programs. Five of them will receive college scholarships totaling \$13,500, with the first place winner delivering his or her speech at the Congressional Banquet tonight.

Mr. Chairman, we all have hoped that wars would become a thing of the past. We still do. We all cherish the ways of peace. But the security of this nation must always be more important to loyal Americans than peace. We as veterans realize that nothing suffices as a military victory, and for that reason we must insist that in the future no American should ever be fielded upon foreign soil burdened with a "no win" policy. The whimpering, unrealistic rationalization of those who cry out for "peace at any price" is to us akin to treason. On the repeated record of human history it is the inevitable dogma of national destruction. It is the submissive philosophy of slavery. We in the Veterans of Foreign Wars cannot accept this shameful compromise with the realities of life. Most of us are here today because appeasement was the reigning philosophy thirty years ago. It is the greatest ally the dictators of the world have ever known. Today we hear it once again.

We are at war in Vietnam. Scaled down, Vietnamized, or ignored by those who choose to bury their heads in the sands of fantasy, this nation is at war. More than forty thousand Americans have died on the battlefield. Hundreds of thousands more have been wounded in actual combat. Disabled young men are returning from that war to every state in this great nation. One million veterans come back to us each year. And yet, there are times when it appears that only you, and we, and those young men and their families are aware of that unhappy fact. It is our continuing obligation to make certain that they receive prompt and efficient service in the processing of their claims for all of the benefits to which they are entitled as a result of their military service.

We in the Veterans of Foreign Wars are dedicated to that goal. We will close this year with the largest membership we have ever had. We will continue to grow, and presently are over 100,000 members ahead of last year. We know that this year we will exceed the largest membership that this organization has ever attained. We will continue our service to the American veteran.

Each of our more than two million men and women and their families keep our V.F.W. work apart from partisan politics. We know that the veterans program is traditionally bi-partisan. That is as it should be. But each of us was extremely disappointed that there was no mention of the American veteran in the "State of the Union Message" this year. There was no reference whatever to veterans programs, veterans rights, or veterans benefits. We hope that President Nixon will heed our earlier request for a special message to Congress setting forth Administration guidelines on veterans programs.

There are many urgent needs for liberalizing and improving existing programs for older veterans, and establishing new ones for those who are returning from Vietnam. We must remember that some of our comrades are returning with bad disabling injuries which deprive them of the ability to earn a first class living. At this point I would like to remind this committee that any man who has served his country and suffers a disabling disability is entitled to preferential citizenship.

Because of this there should be no budgetary or personnel restrictions on the Veterans Administration. It is unfortunate that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs has not seen fit to join in the public clamor to update the hospitals and to update other veterans programs. We are not unmindful of the negative testimony of the Administration before this Committee. It disturbs us greatly. We also recognize that this Committee has repeatedly approved legislation in spite of such testimony for which we thank you. It is our hope that this session of Congress will view this need with sympathy and understanding. It is our fervent hope that you will meet that need with specific legislation which will meet the problems of veterans in the "changing seventies." Even the best program in the world loses its value if it is permitted to remain static.

As you know, the legislative goals of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are established by the delegates at our annual National Conventions. At our most recent Convention, which was held in Philadelphia last August, more than 300 separate resolutions were approved. The great majority of these resolutions address themselves to veterans rights, benefits, and programs administered by the Veterans Administration. The activities of that important agency come under the watchful eye of this Committee. To us it is your most important responsibility. It is also one of the most important responsibilities of the American people—to "care for those who have borne the brunt of battle."

Each year our Legislative and Security Committees meet here in Washington to review our Convention resolutions for the purpose of recommending a Priority Legislative Program. This year our Committees recommended a nine-point program, which is a representative list of the majority of the problems which are of intense concern to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This list has been presented to each member of Congress.

With your permission, I would like to review some of these veterans problems and other developments which have taken place since October 1, 1969:

The V.F.W. is deeply disturbed over the funding and personnel shortages in VA hospitals. Undoubtedly this is the number one problem with respect to veterans programs today.

The quality of medical care has drastically changed during the last decade. The necessary number of personnel needs to be increased and the type of personnel required to do the job calls for much more training and professional ability.

During the past five years the Veterans Administration has been required to absorb a portion of the cost of four salary increases, and is being required to absorb part of another this fiscal year.

Inflation has taken its toll. Cost of equipment, medicines, drugs, and other necessary items essential to medical care have mounted steadily in recent years.

As a result, even though the VA budget has been increased to some extent each year, it has fallen far behind with respect to medical care being provided by most private and public hospitals. It is disturbing to the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the Administration has failed to recognize this even though it has been dramatically called to their attention.

Another development which the VA has not always kept up with are the so-called new services. I refer to intensive care units, cardiac care, alcoholic clinics, kidney units, and other similar services which are now a regular part of first class medical care in any hospital.

We were shocked to learn that many of these units, although constructed and ready to go, are not being operated due to lack of personnel. I am referring to the list of VA facilities which you, Mr. Chairman, placed in the Congressional Record of October 9, as they existed at that time.

Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the fact that in recent days the Budget Bureau approved a VA supplemental request for \$15 million with \$9.8 million allocated for the dental program, \$3 million for special medical units, \$1 million for home kidney dialysis units, \$1 million for extra drugs, and \$200 thousand for spinal cord injury units.

We are pleased by this development as we feel we played a significant role in making this become a reality. You may be assured the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will continue to battle for more funds.

Closely related to new services is the VA construction, modernization, and renovation program. This program, which was intended to be carried out over a 15-year period, has suffered deep cuts over the last four years. Now it has come under the Presidential freeze order, which has eliminated 75% of all new construction.

We are deeply disappointed that the Administration did not agree with the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Congress that the VA programs should be exempt from budgetary and personnel limitations. Despite the rising number of cases from the Vietnam War, and the resulting workload, the VA is expected to do its job with the same number of people that it had over three years ago. We are not unmindful that the proposed 1971 budget includes a nominal increase of approximately 2,000 employees. Administra-

tion spokesmen contend the VA received special consideration in this regard. The truth is that the Department of Agriculture will gain 2,300, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will gain 2,600, the Department of Transportation will gain 6,700, and the Treasury Department will gain 6,800. All of these agencies have a substantial lower employee ceiling than the VA, and therefore, their employee percentage increases are substantially higher. For instance, if the VA were allowed the same percentage increase as the Department of Transportation, the VA would be permitted 15,000 additional employees rather than 2,000. It looks like these other agencies are favored ones. Certainly, there is no proof of special generosity in the meager 2,000 total employee increase authorized for the Veterans Administration.

The Congress has authorized the benefits, and the V.F.W. wants the veteran coming home from Vietnam to receive the services and the care which Congress has authorized, and to which these veterans are entitled. We agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that these men that have borne their country's battle in Vietnam should not be required to return home and battle the inflation here in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned inflation. Inflation hits hardest those who are existing on a fixed income. This is especially true of a large group of disabled veterans and widows. The V.F.W. has noted with appreciation the prompt action of this Committee and the Congress in taking care of the more than 60,000 widows by your enactment of P.L. 91-96. We are encouraged by the fact that this Committee is also considering a cost-of-living increase for service connected disabled veterans. This is one of the legislative goals which has the highest priority and interest of our membership.

In the same category are veterans, widows, and dependent parents of veterans who are forced to exist on a very modest VA pension. Most of these persons will receive a 15% social Security increase next month. Because Social Security and other retirement income are counted in determining entitlement to a VA pension, and the size of the pension check, many of these people are worried that their VA pension payments will be drastically reduced, or even stopped.

We commend the Chairman and the members of this Committee who are co-sponsoring and supporting a bill which will carry out the V.F.W. position that none will lose his VA pension as the result of a Social Security increase.

The V.F.W. has been deeply involved in seeking an increase in the GI Bill education and training allowances. The Senate version of HR 11959 is in keeping with our mandates. We hope that the differences over the controversial provisions in that bill can be reconciled. We want an increase, not a veto. It is our contention that the reason why more Vietnam veterans are not participating in the GI Bill is the inadequate educational and training allowances.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars commends this Committee for the comprehensive study which is being made respecting the needs of VA hospitals to continue to provide first class care. We know that first class medical care cannot be provided on a second class budget.

There are other bills which this Committee is actively considering, or has already sent to the Senate for approval. All of this legislation carries out resolutions approved by the delegates to our National Conventions. Two National Conventions, for example, advocated that which is contained within HR 372, and is now before the Senate. This would remove the requirement for an annual report of income for a veteran or widow at age 72 or older.

The other would also be most welcome to our World War I comrades. It is the provision in HR 693, which would eliminate the requirement that a veteran, 72 or older, swear that he is unable to pay for his hospital expenses or domiciliary care for non-service connected disability. We call this the "pauper's oath". And we in the Veterans of Foreign Wars have long supported demands for the elimination of this demeaning requirement as the price of hospitalization or domiciliary care for American veterans. We believe that it should be eliminated regardless of the age of the veteran.

The shortage of housing is a national crisis. The V.F.W. is painfully aware that the veteran returning from Vietnam is unable to purchase a new or existing home because of the high cost of mortgage money and the shortage of funds for long term financing. For this reason, the V.F.W. strongly supports action by this Committee which would use up to \$5 billion in assets of the National Service Life Insurance Fund for investment in VA home loans as provided in HR 9476. Since the National Service Life Insurance Fund is a totally owned veterans fund, it would seem fair and logical that this money be invested to help veterans purchase a home and sharply increase the earnings of the trust fund, which will result in more dividends for veterans holding National Service Life Insurance policies.

The V.F.W. deeply appreciates the favorable consideration and advancement of other legislation by this Committee which will increase the time limit for community nursing home care by the VA from six to nine months, remove the prohibition against duplication of benefits which discriminates against those taking VA education and training courses, recognizing the service of a small group of veterans for entitlement to VA hospital and pension assistance, who served in the Mexican Border campaign just prior to World War I, and additional assistance to veterans who are suffering from serious health problems. This legislation is of intense interest to the V.F.W. membership and is receiving the vigorous support of our organization.

These are but a few of the most important areas of concern to the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Time does not permit me to discuss others. As I mentioned previously, we have approximately 300 mandates from our Philadelphia Convention. It will be greatly appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a Digest of these resolutions, together with a list of our Priority Legislative Goals for 1970, may be made a part of my remarks at the conclusion of my statement. I request that a press release, dated March 4, 1970, containing my statement respecting the failure of the Veterans Administration to use available hospital beds and my letter of January 26, 1970, to the President in which, among other things, it is requested that he transmit messages to the Congress respecting veterans programs, be included.

In summation, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is alarmed over the general attitude of this Administration toward our nation's veterans. This means the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is going to have to work harder than ever and that this Committee and the Congress are going to have to work harder than ever. If we don't do it, no one else will.

May I again express my sincere gratitude for this privilege of appearing before this distinguished Committee. Many of us will be visiting with you personally throughout the remainder of the day.

We hope that all of you will be able to attend our annual Congressional Banquet tonight at the Sheraton Park Hotel. All members of Congress are cordially invited to a

reception at 6:00 p.m., and to the dinner, which will begin promptly at 7:00 p.m.

Thank you.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars each year conducts an essay contest entitled the "Voice of Democracy." This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State will be brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the VFW.

I am very proud that this year's winner from Oklahoma is Roger T. Manus, of 4708 South Evanston Place, Tulsa—a resident of my congressional district. There is real food for thought in this young man's speech and there is real hope for the future of America with young citizens like this willing and able to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship in a free society.

I am honored to include Roger's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

It is the tense summer of 1776. Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams, all prominent men, are gathered in Philadelphia. Together, they ponder the wording of the Declaration of Independence from tyranny. But the covenant means more for these men. It is their declaration of courage, a declaration of the dignity of man and his free conscience.

The work itself may have been a cooperative venture, but the participation of each man was an act of individuality. Each man staked his life on the democratic search for truth.

It is now early 1970. Skyscrapers tower over Independence Hall where our forefathers labored. 200 million Americans prosper in the most powerful nation on earth. Still, the orderly search for truth, within a democratic framework, continues. But for the American citizen, this courage and individuality of thought and expression remains freedom's challenge.

How can this individuality exist? Through freedom.

Freedom of speech.
Freedom of the press.
Freedom of peaceable assembly.
Freedom of religion.
Freedom from arbitrary government, fear or want.

This freedom and the individuality of American character have cultivated a rich heritage of courage.

President Washington exhibited courage when he gave his unwavering support to the Jay treaty with England to save the newly United States from a war it could not hope to win. He was accused of being a traitor, a hypocrite, but he had a legal freedom to speak and an obligation to do so. The verbal abuse was scathing; nevertheless, our first President was vindicated by his conscience and by history.

In the same manner, historic acts and words have charted the course of America's greatness.

But the challenge we have assumed insists

that individuality not be confined to our leaders. Senator John F. Kennedy wrote in his book, Profiles in Courage:

"In a Democracy, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, 'holds office'; every one of us is in a position of responsibility, and in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends on how we fulfill those responsibilities."

The individuality of the common man is the basis of American culture.

Our forefathers knew that men are not perfect, but they had a deep faith in what the common man might become.

It is precisely because men cannot always be right that we have democracy.

The food of thought would spoil if not constantly digested by men of varying dispositions.

This demands a free flow of different ideas.

I don't advocate being radical so that no one will take you seriously.

Indeed, it is often necessary to be courageous in compromise.

As a consequence of urging compromise in the great debate of 1850, Daniel Webster earned a condemnation unequalled in political history.

In fact, this practice of compromising your policies to further your principles is upheld by America's courageous tradition of moderation.

The whole American system is designed to accommodate various ideas. Abraham Lincoln explained why: "There are few things", he said, "wholly evil, or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of government policy, is an inseparable compound of the two, so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continually demanded".

It has been nearly 200 years since Thomas Jefferson issued his declaration of courage, a challenge for men to free their consciences by exposing their ideas to the dangers of controversy and by protecting their ideas from the tyranny of apathy. To maintain our nation of courageous and independent thinkers is freedom's challenge.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

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. In 1967 the United States produced 2,966,000 metric tons of aluminum. This was three times more than produced by the second leading nation, the Soviet Union.

CONGRESS IS CONCERNED ABOUT FIGHTING CRIME

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the FBI's Uniform Crime Report showed that serious crime in the United States rose by 11 percent in 1969 over the previous year. This report highlights the failure of the Attorney General when appearing before the House Committee on the Judiciary last week to support the efforts of many in Congress to provide

the necessary funds to successfully prosecute the war on crime which President Nixon called for in his state of the Union message. Every sane and law-abiding American of both political parties wants to stem the rising tide of crime, but the testimony of the Attorney General has cast great doubt on the motives of this administration and its continued "law and order" posturing. The Nation is willing to pay what it costs to get results.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell made the amazing request for only half the funds which many in Congress want to provide for the fight against crime. He refused to support congressional initiatives for additional funds needed to fight mounting crime.

Not surprisingly, committee members of both parties reflected disappointment at the Attorney General's proposal for halfway measures in the urgent battle against increasing crime in the streets. The question is raised: Are the administration and Mr. Mitchell seriously interested in fighting crime, or in headlines and political expediency?

It requires only a short memory to recall the political capital Mr. Nixon, as a candidate, sought by repeatedly raising crime in the streets to a national issue in 1968. We recall his promise to curb crime with the appointment of a new Attorney General. The campaign promises were the stuff of headlines.

We also recall the posturing of a new Attorney General who sought the title of "Mr. Law and Order." Although he was reluctant to appear for testimony when requested, he found time to travel around the country to trumpet what he labeled as an administration program to fight crime, although most of the listed proposals were in bills already before Congress. Mr. Mitchell found it politically expedient to be super critical of Congress.

Last week's performance makes it understandable why Mr. Mitchell did not choose to appear previously to testify, for it is now fully revealed that he, nor the administration, has no program to combat the growing rate of crime. They refuse to fund fully and support the agency which can best do the job of Federal aid.

Further, with the tiger of crime prowling the streets and alleys of the Nation's cities, Mr. Mitchell came to Congress not to propound a positive program but to oppose efforts of concerned Congressmen to try to meet the needs of the frontline troops in the fight against the robbers, the muggers, the rapists, and the murderers.

Mr. Mitchell's contention that \$750 million or \$1 billion for the Law Enforcement Assistance Act is too much is an amazing position for the Cabinet officer responsible for law enforcement. Mr. Mitchell said that the agency can use only \$480 million; that more could not be properly used by States and cities.

Does he seriously believe that a northern city of 200,000 which received only \$188 in Federal funds for its police and courts in 1969 cannot effectively use 10 times that much? Does he seriously be-

lieve that a major midwestern city of almost 700,000 which will receive only \$350,000 in 1970 cannot use four or five times as much Federal assistance? Does Mr. Mitchell seriously believe that a major northeastern city of 2 million people and a police budget of \$70 million cannot use several fold the \$207,000 it received from LEAA in 1969?

Does he seriously believe that its share of \$1 billion cannot be fully utilized by the city of over 500,000 which last year received only \$21,000? I know of no single urban area which cannot effectively utilize a full share of Federal funds.

One would hope that Mr. Mitchell has learned well the lesson that his own chickens come home to roost, that all of his headline hunting pronouncements aside, he has learned the real battle against crime must be waged in the streets and alleys, where most crimes are committed. One would hope Mr. Mitchell has learned that the root causes of crime must be attacked. The Safe Streets Act, passed before Mr. Mitchell became Attorney General, remains this Nation's best legislative vehicle to provide needed Federal assistance to local law enforcement officials and local courts. Mr. Mitchell's opposition to providing minimum needs funds for this program is inconsistent with his public posturing against crime. The Attorney General muffed his chance to back his rhetoric with action. Congress, I am confident, will be more concerned about fighting crime than in any political rhetoric.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON ON THE SUBJECT OF THE HOUSE SENIORITY SYSTEM

(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, our colleague, MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON, delivered a speech on the state of the House and in particular how the seniority system affects what has and is taking place in this body. The statement is both scholarly and pragmatic in its analysis and observations.

I offer his statement at this time for the consideration of our colleagues since the Democratic Members of this House will be considering changes in the seniority system:

TEXT OF THE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CHAPTER, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Ladies and gentlemen: I appear to you tonight as a new Congressman. I have served five months. But if I address myself to some aspects of the question of congressional leadership, I hope you will recognize that I am abundantly free from the danger of being accused of damaging my vested interests, and free of course from the associations which a more senior member inevitably might develop.

In short, I come to you with the open eyes of a freshman, reinforced in my pre-congressional views by my new experience, and convinced that Congress today is not meeting the challenges of our times.

At a time when the public is uneasy and afraid as it attempts to cope with the difficulties of modern living, and at a time when there are great numbers of Americans uncertain if government can resolve the problems which now frustrate large segments of the population, the Congress of the United States has drifted further and further from a role of leadership.

Congress no longer fulfills its proper public role, nor commands the public respect that once characterized this legislative branch of the government.

It is time to look candidly at the institution and determine whether we are willing to make the commitment necessary to help it relate to modern America.

Today the House of Representatives is governed by a council of elders who wield and wield inordinate power, and, who by their prolonged control and opposition to reform, have deadened the creative and innovative potential of Congress.

It was not always so.

The House was designed to be that body of government most responsive to our national electorate, most sensitive to national changes of interest and direction.

The Founding Fathers, by providing for the election of all the Members of the House of Representatives every two years, sought to establish an institution which would remain closely attuned to the current aspirations and current concerns of the public.

In James Madison's words, it was essential that the House of Representatives should have an "immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with the people."

To the degree that Congress reflected this intention, the House of Representatives has historically been a significant force in the government of the Republic.

For over a century of our national life the House of Representatives played a full role in the delicate balance of government so wisely devised by the Constitution. Members of Congress were giants in the land, leaders of government and architects of national policy.

But the absolute reliance in recent years by the House of Representatives upon the seniority system has taken its toll of the vigor with which this body responds to the needs of modern society.

I speak of an almost total reliance upon a system which names committee chairmen on the basis of the number of years which they have served on their committee.

In 1960 President John F. Kennedy proclaimed that the torch of leadership had been passed to a new generation of Americans. The late President could not have been speaking of the House of Representatives. Here, to the contrary, leadership has been restricted to a senior generation of Americans. Congress selects men as committee chairmen who may or may not have leadership capacity, who may or may not reflect the current views of our country, who may or may not have the confidence of their committees. Congress selects men who have been there a long time; that is why they are committee chairmen. Yet they exercise control over our most fundamental powers, namely the initiation and consideration of legislation.

One hundred years ago committee chairmen had served an average of six years in the House. Today the average committee chairman has served 28 years.

One hundred years ago the average age of Representatives was 46; today the average age is 52. Not really so great a difference. But one hundred years ago the average age of a committee chairman was 49 and today he is almost 70.

Seventy years old is the average age of congressional leadership, while in private business the average age for retirement is 65. If

retirement rules were followed by the House of Representatives all but five of the present committee chairmen would be forced to retire.

Congress has itself passed rules requiring civil servants to step down at age 70. If Congress followed the rules it laid down for others, half the committee chairmen would have to retire.

Only Congress has institutionalized age and length of service.

In the Executive branch, the average age of cabinet members under President Nixon is 55. Under President Johnson, it was 50. And under President Kennedy it was 48. While in Congress, the average age of committee chairmen is 70.

What other institution requires that its members serve for 28 years before being elevated to positions of responsibility and direction?

Can we imagine either the Ford Motor Company, the University of California, or the United Auto Workers stipulating that its executives be on the payroll for 28 consecutive years before being eligible for a position of authority?

And 28 years is merely the average length of service among our chairmen. It took longer for some. One chairman—the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee—served 35 years before being named chairman of his committee three years ago. In other words he was 77 years old when he began his term as an executive in Congress.

The tradition of seniority is a far greater evil than merely one which assigns prominence to age. It also distorts congressional representation and control of our legislation. The rural and safe congressman becomes a commanding force. 88 per cent of all committee chairmen in the past two decades have come from virtually one-party districts. Inevitably the urban areas, where 80 per cent of the Nation's population lives, are misrepresented. And, it is the urban crisis which to a great extent is the crisis of our nation. When we talk about crime—it is crime in our cities. When we talk about pollution—it is the industries and automobiles in our cities to which we refer. When we talk about housing—it is in our cities where the critical need is.

Yet the Congress gives authority to rural districts.

While we observe the dictum of the Supreme Court in terms of one man-one vote districts, we nonetheless continue by indication to distort the meaning of equal representation as long as we assign rank to the congressman longest in office.

The power accruing to rural members means that 13 out of 21 committee chairmen in today's Congress come from rural areas. Two come from suburban areas. Only six come from the major population centers of the United States, our urban areas.

And of the 10 most important committees in the House of Representatives, only one is chaired by a member from an urban district. Eight of these ten powerful committee chairmen come from one section of the Nation, the South.

These are the men who decide what legislation will be considered, these are the men who conduct hearings on legislation, these are the men whose leadership describes the role and scope of the House of Representatives.

What this has meant for the nation as a whole is that Congress is less attuned to national needs than either the Supreme Court or Executive Branch of government. In terms of congressional action, military might has taken precedence over domestic needs; rural areas are favored over urban areas; regional interests are fostered to the detriment of the national interest; the needs of

the American black population have been ignored to the point of crisis; and the Nation's Capitol suffers under archaic rule which withholds that basic American right, the right to self-government.

Congress deliberates on a stage created for another time about matters relevant to yesterday's world.

It is without criticism of individual chairman that I list these facts. I do not and would not suggest that rural members with long years of service do not work hard and conscientiously. But it is in the natural order of things that a member with a rural background brings to bear less capacity and concern for urban problems than a member with an urban background.

And it is also in the natural order of things that representatives from safe districts are less responsive to the current problems facing the nation.

It does not seem surprising, therefore, that Congress has not been able to develop for the nation a rational and comprehensive federal policy for urban areas.

Nor does it seem surprising that there is no committee for Urban Affairs in the Congress and that 14 separate committees each deal with the splintered pieces of urban problems.

There is no lack of information testifying to the need for programs and policies to assist urban areas.

In 1967, the Senate Subcommittee on Government Reorganization held extensive hearings on the "Federal Role in Urban Affairs" which resulted in 20 volumes of information on the specific problems of the urban crisis and on what the Federal government must do to alleviate the crisis. Since 1967, four national commissions—the Eisenhower Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, the President's Committee on Urban Housing, the Kerner Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and the National Commission on Urban Problems—have issued massive reports dealing with specific aspects of the crisis.

Neither has there been a lack of specific recommendations for legislative action.

Following congressional hearings in 1967, 20 bills were introduced. But few even reached the floor of either chamber.

Similarly, one year after the Kerner report was issued, urban America and the Urban Coalition said:

"A year later, we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

Even in the vital field of housing, the numerous recommendations of the President's Committee on Urban Housing have been largely ignored.

Despite this availability of detailed and expert knowledge and of specific proposals, Congress has failed to respond to the urban crisis. This failure results from its own unwillingness to reorganize to handle urban matters and the under-representation of urban interests in Congress—as well, of course, from the overwhelming dimensions of the problem.

It does not seem surprising also that the Nation's Capitol, a class urban area, has been for 22 years under the control of a member who comes from a 100 per cent rural district. Without derogating the chairman of that committee, I submit that the consistent failure of the committee to approve home rule bills for the past two decades relates directly to a system which gives authority to members who cannot be and will never be responsive to the urban problems that fall within the scope of their committee.

The District of Columbia Committee has consistently failed to pass bills from its committee which had been previously passed by the Senate and which would provide a

modicum of self-government for our decaying Capitol.

It would appear that the Committee fears that the city, more than 50 per cent black, will fall into the hands of its citizens.

A history of the quest for District self-government from 1950 to 1960 sounds like the first few years of the New York Mets.

In 1949 hearings were held but no further action was taken on the Senate passed council-manager bill.

In 1951 the Committee failed to approve the Senate passed home rule bill.

In 1953 the Senate passed bill providing a non-voting delegation to the House was tabled by the committee.

In 1955 the Senate passed home-rule bill died in committee.

In 1958 the bill establishing D.C. territorial government was passed by the Senate but received no action by the D.C. Committee.

In 1959 the committee failed to report the Senate passed home-rule bill.

I need not remind you that home rule has still not come to Washington, a city of a million population.

The seniority system has developed of course some excellent chairmen; but it has also pushed many a misfit into a position of inordinate power.

When a former Senator from Kansas became chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the age of 81, it was said of him that he could hear no one and no one could hear him.

Carl Vinson, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, once remarked that if the present chairman, put any more military installations in his district, the district would sink from the pure weight.

Howard W. Smith, chairman of the Rules Committee from 1955 to 1966, certainly was not incapacitated physically. Though the Rules Committee is generally considered to be an administrative committee that has as its function the facilitation of the legislative process, Smith used his position to thwart the attempts of a majority of the Congress to pass civil rights legislation. He was known to disappear rather than call a meeting if the pressure was on him to pass along a bill he didn't like.

Let me detail the kind of obstructionist control which Chairman Smith was able to exercise and which exemplifies why Congress is following the Nation into the 1970's instead of leading it.

In one session alone, it is estimated that the Rules Committee failed to grant rules to 34 significant measures. In at least six instances, it voted to deny a rule or to table; in the remaining 28, it apparently took no action, leaving the measures still pending at adjournment.

Among the bills thus delayed were nine major bills dealing with education; six concerning labor; three dealing with migrant workers; two significant measures involving discrimination; a bill to set up an advisory council on the arts; and a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax.

One might retort that the leadership is for change; that the preceding Democratic President took great strides in domestic affairs and was supported by a Democratic Congress.

But the leaders of the Congress, the committee chairman who came to power through the seniority system, were often the strongest opponents the President faced in bringing about needed reform.

The Democratic Study Group did a study of 30 key votes which reflected the "National Democratic position" in the 90th Congress. The National Democratic position prevailed on only 13 of the votes. The Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen alone,

our leaders in the House, were responsible for half of the 17 defeats.

Of the 75 House Democrats who voted in opposition more often than in support of the national Democratic position, 42 were committee or subcommittee chairmen. These chairmen voted an average of 87 per cent in opposition to the Democratic programs and policies.

Most of these 42 chairmen were from the South. But, let it be noted, most of the votes were on issues other than civil rights.

And in the 89th Congress, 75 per cent of the 42 committee chairmen voted against such basic national Democratic programs as Medicare, aid to education, model cities, anti-poverty, rent supplement, and minimum wage increases.

This tendency of the congressional leaders of the party to obstruct party priorities has been steadily increasing over the past 16 years.

This week at the meeting of the Democratic Caucus, a resolution will be offered by members of the Democratic Study Group, a coalition of House liberals, which would create a committee to report in April the ways in which Democrats might select effective committee chairmen. I intend to vote for that resolution.

But we have to go further. The crisis in Congress must be met to enable us to confront the crisis in the nation. Ten million Americans are chronically malnourished; 30 million Americans live at the poverty line; the Mississippi River, by the time it reaches St. Louis, is so dirty that a fish placed in water concentrated 10 times dies in 60 seconds. One-third of all Americans over 65 are poor.

Therefore we cannot be surprised when some of our citizens charge Congress with criminal neglect of the welfare of the nation.

The House of Representatives is on trial. Time is short and our only defense will be our ability to reform an institution which has been for too long irrelevant.

Thank you.

COPING WITH DISRUPTIVE TRIAL DEFENDANTS

(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, all of us, and particularly those of us who have practiced law, must be concerned about the attempts on the part of defendants in the State and Federal courts to disrupt trial proceedings. We have seen that disruptive activity take place in Chicago and in New York City. The question is how should one deal with that vexatious problem. The actions of Judge Julius Hoffman in Chicago, in my judgment, set back the cause of justice. The actions of Justice John M. Murtagh of New York City were more reasoned and temperate but still did not adequately cope with this problem.

Prior to my election to Congress, I was a member of a law firm in the city of New York. Upon taking office, I terminated the private practice of law. One of my distinguished former partners was Allen G. Schwartz, who recently authored an article in which he discussed the actions of Justice John M. Murtagh and proposed how to better deal with these court disturbances. I am setting forth that article which appeared in the

Village Voice of March 5, 1970, with the thought that it would be of interest to all of our colleagues.

The article follows:

THE PRESS OF FREEDOM: THE JUDGE AND THE PANTHERS: A FORMULA FOR INJUSTICE

(By Allen G. Schwartz)

On the Washington's Birthday weekend, a bomb exploded at the home of Supreme Court Justice John M. Murtagh, trial judge in the case of the 13 Black Panthers. On the same weekend the judge apparently solved the problem that had been plaguing him, and upon the resumption of pre-trial proceedings on Tuesday two events occurred. The Panthers and their attorneys offered their sympathy to the judge and their regrets over the bombing, and the judge announced that he had finally devised "a formula for firmly maintaining the dignity of the court without in any way sacrificing the rights of the accused" but that he intended to delay invoking the formula "for a week or two."

Notwithstanding, the following day, while a police officer testified and the defendants raged in clear contempt of court, Justice Murtagh directed that the defendants be removed from the courtroom and returned to prison where they have been since April, 1969, and he invoked the formula which he promised would be as effective as it was simple: an indefinite recess of the hearings. "That, in essence, is the formula," he stated, adding that the proceedings will be resumed only after a motion to resume had been made by the attorney for the defendants and only if the motion is supported by an unequivocal assurance and a statement "signed by each and every one of the defendants" that "each defendant will give complete respect to the Court during the continuance of the hearing and the continuance of the trial to follow, and an assurance that the defendants are now prepared to participate in a trial conducted under the American system of criminal justice."

The formula, the judge had promised, would firmly maintain "the dignity of the court without in any way sacrificing the rights of the accused." The court referred to the right to a speedy trial, but the Panthers were held in prison for 10 months waiting trial. They are accused of conspiring to bomb public places, possession of illegal weapons, attempted murder, and attempted arson. To them, the only right of consequence is the presumption of innocence. But the formula conflicts. The formula requires that the defendant be in prison during the pendency of the proceedings—and who puts people presumed to be innocent in prison? The formula, by implication, depends for its success upon the defendant's having virtually no chance of raising bail and freeing himself during the indefinite recess. Thirteen Panthers, each held in \$100,000 bail, are not likely to raise \$1,300,000. And if they did, is there any assurance that they would be freed? In a non-Panther bombing case in the federal court recently, when someone came forward willing to post a defendant's high bail, the judge increased the amount of the bail. To the Panthers, the formula can only be applied to them, or others similarly situated—those who cannot raise the bail.

The Panthers' contention has been from the beginning that this case is being handled in an unusual way; in a way that indicates to them that they are not going to get a fair trial and that extraordinary measures have been taken and will continue to be taken by the authorities. Is that belief just another piece of Panther paranoia? Before the proceedings ever began, the attorneys for the Panthers requested that Justice Murtagh,

who they charged was hand-picked by the District Attorney, disqualify himself. Murtagh refused and the Panthers appealed to the Appellate Division, arguing that Murtagh was (1) hand-picked and (2) prejudiced. The Appellate Division rejected the appeal.

Was Murtagh hand-picked by the District Attorney? The answer is clearly that he was. The Appellate Division knew, as every lawyer in the city knows, that in every case the D.A.'s office in New York County selects the judge before whom a case will be moved for trial. The defendant has no say whatever. The selection resides solely with the assistant district attorney who has the case for trial. In the Panther case the assistant is Joseph Phillips who, as it happens, was the assistant district attorney who prosecuted William Epton in 1965 for incitement to riot and anarchy. Phillips takes a hard line in political cases, but then Phillips' view in this regard is the view of a substantial segment of society. The question is: should Phillips be the one to select the judge?

Or more pointedly: is the judge prejudiced? Before the proceedings began, who knew? The Panthers say they knew, and that the proceedings to date bear them out. But disinterested observers, including attorneys with little affection for the judge, will tell you just the opposite: that he has done masterfully, that the extent to which he has been provoked is unprecedented and yet the judge has not lost his patience or his cool and has persistently confirmed his intent to grant the Panthers a full and fair hearing.

On the other side of the coin, besides the fact that the judge was hand-picked by the District Attorney and hand-picked by a particular assistant district attorney, add the fact that the judge has a well-established reputation for maintaining strict control of his courtroom, being uncommonly severe on sentencing, and has had a close working relationship with the D.A.'s office, developed over a span of years while he was presiding judge of the Criminal Court and chief magistrate.

Is it relevant that the judge is white? If you think not, you're probably white. Is it relevant that the judge is a devout Catholic, Irish, a reserve colonel, Jesuit trained? But what do the Panthers think? Their windmill is a monolithic white conspiracy and here they are on trial before a white Irish Catholic judge selected by a white Irish Catholic assistant D.A. to hear the testimony of white police officers from a police department historically controlled and disproportionately populated by white Irish Catholics. And if we're concerned with avoiding contempt in the courtroom, isn't it critical what the Panthers think?

On the day Justice Murtagh announced his formula, he stated that he "and the District Attorney" stood ready to "grant the defendants a fair trial to which they are entitled, but which they continue to reject." A simple enough statement, except for this element: the judge represented that he was speaking not only for himself but for the District Attorney as well. Perhaps that is an unduly sensitive interpretation of the judge's remarks, but it is common knowledge in the criminal courts that not only do assistant district attorneys select the judges, but they discuss the cases with the judges outside the presence of defendants and their counsel regularly and without restraint. Hence, when a judge purports to speak for the District Attorney it is not unfair, because of the widespread practice, to assume that the judge may have discussed the matter privately with the prosecution. What is more frightening, if true, is the statement in the New York Times that the judge in invoking his formula may "have cleared his action in advance with the Appellate Division, if not with still higher-ranking judicial officials."

Whether cleared with higher authority or not, the formula received wide and immediate acceptance. The New York Post, the following day, reported that such as Bernard Botwin, former presiding justice of the Appellate Division, Edward Bennett Williams, the well-known Washington criminal lawyer, Herbert Wechsler, Columbia Law School professor and leading legal scholar, and an unnamed nationally recognized authority on constitutional law who teaches at Harvard all agreed that the Panthers' right to a speedy trial was in no way abridged by the formula and that the right to a "speedy trial" means a speedy and orderly trial. None suggested that the formula depends for its success upon the indigence of the defendants or that the Panthers ought to have an equal say in the selection of the trial judge or that a political trial demands that an effort be made to persuade the defendants of the court's integrity and impartiality.

All of which is not to suggest that the Panthers wouldn't behave in exactly the same way regardless of the court's posture or integrity; only that the formula is unconstitutional and tailor-made for the Panther fantasy. But if not the formula, what then? Judge Hoffman's massive contempt citations including separate sentences for being disrespectful to the prosecution or for accusing the court of being wrong when it wasn't or for embracing Reverend Abernathy in front of the jury are not likely to be sustained on appeal or to enhance the stature of the court. Neither is binding and gagging the defendants, although that practice has gone on for years.

The formula beats glass booths, plastic walls, closed-circuit television to jail cells, chains, gags, and handcuffs, it has been argued. And it doesn't discriminate against the poor and the black either. After all, a defendant who could raise bail and who wasn't already in prison would surely be immediately incarcerated for contempt anyway and keeping the Panthers in prison is not really any different. Except for the fact that this is a political trial and that what the court does in this trial will touch a great many more people than the defendants.

And the fact that this is a political trial accentuates the essential defect in Murtagh's formula. The Panthers are not likely to give the court any such signed statement. And if the Panthers do not, what then? Will the courts allow the Panthers to remain in prison indefinitely or for their lifetimes? Could the Panthers have constructed a better situation to make their point? The white establishment is only too willing to put the black man aside, out of sight and out of mind, and if the black man won't cooperate, then do as we've always done, — him.

HE HAD A JOB TO DO—CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER GARY WETZEL

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, periodically one comes upon an essay or a story that he wishes he had written himself because it so eloquently expresses what one feels inside.

Such is the case regarding "He Had A Job To Do," an essay by Mr. Donald E. Turek, executive director of the Milwaukee County War Memorial Center. It is about a young constituent of mine, Mr. Gary Wetzel, who lives in South Milwaukee, Wis. Gary served his coun-

try well in Vietnam. Because he carried out his duties so well, Gary was awarded our Nation's highest tribute for bravery—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute not only to Gary Wetzel but to Mr. Turek as well. The essay "He Had A Job To Do" received the highest award in its category in a contest sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

I recommend this essay to the reading of my colleagues. I know they will join me in sincere congratulations to two fine Americans.

The essay follows:

HE HAD A JOB TO DO

(By Donald E. Turek)

A young man, twenty-one years old, saluted the American flag, and I cried. Standing before five thousand proud Americans, I cried.

At that moment I knew there was no generation gap.

The occasion was "Salute to the Armed Forces Night," part of our community observance of Summerfest. It was the serious moment of a fun week. As honorary chairman, I was to lead the young man across a baseball diamond while bands from the five branches of military service in mass formation played "America, the Beautiful."

We stood at third base. I told him we would walk directly to the pitcher's mound where he would be introduced.

He said he was sorry but he couldn't do that because there were five American flags in formation and he must salute each of them.

I hadn't noticed.

But this young man had.

He pointed with the hook that replaces the arm he left in Vietnam. The arm he left before pulling four fellow soldiers from a helicopter under heavy enemy fire.

He met his crisis—his moment of decision—and his nation thanked him with its highest award for bravery—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He marched briefly to each of five American flags—came smartly to attention, and proudly saluted.

I cried.

I knew at that moment I was of another generation. I also knew at that moment there was no gap between our generations.

We proceeded to the pitcher's mound. His citation for bravery was read. The massed bands played the "Star Spangled Banner."

Five thousand people standing at attention, applauded in an unusual manner. It was a proud grateful sound—like they too realized there was no generation gap.

Once I almost drowned. The suspension of time seemed the same. Many thoughts can race across the blackboard of the mind in a very short space of time.

First came a thank you to God and a prayer in gratitude for birth in America.

Then a thought of the persons in our community that should be exposed to this emotionally moving moment.

They would be those who repeatedly shout out evidence of their negative frame of mind.

Those who would call the young hero at my side a naive cog in the establishment.

Those who would say he is a victim of capitalist imperialism.

Those who shout peace and freedom, but prefer to promote a negative attitude that does not allow for heroism.

Those who would consider George Washington a victim of the establishment for coming from an aristocratic way of life to lead his men through ice and mud to prove he personally understood, honored, main-

tained, and wanted to pass on to future generations the American way of life.

Those who have no appreciation for a president who died in a pool of blood, with a bullet in his brain, doing what he could for his country.

As I stood next this young hero, these were the emotionally charged thoughts on my mind.

I realized that this young man, with a high school education, presently holding a job that we call working with his hands—excuse me, his hand—he knew that a moral fibre in most Americans keeps this country great and good.

I realized at that moment it is a continuing, but rewarding, struggle to make certain each succeeding generation develops the necessary respect for the American way of life that allows for heroism.

The young man standing next to me had only one statement regarding his heroism in Vietnam—"I had a job to do, and I did it. I'm glad to be home."

That is all we want from any American. But that is what we want from every American.

To those who can burn an American flag and call it a piece of silk, hiding behind the word freedom—I join my heroic friend and pity you.

To those who can attend our great colleges and universities and desecrate them by your obnoxious presence—I join my heroic friend and pity you.

To those who refuse to serve their nation, because in their immature minds they feel a war is unjust—I join my heroic friend and pity you.

Kindness is putting a little of one's self into the lives of others. With my young heroic friend, I ask you negatives to become positive.

The suspension of time ended.

The National Anthem concluded—tears were in the eyes of two generations. I seized the hand of my young friend and said, "God bless you—your flag—and your country."

I knew at that moment the inner emotional feeling is Americanism.

I cried only once that night, although tears were in my eyes once more. But words did not come from my lips.

As I drove this young hero home with his bride of two weeks we passed through the downtown area.

Slovenly strolling along the sidewalk we saw several hundred young people with their negative hate signs. They were shouting "Hell No, We Won't Go."

People on the sidewalk fearfully stepped to the street.

I looked at my young friend. No visible reaction.

But I remembered—he had a job to do and he did it.

Best you and I find a job to do for this country and do it!

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW GERMAN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Waldman, professor of political science at the University of Calgary and recognized German scholar, expressed in a recent article his analysis of the new "Eastern" policy of the West German Government.

His penetrating appraisal of the international implications of this policy

originally appeared as a four-part series in the *Albertan*.

In order to share with my colleagues Dr. Waldman's views I am pleased to place his article in its entirety in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at this point.

The article follows:

GERMANY TODAY—INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW GERMAN GOVERNMENT
(By Eric Waldman)

In October 1969 a new German coalition government came into power. This new government was formed by the Social Democrat Party (SPD) and the Free Democratic Party (FDP). The elections on September 28 which preceded the formation of the new government still returned the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) as the strongest party, however, the combined strength of SPD and FDP has a slight majority in the German lower house (*Bundestag*). The Christian Democrats find themselves for the first time in the role of the opposition since the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1949.

In the present coalition government, the SPD occupies by far the senior position, having 224 seats in the *Bundestag* as compared to the 30 seats of the FDP. (The Christian Democrats hold 242 seats). The Social Democrats assumed government control as a result of a well-thought-out strategy. It is generally believed that Herbert Wehner, one of the party's top leaders, was primarily responsible for the policy which brought his party into power after a long and strenuous period in perennial opposition (1949 to 1966). From December 1966 until 1969, the SPD participated with the Christian Democrats in the Grand Coalition after a previous coalition government, comprised of CDU/CSU and FDP had fallen apart. The two years of the Grand Coalition was Wehner's "policy of embracement" of the Christian Democrats. SPD party leader Willy Brandt became Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Several other Social Democrats served as ministers in the government. One of the main purposes for the participation of the SPD in this coalition was to change its image from an opposition party to a responsible governing party.

The SPD, however, would never have been able to form the government in 1969 if the Free Democrats would not have dramatically changed their basic political orientation and de facto moved from the political right to a position on the left of the political spectrum. The election of a Social Democrat as Federal President in March of 1969 with the assistance of the FDP vote was probably the dress rehearsal for the later coalition agreement between the two parties. The change of the FDP's political orientation has caused the party a considerable loss of votes. The percentage of the votes for the FDP went down from 9.5 per cent in 1965 to 5.8 per cent in 1969. Correspondingly the number of seats changed from 49 to 30. The conservative voters moved in increasing numbers to the Christian Democrats.

As could have been expected, the new government quickly embarked on domestic and foreign policies which in many respects mark the beginning of a new era for the Federal Republic. Our discussion will not include the contemplated internal changes which for better or worse reflect the left-liberal attitudes of the coalition partners. They will include long overdue re-evaluation of the educational and certain aspects of the judicial systems, but also will foster so-called progressive and controversial concepts such as a further enlargement of employers' or rather trade unions' codetermination in the affairs of economic enterprises and a further watering-down of laws protecting society from the effects of left-wing political radicalism. Our purpose is to analyze and to eval-

uate to what extent the policies and attitudes represented by the new policy-makers will in all probability bring about changes in West Germany's relationship with her allies and her Eastern neighbours, in particular with the German Democratic Republic.

Even though the new government has been only a little over 100 days in existence, enough indications seem to be available to arrive at some tentative conclusions. The first and perhaps the most important one, in the opinion of this observer, is that Bonn's Western allies are not fully aware of the possible developments which Chancellor Brandt's "new Eastern orientation" entails because they still see in him the courageous mayor of West Berlin who symbolized that city's stubborn resistance to Communist pressure. Furthermore, they do not realize to what extent other personalities belonging to the coalition parties such as Herbert Wehner, presently the leader of the SPD parliamentary group, or Professor Carlo Schmid, a Vice-President of the *Bundestag*, exercise a considerable influence in the formulation of foreign policy and on its implementation. In addition, it is also possible to recognize a left, in part left-wing socialist, political climate surrounding the new coalition government. Influential publicists and several news media not only lend full support to the government's overtures to the East, but also encourage the making of more concessions to Soviet demands. In this type of political atmosphere it is understandable that anybody who advocates a more cautious policy towards the East, is immediately denounced as a "cold warrior." It also might explain the governmental attitude to go ahead with the new policies in spite of the very narrow margin their parties have in the *Bundestag*.

Before attempting to evaluate the international implications of the foreign policy orientation of the present West German government, this writer believes that it is necessary to point out that any evaluation of these policies must be undertaken in conjunction with an understanding of Soviet long- and short-range foreign policy objectives with regard to Europe and Germany, and their methods of implementation. It is precisely at this point that the opinions of political analysts have a tendency to move in different directions. It appears therefore advisable to present briefly the views held by this writer concerning the nature of the Soviet challenge.

In this author's judgment there are at least four major elements related to Soviet foreign policy objectives which must be taken into account:

(1) Soviet long-range foreign policy objectives have remained unchanged and aim at Soviet hegemony over Europe as a vital transitory development for the establishment of a "world under communism" led and controlled by Moscow. The most recent confirmation of the continuing adherence to these objectives by the Communist leadership, as an integral part of their acceptance of Marxist determinism of historic developments, can be found in the "Tasks at the present stage of the struggle against imperialism and united action of Communist and workers' parties and all anti-imperialist forces" adopted by the international meeting of Communist and workers' parties in Moscow, on June 17, 1969 and in the 21 Theses published by *Pravda* on December 23, 1969 under the title "Our General Perspective—the Build-up of Communism," intended to introduce the "Lenin year," celebrating the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth.

(2) The Soviet leadership, irrespective of the changes which have taken place and in all probability will also occur in the future, recognizes the fact that the key to the control of Europe is the control of Germany. This in turn implies the notion of a unified Germany under Communist auspices.

(3) In order to establish control over Ger-

many it is essential either to break-up the NATO alliance or to weaken it to an extent that it has no meaningful deterrent effective upon Soviet actions. For years the Soviet Union has attempted to reach these objectives by trying to create disunity among the Western allies, especially by driving a wedge between the allies and the Federal Republic of Germany, and by endeavouring to substantially reduce the American influence and presence in Europe with the ultimate goal of the complete expulsion of the "non-Europeans."

(4) The existence of these long-range objectives does not prevent Moscow from pursuing short-range goals in Europe and elsewhere which under superficial examination might even appear to be contradictory to the Soviet Union's final aim. The implementation of these objectives primarily serve two purposes: the consolidation of the Soviet power within its own orbit and the improvement of the operational basis for further expansion of control. Under this heading come such efforts as:

(a) The Soviet determination to maintain complete ideological control over the "socialist countries" in order to safeguard their own political and economic systems. "Revisionist" and decentralizing tendencies have been suppressed long before the so-called "Brezhnev Doctrine" was presented as the official "brotherly" policy of the Soviet Union in relation to other "socialist countries."

(b) The "finalization" of the division of Europe and Germany. This situation is to be achieved through the recognition of the German Democratic Republic under international law, the provisions of a multilateral security treaty accepting the European status quo or the so-called "present realities," and the recognition of the "independent political status" of West Berlin. Closer examination of these objectives reveals that the alleged "finalization" is, as far as the Soviet leaders are concerned, only a transitory arrangement, to be used, for example to subvert the domestic conditions in the Federal Republic and to remove step by step U.S. influence and American protection from Western Europe.

(c) The interrelation of "peace in Europe" and other Soviet activities. The temporary consolidation of the European situation also is supposed to strengthen the Soviet position in the Soviet-Sino conflict and in other theatres of Soviet operations, e.g. in the Middle East and in the developing world.

Provided that this evaluation of Soviet strategy is accurate, and this is, of course, the view of this observer, then there are at least three major consequences to be drawn by all of the Western nations, including, of course, the Federal Republic of Germany:

(1) The continuation of the containment policy in Europe, i.e. the prevention of further Soviet expansion towards the West.

(2) The preservation of the means to implement the containment policy, i.e. the continuation of the Western defense alliance as an effective deterrent both within the fields of conventional forces and nuclear protective power.

(3) The maintenance or even improvement of Western unity of purpose in political, economic, and military matters.

It should also be kept in mind that in spite of this evaluation of the over-all situation, there still remains the possibility and even usefulness of negotiations with the governments of the Soviet Union and the other countries ruled by Communists. Agreements on specific matters of mutual interest have been concluded and can also be reached in the future. The subjects susceptible to negotiation and the scope of maneuverability are limited but are nevertheless of significance, as illustrated for example by the limited nuclear test-ban treaty or the many foreign trade agreements. In spite of recent

optimistic views expressed by leading statesmen in the West, and the Canadian Minister of External Affairs also belongs to the group of optimists, effective arrangements intended to halt the nuclear arms' race have a far lesser chance of success than, for example, arrangements dealing with more or less non-political or non-military matters.

From the many possible topics of contemporary German foreign policy perhaps the following three areas might exert the greatest impact upon the future relations of the Federal Republic with her allies and the countries of the European East:

- (1) The "new Eastern policies" aimed at improving relations with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Soviet bloc.
- (2) The West German policies with regard to the German Democratic Republic.
- (3) The German attitude toward the Soviet sponsored European Security Conference.

GERMAN-SOVIET RELATIONS

German-Soviet relations prior to October 1969, the time when the new left-liberal government was formed in Bonn, showed all the signs that at least in this sector of Europe the Cold War was still flourishing. Soviet propaganda continuously accused the West German government of pursuing a "revanchistic" foreign policy with the aim of regaining the territories in the East lost after the defeat of Hitler. The Federal Government also was denounced for supporting the emergence of militarism and Neo-Nazism, for providing an operational basis for American imperialism, and for participating in the "aggressive" and "imperialistic" North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The "German danger" was one of the means employed by Moscow to maintain cohesion within the Soviet orbit. Even after the government of the Grand Coalition renewed the attempts to improve West Germany's economic and political relations with East European countries, the Soviet Union insisted that this was done merely for the purpose of undermining the Soviet influence in Eastern Europe. The occasional exchanges of notes between Moscow and Bonn ended in deadlocks because it was impossible for Bonn to accept the demands made by the Soviets without eventually accepting Moscow's hegemony. The Soviet leaders realized that as long as the Christian Democrats controlled government policies, unilateral concessions could not be secured through negotiations.

The German offer to the Soviet Union to conclude agreements on the reciprocal renunciation of the use or threat of force remained as unsuccessful as the approaches made to Poland or the German Democratic Republic.¹

Moscow's hope for a decisive change in the composition of the German government was fulfilled. It could be noted that during the German election campaign the Soviet Union was careful not to create tensions with the Federal Republic in order to facilitate a Social Democratic victory. In the past, Soviet intransigence was of substantial aid to the Christian Democrats' "hard" position in their foreign policy election platform.

Of course the Soviet leaders could hardly expect that a government dominated by Social Democrats would be pro-Communist in outlook. However, as seen from the Soviet point of view, there were a number of factors which would greatly benefit the Soviet Union. The new government's inexperience in dealing with the Soviets, its greater willingness to accept the so-called "post-war realities" and its anxiety to get into the Western spirit of negotiation rather than confrontation are among them. Left-wing intellectuals, publicists, and union leaders

could also be of significant influence upon the new government and assist in providing a better opportunity and political climate for the implementation of some of the short-range Soviet foreign policy objectives in Germany and Europe.

Prior to the elections in September 1969, a number of SD and FDP leaders were invited to visit Moscow. It so happened that almost half of the new Cabinet enjoyed this Soviet hospitality while the Christian Democrats waited in vain for a similar invitation.

Chancellor Brandt in his Government Declaration of October 28, 1969 announced the basic changes of his government's *Ostpolitik* and policies toward the German Democratic Republic. He suggested again a treaty to Moscow renouncing the use or the threat of force as a beginning for discussions of other issues of concern to both countries. It also became quite apparent that the new government was ready to make certain "advance concessions" which the previous German chancellors were not willing to do. One of the "advance concessions" was the acceptance of the permanency of the division of Germany which Chancellor Brandt had made with his formulation of the "existence of two states in Germany." He also made it quite clear on several occasions that he no longer believed in the feasibility of German re-unification. The Soviets were further pleased when the Brandt government signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty which the Christian Democrats intended to oppose as long as the Soviet Union insisted on her right to intervene in the domestic affairs of the Federal Republic on the basis of Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter of the United Nations.

German-Soviet discussions actually commenced in Moscow in December 1969. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko met at least on three occasions with the ambassador of the Federal Republic. These discussions apparently did not indicate if the Soviets had changed some of their well-known basic positions which included the demands of Bonn's recognition of the Oder-Neisse border, the recognition under international law of the German Democratic Republic, the acceptance of the status of West Berlin as an "independent political entity," and the Soviet right to intervene in the domestic affairs of the Federal Republic if Bonn should fail to take "effective measures" for the prevention of the rise of German militarism and Nazism. In order to clarify the basis for the continuation of the German-Soviet talks, Chancellor Brandt sent his long-time associate and confidant Secretary of State Egon Bahr to Moscow. Bahr's attitude toward the East is well known. He has demonstrated in the past his willingness to explain Soviet demands as legitimate security interests. According to Bahr, Bonn's relationship to the German Democratic Republic was to be the upshot of reciprocal "changes through convergence." If one realizes the rigid orthodoxy of the Communist regime, Bahr's "convergence" theory could only mean a course to the left for the Federal Republic, incidentally also one of Ulbricht's pre-requisites for German re-unification. It is also known that Egon Bahr had maintained secret contacts with the Soviet in East Berlin. It is for these reasons that many Germans are concerned about the negotiations conducted in Moscow. According to Egon Bahr, the saboteurs of the West German efforts in reaching agreements with the Soviet Union belong to the East German Socialist Unity Party and to the Christian Democrats of the Federal Republic.

Moscow has nothing to lose. Even if the negotiations with Bonn do not lead to concrete agreements, Bonn's "Advance concessions" constitute in any case a marked success.

The new left-liberal government has also recently started direct negotiations with Warsaw. It is generally anticipated that these

talks will extend over a very long period of time and probably will place Bonn in serious difficulties, since Poland also demands "advance concessions" such as the recognition of the Oder-Neisse border and the recognition of the German Democratic Republic under international law.

If the government in Bonn believes that certain existing differences of interest among the Warsaw Pact nations can be exploited, it will soon find out that the Soviet leaders have successfully coordinated the countries of the Soviet bloc and assigned them specific roles in their negotiations with the Federal Republic. Not even the generous West German loans, approved by the Cabinet in December 1969 as proposed by Minister of Economy Schiller, and designed to assist the states ruled by Communists in solving their economic problems, will change their insistence that the Federal Republic has to meet their basic political demands. (Rumania and Poland each received loans of about 125 million dollars. An even larger amount has been made available to the Soviet Union for acquiring steel pipes from the Federal Republic for the expansion of her natural gas pipe line system).

WEST GERMAN RELATIONS WITH THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Possibly the most dramatic illustration of the new German government's foreign policy outlook is the *de facto* recognition of the German Democratic Republic. It is, as mentioned before, one of the important "advance concessions" which the left-liberal government has made since coming to power. Chancellor Brandt's formulation of "the existence of two states in Germany" in his Government Declaration of October 28, 1969 and his invitation to the Ulbricht regime to commence "negotiations at Government level without discrimination on either side, which should lead to contractually agreed cooperation" leaves hardly any doubt that a kind of recognition has taken place.

Only one position held also by past West German administrations was retained. Chancellor Brandt declared: "International recognition of the German Democratic Republic is out of the question." There is considerable doubt in the mind of this observer if this refusal of a *de jure* recognition can and be maintained. Ulbricht's determination to enter into negotiations with Bonn only after receiving recognition under international law for his state, a demand for which he has received full support from the Soviet Union and from the other Soviet bloc countries, as well as various statements made by leading SPD and FDP officials, seem to indicate that Bonn might also give in in this issue.

This decisive change of the official West German attitude toward the German Democratic Republic allegedly serves a twofold purpose. In the first place, it is an attempt to facilitate the process of relaxation of tensions by recognizing the so-called "realities" as demanded by Moscow. Secondly it is an effort to find a *modus vivendi* for the two German states in the hope that this also will improve the political environment for the 17 million Germans living in East Germany. To what extent this notion is based upon realities as seen by the West or upon illusions, only the future will tell.

The following is a brief account of the events which have transpired since Chancellor Brandt's declaration on October 28, 1969. The Soviet leaders recognized the improved possibilities to implement their European objectives as a result of the "realistic" attitude of the new government in Bonn. The Moscow Conference of the Warsaw Pact leaders which took place on December 3 and 4, 1969, opened the way for the member states to negotiate with the Federal Republic on a bilateral basis. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko actually began discussions with the German ambassador in Moscow about the

¹ Former Chancellor Kiesinger's Declaration of the Grand Coalition on December 13, 1966.

"possibility" of commencing negotiations concerning an agreement on the renunciation of the use of the threat of force. Ulbricht's alleged demand that these bilateral negotiations should be preceded by Bonn's recognition of the German Democratic Republic under international law was rejected only in procedure and not in substance. It was decided that negotiations might well start prior to the recognition of the GDR, but recognition would have to be given before any other agreement could be signed.

On December 13, 1969 on the occasion of the 12th meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party (SED), Ulbricht also officially noticed the changed situation. He gave Chancellor Brandt credit for his positive attitude toward the Moscow sponsored European Security Conference and for his reference to the existence of two German states. On the other hand, he strongly attacked the participation of the Federal Republic on the "global strategy of the United States" and charged Bonn with pursuing "a dangerous revanchistic course."²

On December 21, 1969, the SED Party organ *Neues Deutschland* published the text of a letter and of a draft treaty which Ulbricht had sent on December 18 to the President of the Federal Republic, Mr. Gustav Heinemann. This move was immediately interpreted in some of the newspapers in the West, that East Germany wishes to normalize her relations with Bonn and would like to commence talks to this effect. A closer examination of the draft treaty however indicates that East Berlin had rather increased its demands as a price for the establishment of formal relations with the Federal Republic. These demands included the recognition under international law, the exchange of ambassadors, and the recognition of the border between East and West Germany as a state border. The draft treaty also calls on Bonn to expunge all laws "discriminating" against East Germany, to recognize West Berlin as "an independent political entity" with no ties to West Germany, to renounce any participation in the employment of nuclear weapons, and to prohibit the stationing of nuclear weapons on German soil. In other words, the Federal Republic would have to renounce the Paris treaties, the very basis of her security. It requires indeed a great deal of optimism to see in these proposals any indication of Ulbricht's willingness to arrive at some reasonable agreement with Bonn.

Chancellor Brandt's reply to Ulbricht's "offer" which some members of the governing parties found interesting and readily interpreted as a sign that East Berlin did not close the door to negotiations, came in his "Report on the State of the Nation" on January 14, 1970. He repeated his position that the relations of the two states in Germany must not be the relations between two foreign states, i.e. no recognition under international law is possible, and that both sides must obligate themselves to respect the social structure on the territory of the other state and not attempt to change it by force.

At a press conference held on January 19, 1970, attended by over 400 journalists from all parts of the world, Ulbricht not only repeated that the demand made in his draft treaty are prerequisites and must be accepted before talks with Bonn could even be started, but he also rejected the entire Brandt-formula of the continuation of the "German nation" in the form of two equal states. He accused the "ruling circles" of the Federal Republic of pursuing a "policy of revanchism aimed at the incorporation of the German Democratic Republic into NATO."

² *Aussenpolitische Korrespondenz*, 13. Jahrg., Nr. 51, East Berlin 22. December 1969, p. 397.

The purpose of East Germany's initiative is, so he claimed, to curb Bonn's nuclear and war policies and "to help the population of West Germany, the West German workers, and the West German youth in the creation of a peaceful and secure future." This can hardly mean anything else than the continuation of the Communist efforts to subvert the political, economic, and social system in the Federal Republic. This is of course a long standing objective of Moscow. For example, at the Meeting of 24 Communist Parties at Karlsbad in April 1967, it was decided to give all possible support to the struggle of the progressive forces in the Federal Republic. Ulbricht in his address on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic on October 6, 1969 referred to the demands of the "forces of peace" which existed within West Germany. It has become quite obvious that Moscow wishes to create a "mass movement" in the Federal Republic and has assigned this important role to East Berlin. Ulbricht therefore appeals to the left forces within the SPD, within the trade unions, within the intelligentsia, and to the "peace camp" in his effort to create an anti-Western, anti-American, and anti-democratic "left nationalism". Moscow expects that the mobilization of these forces will place the Federal Government under considerable pressure and will thereby facilitate the implementation of Soviet objectives in Europe. Ulbricht appeared very sure of himself at the press conference, probably because he had received all necessary assurances of support from the Soviet ambassador in East Berlin, Abramimov, whom he met just prior to the meeting with the journalists.

On January 22, 1970, Chancellor Brandt sent a letter to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Willi Stoph, in which he repeated Bonn's offer to "open negotiations on the exchange of declarations on the renunciation of force." He also proposed that these negotiations should "provide an opportunity for a wide-ranging exchange of views on the settlement of all outstanding questions between our two states."

Perhaps the harrassment of the traffic to Berlin which commenced on January 21 and is East Berlin's way of expressing its displeasure at the meeting of several committees of the Bundestag in West Berlin, might also be an indication of Ulbricht's attitude toward negotiations with Bonn. Chancellor Brandt with his "advance concessions" has gone as far as the West Germans can be pressured to go at this time. Further concessions might have to wait until the impact of the undermining activities of various left-wing groups, confused politicians, and publicists of the kind of Rudolf Augstein, the publisher of *Der Spiegel*, have had more time to exert their influence.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TOWARD A EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE

The Soviet proposal of a European collective security system intended to supersede the precarious balance of power of the two military blocs, has as its primary purpose the elimination of the American involvement in Europe, Moscow is aware that as long as the U.S. remains as the guarantor of West Europe's security, Communist plans of Western expansion will be effectively blocked. As has been pointed out earlier in this paper, the control of Germany and of Europe are considered essentials for Moscow's global aims.

The history of Soviet or Soviet sponsored proposals for a European Security Conference goes back to a note, of November 15, 1954, sent to 34 states suggesting a collective security system. The Soviet Union intended then to prevent West Germany's re-armament and the inclusion of the Federal Republic into the Western defense alliance. 1958 and 1964 witnessed three proposals made by the former Polish Foreign Minister

Rapacki. All of them were variations on the concept of disengagement, again with the purpose in mind of reducing or removing American influence from the European continent. Communist Party Chief Brezhnev and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko made it quite clear at the XXIII Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1966 that the impact of the non-European powers must be eliminated and that the Europeans can and must bring their own house into order.

The Bucharest Declaration of July 8, 1966 suggested the removal of all foreign troops, the creation of a nuclear free zone, and a discontinuation of both military blocs.

At the Conference at Karlsbad on April 25, 1967, Brezhnev called attention to the fact that the American military presence in Europe endangers the peace. The Communiqué of the Conference appealed to the working class and socialist and workers' parties to fight on a continental basis in broad mass actions for the collective security of Europe.

The next appeal was made at Budapest on March 18, 1968. The Karlsbad decisions were endorsed and again the European states were called upon to solve their own security problem.

The Main Document of the Moscow Conference of June 17, 1969 calls for the intensification of the struggle against imperialism and referred to "the basic right of the European states to be masters in their own house without interference from the U.S.A."

The most recent declaration was made at Prague on October 31, 1969. The Budapest statements were endorsed, the possibility of U.S. participation in a security conference was considered, and the following two items were recommended as proper issues for a European Security Conference which was to be held as early as possible in 1970:

- (1) Guaranteeing European security, and the renunciation of the use of force or the threat of force in relations between European states.
- (2) The extension of trade, economic and scientific-technical relations on the basis of equality, with the aim of developing the political cooperation between the European states.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the objectives to be achieved by this conference range from the obvious advantages for the economies of the Warsaw Pact states, the multi-national recognition of the division of Germany, and of the existence of the German Democratic Republic to the elimination of U.S. influence in order to remove the greatest obstacle for the expansion of Communist control.

Polish Communist Party leader Gomulka stated this ultimate objective very clearly at the Karlsbad Conference on April 27, 1967:

We Communists are convinced that in Europe which is organized in a collective security system, the class struggle will continue. This process will eventually lead to the complete victory of the socialist order on our continent.

It appears that this evaluation of the purpose of a Soviet sponsored European Security conference is not shared by the present left-liberal government in Bonn. Statements made by SPD and FDP politicians emphasize the "positive attitude" of the Federal Republic toward this proposal. Of course the West Europeans still insist that the U.S. and Canada might also be included at the conference.

The issue of the European Security Conference was also on the agenda of the NATO Ministerial Meeting at Brussels in December 1969. U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers referred to the Soviet proposal as "nebulous, unrealistic, and premature." He openly accused the Soviet Union of attempting to utilize this conference to finalize the division of Europe and to cover up the suppression of Czechoslovakia. Mr.

Rogers also stated that the U.S. would not participate in a conference which would *de facto* endorse the Brezhnev Doctrine.

For the Americans it is difficult to understand that of all countries the Federal Republic does not seem to grasp the real purpose of the psychologically very cleverly worked out Soviet maneuver.

CONCLUSIONS

Chancellor Brandt's policy of "overtures to the East" has found severe criticism within and outside the Federal Republic. To this observer, the critics' concern about the impact of the new foreign policy orientation upon the entire Western position vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc, is largely justified.

The practice of making "advance concessions" to totalitarian regimes has in the past not contributed toward an improvement of the political climate. It had always failed because totalitarian rulers tend to interpret concessions not as signs of goodwill but rather as indications of the weakness of the opponent. The reason that Western statesmen have repeatedly made this error, is that they superimpose Western concepts and Western values upon an entirely different ideological environment. Stalin was apparently not impressed by the "spiritual" influence of the Pope when he inquired about the number of divisions the Pope had at his disposal. American concessions to the Soviet Union during and after the end of World War II also failed to convince the Soviets of Washington's good intentions and hopes for a future peaceful world.

It is possible that the Communist leaders of the Warsaw Pact states will only be encouraged in their aggressive designs while at the same time the Western position might be seriously weakened in terms of military and psychological immunities to Soviet expansion.

There is ample reason to believe that out of all the prolonged so-called negotiations nothing will be accomplished and no meaningful reciprocal agreements will be reached. The result then might be a great disillusionment among the West Germans both in their left-liberal government but also in their Western allies. Even now certain alibis are being prepared which could be used to shift the blame for the lack of success of Chancellor Brandt's efforts to the allies, in particular to the U.S. Countess Doenhoff, Chief Editor of *Die Zeit*, and a great supporter of the new approach, has already mentioned that all really depends on the dialogues between Washington and Moscow. If they break down, she maintains, there is also no possibility for Bonn to carry on an Eastern policy.³

Indeed, there is no possibility for a unilateral policy of any of the Western countries without endangering the entire Western alliance.

DISTRICT COURT UPHOLDS PHILADELPHIA PLAN

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

It is fundamental that civil rights without economic rights are mere shadows.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with those words Federal District Judge Charles R. Weiner upheld the constitutionality of the Philadelphia plan in Federal district court in Philadelphia on March 13.

During House debate on the Philadelphia plan, those of us who strongly supported it stressed that we were more than

willing to allow the courts to rule upon its constitutionality. The Federal district court has now spoken and, as we predicted, has upheld the Philadelphia plan as not being in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In upholding the plan, Judge Weiner stated that the Civil Rights Act was not violated because the plan "does not require the contractor to hire a definite percentage of a minority group." Rather, the contractor is required only to make every good faith effort to achieve a definite percentage of minority employment. In his opinion, Judge Weiner stated:

It is beyond question, that present employment practices have fostered and perpetrated a system that has effectively maintained a segregated class. That concept, if I may use the strong language it deserves, is repugnant, unworthy and contrary to present national policy.

The judge further noted that the Philadelphia plan would provide an "unpolluted breath of fresh air to ventilate this unpalatable situation."

I am hopeful that this decision will help speed up the implementation of the Philadelphia plan or similar plans across the country. As President Nixon has stated:

Nothing is more unfair than that the same Americans who pay taxes should by any pattern of discriminatory practices be deprived equal opportunity to work on federal construction contracts.

WE MUST PERSEVERINGLY HONOR OUR NATIONAL MORAL COMMITMENT "TO CARE FOR THOSE WHO HAVE BORNE THE BURDEN OF BATTLE"

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

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of this House, and particularly those of us from Massachusetts, are deeply gratified by the recent announcement of the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, that his committee would undertake extended hearings on the operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals because of our separate requests and his own serious concern that the VA hospital system is gravely impaired and the veterans medical programs undermined because of the lack of proportionally higher funding and staffing allocations necessitated by rising workloads and medical costs.

The chairman stated that, following his committees' preliminary inquiries:

Some curtailment of VA funding and staffing has been blamed on the war on inflation.

The chairman went on to indicate his own position and reflected my conviction as well, I am sure, as the great majority of the membership here, when he emphasized his belief that:

The Vietnam veteran has contributed enough when he fights the shooting war and that he should not be expected to fight the inflation war also at the expense of his health. This Nation has prided itself in its service to those who have borne the bur-

den of battle. A bi-partisan attitude has long prevailed in Congress in the funding of an adequate medical program for America's veterans. . . . We in Congress of both parties have always acted in the belief that the finest medical care should be made available to those who served their country, in uniform, and especially to those who returned home suffering wounds and service-connected disabilities. I do not intend to sit idly by and allow shortsighted policies to destroy a medical program that is absolutely necessary to care for America's veterans and that's why we're conducting this survey so we can make a determination if we are doing all that needs to be done to properly and promptly serve America's ex-servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, these statements of the dedicated chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee truly represent, I think, the consensus of the Congress and the people of this country.

Just a few weeks ago officials of our Massachusetts Veterans' Administration hospital said that they had funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 of over \$1.7 million in December of 1969 in their operation of some 4,000 hospital beds serving approximately 300,000 Massachusetts veterans. Although these hospitals and others received some supplemental funding for fiscal 1970 the hospital officials unanimously agreed that substantially increased funding will be necessary to adequately provide complete hospital treatment and medical services to Massachusetts veterans particularly those disabled veterans returning from the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated here many times before and I will state it again now, my conviction that the extension of complete and competent hospital and medical treatment and services to our veterans is a vitally important factor in sustaining the high morale of our people, essential for the accomplishment of our own domestic tranquility and world leadership for peace. This is obviously a matter of special concern to the young people in this Nation today as well as the disabled veterans, and their families, of all wars.

In my judgment, any reduction or deterioration in the medical care of our veterans would be a major disaster to this country. It would represent an incredible and intolerable neglect of our disabled Vietnam veterans who are, tragically, held to be the most unwept, unhonored, and unsung war heroes in all our history. The tragedy of their courageous war service would be compounded by any national betrayal of our moral commitment to them. We can never permit it to come to pass that those Vietnam war veterans who have been the least honored also be the most neglected.

Along with the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee I, and I am certain all other Members also, do not intend to stand idly by and allow shortsighted policies to destroy a medical program that is absolutely necessary to care for America's veterans. I know that we will all join with our devoted chairman in urging the President of the United States to place the proper and complete modern hospital treatment and medical care of our veterans among the very highest priorities of our national budget in order that this country shall

³ *Die Zeit*, 25. Jahrg., Nr. 3. Hamburg, Jan. 20, 1970.

fulfill its moral commitment to care for those who have borne the burden of battle.

Mr. Speaker, in particular concern for and particular reference to our Vietnam veterans I wish to include a very timely and thought-provoking article by John S. Knight, editorial chairman of the Knight Newspapers, that appeared in the March 16, 1970, issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram. The article follows:

THE HOME FRONT'S SHAME—FOR VIET VETERANS, NO BAND, NO PARADE

(By John S. Knight)

Are the people of America falling to honor our servicemen returning from Vietnam?

Do they appreciate the sacrifices of these young men who fought in a war brought on by the miscalculations of their Nation's leaders?

Is adequate tribute being paid to those who have suffered so much while we at home make no sacrifices whatsoever?

Plain-spoken Lt. Gen. Herman Nickerson Jr., retiring Marine commander in Vietnam, says he is "disappointed in the silent majority" for not honoring Americans who have lost life and limb in Vietnam.

"There are relatively few places," the general added, "where they waved flags and honored our servicemen as they did in the great days when the boys came home as heroes. They're not interested in the exploits of our young men. Maybe we're getting to be pretty blasé about the whole thing."

The general's indignation is shared by others. As one Veterans Administration official remarked, "The guys who fought in World Wars I and II found gratitude and the traditional hero's welcome when they came home. These guys get no bands, no parades, not even a flicker of interest."

This shabby lack of attention is bad enough. But a more severe indictment can be drawn against the treatment of wounded veterans in government hospitals.

NOT DUPLICATED AT HOME

Prompt use of the helicopter, intensive battlefield medical care and the Army's modern evacuation procedures save thousands of wounded men who would have died in an earlier war.

Unhappily, this superb medical treatment on the field of battle is not duplicated on the home front. When wounded veterans are ultimately assigned to Veterans Administration hospitals for long-term treatment, the story changes.

In Miami, doctors have charged that veterans suffer a "tragic lack of care" because the VA hospital is "grossly understaffed."

Dr. Stewart Wolf of the University of Oklahoma says "There is real danger that the administration and Congress are about to see veterans hospitals revert to mediocre status of the 1920s and 1930s when tired physicians and political jobholders provided the care for the defenders of our country."

And Dr. Ernest H. J. Bors of the VA hospital in Long Beach, Calif., blames lack of people for the deterioration in the care of paraplegics. "We don't have the hands to do the job," says Bors. "It boils down to a matter of the budget."

EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY

Donald E. Johnson, newly appointed head of the VA, insists that veterans still receive top quality care—"Care second to none."

Yet most of the evidence is to the contrary.

The cruel nature of the Vietnam war—booby traps, jungle ambushes, mines and hidden spikes—has taken a gruesome toll of combat troops. More than a quarter of a million Americans have been wounded in Vietnam, with about half of them requiring hospitalization.

Correspondent Don Oberdorfer reports that an Army study of 1,000 men separated from

the service for disability discloses that 28 per cent were amputees, 25 per cent suffer from paralysis of extremities and 14 per cent have "impairment of sense organs."

These are much higher percentages than in previous wars. The rate of blindness is triple that of World War II.

President Nixon and the Congress have an imperative responsibility to upgrade the quality of care being given to wounded veterans in government hospitals.

WORDS STRIKE DISCORDANT NOTE

Words such as "economy" and "budgetary considerations" strike a discordant note when applied to the obligation we owe to young men whose lives and bodies have been shattered in the service of their country.

The fortunate ones—those who returned sound of mind and body—can abide the neglects as they move almost invisibly through civilian life.

They don't talk much, but the distrust within them runs strong and the bitterness lies deep.

As 25-year-old Wally McKay, a much-decorated Marine veteran, has remarked: "I just keep my mouth shut about the war. If anybody asks me about Vietnam, I just refer them to the library."

Mike Sergleff, an ex-sailor, put it this way: "I didn't expect to be treated like a hero when I got home. But I didn't expect to be ignored."

The tragic neglect of our Vietnam veterans is a sad commentary on present-day society, steeped in greed and devoid of compassion.

We should hang our heads in shame.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. GAYDOS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, March 16, through Thursday, March 19, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. ESHLEMAN), for 15 minutes, on March 23; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HÉBERT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GHAIMO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLARK) to extend their remarks immediately following Mr. CLARK's opening statement on H.R. 15694:)

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESHLEMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. SHIPLEY.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. McFALL.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN.

SENATE-ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3427. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 16, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1497. An act to permit the vessel *Marpole* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 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:

1790. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary on the state of finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1027 (H. Doc. No. 91-228); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1791. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report summarizing the 1969 activities in the desalting of sea and brackish waters, together with legislative recommendations for the 1971 fiscal year, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 881. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16196, a bill to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, to revise the procedures for handling juveniles in the District of Columbia, to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-914). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MEEDS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 15361. A bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 16503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands at the Petersburg National Battlefield, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16504. A bill to provide for a training program for organized crime prosecutors, an annual conference of Federal, State, and local officials in the field of organized crime, and annual report by the Attorney General on organized crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLANTON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. NICHOLS):

H.R. 16505. A bill to provide loans to assist

local educational agencies in constructing school facilities needed to meet the requirements of Federal law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 16506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the applicability of the exemption from income taxation of cemetery corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 16507. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 16508. A bill to meet the school financing emergency facing school districts which must meet requirements imposed by Federal judicial decisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16509. A bill to share Federal revenues with State and local governments for purposes of assisting public education and reducing the State and local tax burden of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 16510. A bill to share Federal revenues with State and local governments for purposes of assisting public education and reducing the State and local tax burden of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 16511. A bill to extend through December 31, 1972, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16512. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund the section 235 low-income homeownership program for the fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 16513. A bill to reduce mortgage interest rates charged middle-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16514. A bill to establish a senior citizens skill and talent utilization program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 16515. A bill to provide that ports on the Great Lakes shall be included in the ports described in section 809 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. ROUBUSH, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. PELLY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WINN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 16516. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 16517. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, by extending its coverage to persons employed by States or political subdivisions thereof in the provision of fire or police protection, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 16518. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 16519. A bill to exclude from gross income the first \$750 of interest received on deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. AD-DABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 16520. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 16521. A bill to authorize the emergency issuance of 2,000 special immigrant visas to nationals of Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16524. A bill to incorporate the Italian Heritage Society of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 1135. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY:

H.J. Res. 1136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 1137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the establishment of public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 1138. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution relating to an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16522. A bill for the relief of Tong Yee Kam Po; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 16523. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. Robert T. Frederick; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

418. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to terrorism against travelers to Israel, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.