

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 27, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.—Psalms 112: 6.

O God, our Father, we pause at this altar founded by our forefathers to bow our heads in prayer and in praying to call to mind again those who over the years have given their lives for our country. For them we are most thankful and our hearts sing with gratitude. May their devotion to freedom and their dedication to our country fire us in our endeavors to keep liberty alive between these shores and on this planet.

We pray for the guidance of Thy spirit as we face the demands of these days and as we respond to the call of duty. Help us now and ever to work together with those who do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4724. An act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

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

S. 485. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that certain aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall be eligible to operate amateur radio stations in the United States and to hold licenses for their stations; and

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate June 1, 1971, as "Medical Library Association Day".

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair has the honor of requesting the Member-elect, the Honorable WILLIAM O. MILLS from Maryland, to come to the well of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable WILLIAM O. MILLS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election

has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MILLS will represent the First Congressional District of Maryland and will succeed the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, now the Secretary of the Interior.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MILLS was the administrative assistant to Congressman Morton and was very well known and respected on the Hill here.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM O. MILLS of Maryland appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

A COMMENDATION TO AN OUTSTANDING ATHLETE, SMYLIE GEBHART

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend an outstanding athlete and a great American—Smylie Gebhart from my hometown of Meridian, Miss. Smylie is one of four NCAA college All-Americans that will tour military hospitals in the Pacific during the last part of June.

For the past 2 years he has been a key figure in Georgia Tech's outstanding defensive unit and was the 1970 team leader in "defensive big plays." Smylie is majoring in industrial management at Georgia Tech.

I am quite proud of Smylie Gebhart and the other All-Americans who are giving up part of their summer vacation to visit with our hospitalized servicemen. I am sure all my colleagues will join me in commending these athletes.

FLORIDA'S LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR ADAMS ADDRESSES MEETING OF THE WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Congress was formed earlier this year when the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and Water Resources Associated were combined. At the first regional meeting of the combined membership of the Water Resources Congress, Florida's Lt. Gov. Tom Adams was scheduled as the keynote speaker. He became ill and had to be hospitalized, and his address was delivered by an aide. It is a significant message and I feel that the membership of the Congress will welcome an opportunity to read it.

Because of his long and active cham-

panionship of conservation programs, Governor Adams is an outstanding authority on this subject. I submit his address for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY LT. GOV. TOM ADAMS

In union there is strength . . . and the union of two strong organizations gives a greater strength than each had before . . . and, so, as we meet here today, as members of the Water Resources Congress, we can be confident that we have a strength of purpose and a unity of goals second to no other group devoted to the beneficial development of our Nation's water resources and the proper protection of our environment.

All of you here today have devoted your efforts to the orderly land productive development of America's vital water resources. The effort has been rewarding, if sometimes frustrating, and one in which we all can take pride.

Effective effort must be based on unity of purpose . . . and the water resources congress has that unity today. Some of us began our efforts with the Mississippi Valley Association, then we functioned as Water Resources Associated.

Our companions in cause, the Rivers and Harbors Congress, were diligently and effectively pursuing much the same goals as were we.

In this age of an awakening and popular concern for our environment, it became apparent that if challenges were to be met, our groups must meet them with a singleness of purpose . . . with concentrated and united effort . . . with the sure knowledge that there would be no duplication of effort which could dilute the ultimate impact of either organization.

As is proper in matters this important, the question of a merger of purpose and effort was put before the boards and memberships of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and of Water Resources Associated.

The union was approved and the merger was accomplished with a quiet pride by both groups. Both organizations had left their imprint upon the history of water resource development and each knew that in uniting, the combined body would go forward to even more historic accomplishments.

It is vitally important at this time in man's history that we pursue our purpose with all the strength we can find . . . for man is facing a decade of decision which will shape the world of the future.

Wasteful and rapacious use of any, or all, of our natural resources will so change our environment as to render it hostile to human life . . . and this, obviously, must not happen.

The challenge facing us . . . facing the water resources Congress . . . is one of adequately and effectively informing Americans of the solutions to environmental problems that we know will work.

Ecology . . . environment . . . pollution . . . bio-degradable . . . have all become catch phrases in a popular cause—and this is as it should be. But they have also, too often, become scare words . . . "Wolf" words . . . used by cynical and selfish people to further their own political or financial aims.

One of the goals we must accomplish is to render these polluters of the mind . . . these distorters of fact . . . ineffective and impotent so that Americans can be informed properly . . . can shape and implement solutions to environmental concerns . . . can be certain that all of our efforts are toward the same purpose of saving our Nation's natural resources.

The weight of these challenges grows with each day . . . we have freezes upon public

works . . . we have an unwarranted presidential abrogation of the rights of a sovereign state which stopped a project supported by five previous Presidents . . . we have confusion of purpose between sincere and well-meaning groups interested in an ecological balance between man and nature.

We have inconsistencies of effort which puzzle and upset our citizens . . . for instance, in Florida, on the one hand, we are experiencing the worst drought in 60 years, and, on the other hand, a group of citizens are clamoring mightily that we drain our Rodman pool.

South Florida is dying of drought . . . and an impoundment in central Florida which replenishes our vital aquifer is threatened because it is a part of the cross-Florida barge canal.

Again, in Florida, we have one branch of state government telling us Rodman pool must be drained to save the trees . . . while the same agency is calling for a rise in other waters to help the trout spawn.

Inconsistencies at the national level beset our people.

It puzzles our people . . . shakes their confidence . . . that we have a Federal bureaucracy with so little apparent concern for our environment and safety that it stores biological warfare weapons in our Nation . . . that it dumps nerve gas off our shores . . . that it continues underground nuclear testing despite the inherent dangers in the present system.

These inconsistencies impress upon our people the fallibility of man's judgment, at times. It is difficult for some of us to trust completely the judgment of the Federal system which approves an Alaskan oil pipeline, which permits oil drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel, which grants new offshore oil drilling permits in Louisiana.

These inconsistencies make our task of informing and educating much more difficult . . . and much more important.

You know, it distresses me greatly, disappoints me, that some people are so quick to form unfounded judgments today when they hear the words "environment" or "ecology" mentioned.

It almost appears that to destroy, or invalidate, an effort to properly meet environmental challenges, all any group has to do is make a blanket claim that it will upset the ecology, or threaten the environment, without presenting any factual or pertinent material to support such claims.

No one in America today has a monopoly of concern; or, alone, has the sense of urgency that we are fast approaching a time of decision. All thinking men know and feel these things.

That is why we are here today . . . because we are truly concerned about our Nation and its future. We have arrived at a crossroads of centuries of wanderings down ecological byways and we must now find the true path for environmental survival or we will travel no more.

For, unless mankind chooses correctly and wisely, the earth will continue to feel the terrible stresses of population pressures and our natural resources will dwindle, or become so unusable that they no longer sustain life—and, then, life will come to an end.

Our hope is that through meetings like this, through the interplay of knowledge and the impetus gained by mutuality of purpose, that mankind will make the correct choices and we will embark upon a course which will mean a more abundant life for future generations.

We have reached a point in man's history when we can all too well see the results of centuries of wasteful utilization of resources, of the unthinking unbalancing of ecological factors upon which our very lives depend.

No person, or group, deliberately set out to destroy our environment, to take any action, or to begin any sequence of events

to threaten doom to the human race. But these events happened.

No person, or group, set forth with premeditation to foul our air, pollute our water, or poison our soil. But these events happened.

No person, or group, plotted to so upset our ecology that the vital relationship between atmosphere, soil and living organisms became so unbalanced that our environment went astray and threatened our survival. But these events happened.

We cannot let events such as these continue "to happen." Each change we make in our environment, each alteration we make in the delicate ecological balance that preserves mankind upon this planet, must be made with knowledge and concern for the consequences.

We cannot let events just happen anymore because there is no room left in this world for new mistakes of the past.

What we must talk about now is philosophy and not projects. We must return to the beginning so that we may start anew, and we must agree upon our basic goal so that we may properly structure means of implementation.

The basic goal is really simple to state, extremely complicated to achieve. It is the preservation of man in an environment which will sustain and nourish him. There can be no real disagreement on this goal—it is all-encompassing.

The disagreements come in the methodology, in the means of implementation and in the differences of opinion as to what environment will best sustain and nourish man.

The spectrum of disagreement is broad. It runs from the preservationists who would return man to growl over bones in a cave to the synthesists who would ignore the conservation of natural resources and simply manufacture substitutes to replace those depleted by mankind.

Most of us will forego a return to those days when man caught his food with bare hands and environmental change was wrought by fire, flood and earthquake.

Most of us would gladly forego an artificial atmosphere, manufactured water and synthetic soil to enjoy the real resources given us by nature.

We have fossils of the preservationists' past, the dinosaur and other victims of evolution. None of us want fossils of the future when the only tree to be seen would be in a museum and clear skies would exist only in photographs and drawings.

None of us want a nation polluted and so changed environmentally as to be unsuited for life. None of us want a nation returned to the past when survival was a struggle waged by man unaided by present skills and knowledge.

America is committed to the future. We have embarked upon projects which cannot be recalled, or undone, because the consequences lie far beyond our generation. We have a responsibility to the future to leave America a better land than we found it. We will fulfill that responsibility.

The projects to which we are committed are of great value, of great merit, as steps along the path to reach our goal of the survival of mankind.

These projects were proposed, planned and begun with sincere motives to better our Nation. They were proposed, planned and begun after long study and consideration of eventual effects upon man's ability to meld economy and environment into harmonious and beneficial balance.

They are not the products of chance, or of haphazard efforts to simply change the landscape for the sake of change.

These projects range from water conservation to balance out years of flood and drought, to harbor improvement and canals, to beach nourishment, and to the retention of wild areas for the people of our Nation.

Each project is a link in a chain. Break the link and the chain falls. Public works project, then, lie in as delicate an environmental balance as our ecology—an alteration to one causes a change to the other.

Because the balance is so sensitive we cannot let one project fall to the detriment of the whole. We cannot let any group embark upon a domestic domino theory in which they seek to stop first one project, then another and another until all fall and public works are brought to a standstill in America.

This would be no victory for conservation, and could well spell defeat for our chances of arriving at our basic goal of survival.

An America left defenseless against flood and drought, for instance, would be an America returned to the stone ages when man simply tried to exist against the elements.

And yet, we have sincere people seeking to do just this—we have equally sincere people who realize that man has continually changed his environment to meet his needs from the first time he dammed a stream to conserve water to the creation of such great projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We must continue to change for we cannot meet the growing population pressures by returning to the past.

How can we stand still? How can we not move now to meet the drastic needs we know our population growth rate will require? How can we ignore the potential for good that this growth has for America?

Too many people equate growth with destruction while the opposite is true. Not to grow, to stagnate, is death. To live is to grow, and all nature shows us this to be true. Growth, as such is not evil. Uncontrolled growth, as in a cancer, is harmful and that is why we must plan our growth right now for a future which is beneficial to all.

Planned growth involves the proper conservation of water supplies, the protection of habitable land from flood and drought, the proper utilization and maintenance of our harbor areas for the transport of needed products and goods, and the proper public works planning which will lead growth to those areas best able to serve it.

These are critical years of survival for all of mankind, and America must be a leader in planning and implementing those projects which can serve as a model for the world.

For, America is not alone. The world faces the same challenges for survival . . . the same need for finding workable solutions.

There is no unanimity of agreement as to how best to meet these critical challenges . . . and there never will be.

But we have all reached one area of agreement—that man must survive in a beneficial and practical environment.

One area of agreement will lead to another and to another . . . and as long as men talk and plan and dream as we do, then we know we will reach our goal—and man will survive.

PAKISTAN SEEKS DOMESTIC PEACE THROUGH THE BALLOT

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of armed revolt in Pakistan in late March, the press has shown a notable bias toward rebel groups. Only rarely has publicity been given to the Pakistan Government's view concerning the events which have taken place in East Pakistan. I feel that it is only fair to call the attention of the Congress to statements made by President Yahya Khan of that country on the present political situation

in Pakistan. In a recent statement to foreign correspondents he again spelled out Pakistan's plans for an orderly transfer from military to civil rule in Pakistan and he explained the problems which Pakistan has encountered in recent weeks.

I submit President Yahya Khan's statements and a commentary which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, May 25, for reprinting in the RECORD:

YAHYA AGAIN SAYS AIM IS CIVIL RULE; PROMISES TO PRESENT PLAN FOR "ORDERLY TRANSFER"

(By Malcolm W. Browne)

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, May 24.—President Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan said today that he was determined to bring about "an orderly transfer of power" to a civilian government.

General Yahya told a group of foreign correspondents at the presidential mansion here that he would present a plan for doing so in "two or three weeks."

"I have been saying for the past two years that it [the transfer] would happen," he declared, "and last December [when elections for a constitutional assembly were held] I said, 'By God, I've done it.'"

"Well, I'll still do it even though some of my countrymen don't like the idea. They say: 'What the hell's going on? This will lead to chaos.'"

"But I am determined on an orderly transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people."

MARCH MEETING PLANNED

The National Assembly elected last December was to have met March 3 to start to write a constitution that would return Pakistan to civilian rule. But General Yahya postponed the session when the Pakistan People's party, the dominant political group of West Pakistan, which had won only a minority role in the assembly, said it would not attend.

A series of protest strikes followed in East Pakistan, whose principal party, the Awami League, had captured a commanding majority in the assembly on a platform of regional autonomy.

General Yahya was asked today if his plan for an "orderly transfer of power" would also apply to the Awami League, which led the Bengali separatist movement in East Pakistan. The league was outlawed in the early stages of the army crackdown, which began on March 25.

The President replied that the Awami League, as a political party, would "remain forever banned."

SOME MEMBERS WELCOMED

But he said that many members of the Awami League had been misled by the separatist cause and were welcome to assume their functions as representatives later.

"Some people have spoken of a general amnesty for the Awami League," the President said.

"For those who were genuinely misled, all right, but for those who committed rebellion, murder, looting, raping and arson, no, I shall deal with those criminals."

Today's meeting was the first President Yahya has had with the foreign press since the military action began in East Pakistan.

He spoke particularly bitterly about Sheikh Mujiburrahman, leader of the Awami League, who is now believed to be imprisoned on charges of treason.

"He was plotting against me," the President said. "He even tried to have me arrested, I hear he confessed that himself."

"What did he have to lose, for God's sake? I offered him the Prime Ministry on a silver platter and he refused it, always talking of

separate legislatures for East and West Pakistan and so forth."

"I'll be damned if I'll see Pakistan divided," the President added.

Asked about the fate in store for Sheikh Mujib, the President replied: "Why is that of any interest to you? Sheikh Mujib is a citizen of Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan will deal with him as it sees fit."

WOULD NOT WHIP UP FRENZY

On the subject of Pakistan's hostile relations with India, the President said that "in their heart of hearts the [the Indians] don't want war," and added, "I could whip up a frenzy for war very quickly in my country but I refuse to do so."

President Yahya acknowledged that his nation was in a serious economic position. It has been caused in part, he said, by the looting of 600 million rupees—about \$150-million hundred—from banks in East Pakistan by the Awami League.

"We are going ahead with what we have but it is not enough," he said, "and we are accepting foreign assistance."

"We are not shouting at the top of our voices, 'we're dead and dying, help us,'" he said, "and I am not going to let a single man of my country die of hunger."

Touching on the severe strains on recent relations between Pakistan and the United States, President Yahya said that he had recently received a letter from President Nixon.

"It was a very warm, kind personal letter in which Mr. Nixon offered to do anything he could to help," he said.

Today's meeting at the presidential mansion was held primarily for the 10 correspondents who are being permitted to enter East Pakistan tomorrow for a four-day visit. They represent United Press International, The Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, the West German news agency D.P.A., Agence, France-Presse, Le Monde, Far Eastern Economic Review, the Kyodo news agency and Asahi Shimbun and Yomiuri Shimbun of Tokyo.

PRESIDENT YAHYA KHAN SPEAKING TO A GROUP OF FOREIGN PRESS CORRESPONDENTS IN KARACHI, MAY 24, 1971

1. Power will still be transferred to elected representatives of the people.

Recent happenings in East Pakistan had been particularly disappointing for him because his scheme of things which had been going along fairly well had received a big jolt. But this was temporary. He had not lost the main aim, which has been, and still is, transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people. "We have struggled hard to hold elections. We shall not allow these elections to be destroyed."

2. International assistance welcomed.

He expressed his thanks to the world community to help restore normal life in East Pakistan. He welcomed the offer and gratefully accepted it. "But let me also say that my Government is not one of those who start shouting at top of their voice that we need this and that, please help us. So far we have been busy assessing what help we want from the world community. We have now completed that assessment and have conveyed our requirements to United Nations."

3. No starvation will be allowed in East Pakistan.

He stressed that there were enough stocks of food in East Pakistan for the next three months but the difficulty was that of movement, because of destruction of bridges and rail routes. "However, I will not allow a single person in my nation to die of hunger."

4. Requests to all bonafide refugees to return to their country.

He maintained that every genuine Pakistani who has left his country under threats, duress or fright shall be taken back into

Pakistan. "I shall make sure that they do come back. Had it been purely Pakistan's affair, we might have sorted it out a long time ago. But I regret we were not allowed to do so by forces around us which made certain obviously blatant moves to interfere in our internal affairs."

5. Amnesty for all innocent persons.

The President said that he was prepared to grant amnesty to those who were genuinely misled but not to those who had rebelled against the country and had committed loot, murder and arson. Every country in the world had a right to deal with its criminals.

6. Possibility of war with India.

When a correspondent asked that after the threat from Mrs. Indira Gandhi, was there any possibility of war between India and Pakistan, the President replied "I am not threatening her. I have not held out any threat. Nobody wants war. War is not an answer. I am sure in her heart of hearts she does not want war. We have said that repeatedly. We have repeatedly told the world community that we do not want to fight a war with India. We have been telling them war is not an answer as it does not solve anything."

EXPANSION OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE AND OVERTIME PAY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the House soon is to consider H.R. 449 providing for the expansion of the Capitol Police force and for overtime pay for these outstanding public servants.

I fully support the intent of this proposal.

Early in May, those of us in the Congress watched, along with the Nation, as these fine men withstood all of the insults and diatribe hurled at them by the so-called demonstrators who came here for the singular purpose of halting the Government of the United States.

Day after day, the men of the Capitol Police force acted far above the call of duty. They spent endless hours on duty and other endless hours on call. For days on end, they kept the buildings of the Capitol Hill area open to legitimate visitors yet secure from the masses of unruly dissidents and would-be revolutionaries who, were it not for the Capitol Police, would have made business in this very hall impossible.

During those trying days, it became painfully obvious that more men were needed to assist our Capitol Police and that provision should be made to compensate these officers for the dedicated work they performed.

H.R. 449 is designed to accomplish this, Mr. Speaker. It fills a void where a void has long existed. It will allow for orderly expansion of the force itself and will provide for payment to these men when they are called upon to perform the rigors of overtime duty.

It is a measure worthy of favorable congressional action and I urge its passage at the earliest possible moment.

DECEPTIVE STRIP MINE ADVERTISING

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Environmental Action, Inc., of Washington, has furthered the investigation of Bethlehem Steel's deceptive advertising concerning its strip mine reclamation practices. This investigation was inaugurated by Ernest B. Furgurson of the Baltimore Sun. Since the West Virginia Surface Mining and Reclamation Association is planning a \$180,000 advertising campaign on strip mine reclamation in West Virginia, and similar groups may be planning campaigns in other States, the following report may be of particular interest to my colleagues. It was printed in the May 15, 1971, issue of Environmental Action, as follows:

DEBUNKING MADISON AVENUE

Bethlehem Steel is neither the nation's largest steel maker nor its largest coal miner, but in the eyes of many veteran ad-watchers the giant corporation has carved out a niche for itself: it has one of the nation's most arrogant advertising divisions. In fact, the outrageousness of this nationally-run full-page color ad brings back memories of the infamous Potlatch "clean water" campaign of last year (Environmental Action, August 1, 1970).

Fishpond Lake is a pathetic, ugly fishing hole. Whatever slight beauty shows through does so in spite of the strip miners' efforts to eradicate it. And, whatever "reclamation" has been done is merely an obscene mockery of what Eastern Kentucky used to be before it was turned upside-down. One amazed observer bitterly commented, "I wonder why they didn't just truck in some plastic grass and shrubbery and get it over with?" One possible answer to that question is that acid mine drainage—sulfuric acid—it just as hard on plastic grass as it is on the real thing.

Besides luring this reporter to Letcher County, the ad attracted the curiosity of others. Bud Glendening of Washington's Center for Science in the Public Interest was so astounded by the difference between Bethlehem's claims and the actual sight that he told *Environmental Action*, "It completely reversed my opinions about the corporate structure in America, and it destroyed my faith in big business as a whole." And Ernest B. Furgurson, columnist for the Baltimore Sun, was infuriated enough to devote a whole column to the lake.

In actual fact, Fishpond Lake is not the beautiful paradise that Bethlehem's camera crew makes it out to be. Whereas it looks large, serene and lush in the ad, it is actually cramped and barely covered with scrub brush. The trees are sickly and struggling, and coal dust and debris is everywhere. In fact, Fishpond Lake is exactly what one would expect from a crew of industrial designers who had a great deal of money to spend—and no intention of ever returning to the scene of their well-publicized crime.

Even worse, the company implies that the lake is clean enough to support fish, and that fishing is excellent. According to the ad, Kentuckians are eternally grateful to Bethlehem for sparing them the ugliness of the former "holler" and installing a lake.

To a man, the 15 fishermen to whom I spoke said fishing was "lousy," although most had heard that it was a good place to fish. Even George Mullins, protagonist of the advertisement, admitted over the telephone that fishing was very uneven and that the lake had to be stocked several times a year. When queried further, the fishermen of Fishpond Lake generally explained that they chose the spot because there are no longer any fish in the poisoned streams of Letcher County.

Although, it is not obvious at first, this advertisement attempts to kill two birds with

one lump of coal: On the one hand, the ad promotes Bethlehem as the company that really cares about the environment; at the same time, it tries to show that strip mining is, basically, all right—and, for God's sake, not to worry about it. Unfortunately, the ad bulldozes its way past the truth on both counts. Not only is the vast majority of strip mined land unreclaimable, but Bethlehem's connections with the "holler" which is now Fishpond Lake are so remote as to make a mockery of the company's publicity effort. Not only was the area not reclaimed by the company, but it was not even stripped by Bethlehem!

The original stripping in the Fishpond Lake area was done by Consolidation Coal Company, one of the giants of the industry, in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Consol "restored" part of the mined land by pushing some of the dirt around, but none of it was reclaimed.

In 1955 Bethlehem bought the land from Consol, augered along the bench that still remained, filled the auger holes and again failed to replant or reclaim the land. Several years later, the company, along with a neighboring Kentucky landowner, donated about 900 acres to the Commonwealth, Kentucky (via the Corps of Engineers) was shouldered with the burden of building the dam, creating the lake and transforming the mine bench into a road. Bethlehem, meanwhile, was given a large tax write-off for the donation and—worst of all—still holds title to all its original mineral rights.

The truly sad part of the Fishpond Lake fraud is that the lake is in the near-perfect spot for good reclamation. It was mined by the small machines of the 1940s and 1950s, it is located on the inside of a small horseshoe-shaped "holler" rather than on the outside edge of a hillside, the coal seam is a relatively thin one, and the coal of Letcher County is among the nation's lowest in sulfur content. Yet, the lake continues to be too acidic to support fish properly, the surrounding areas continue to erode and support only a minimum of natural vegetation, and the area—more than 20 years after it was mined and "reclaimed"—remains ugly and unnaturally barren.

In other words, even if everything the advertisement had depicted and claimed were absolutely true, it would not have proved the case for strip mining in general. The ad does not even attempt to deal with the problems of strip mined boulders and debris crashing through the houses of people who have the misfortune to live below a mine, it does not mention that there is so little wildlife that hunting is a dead sport. It ignores the vast problem of siltation. This advertisement, in fact, is a testimonial to the very cause it fights: strip mine reclamation, even under the best possible conditions, is impossible.

Bethlehem Steel owns 40,000 acres in Pike, Knott and Letcher Counties. Aside from its underground mining operations, the company is stripping at the rate of 800 new acres per year. And the three counties have enough coal to last for many decades.

Last year, when criticism of stripping markedly increased, Bethlehem issued a statement of its policy, part of which said:

"We recognized that the decision to begin surface mining in Eastern Kentucky would not be well received in some quarters; however, our Board of Directors carefully considered the matter and we believe their decision was a proper one. We appreciate the concern for conservation and environmental quality control and we would like to assure you that Bethlehem also has a sincere interest in the land and the proper utilization of our nation's natural resources."

Despite this, the destruction continues as mountains are shaved away for their contents, forests denuded and streams polluted. Strippers continue to stifle the job market by squeezing out the higher-paying un-

derground mines. Bethlehem continues to produce the steel which, among other things, makes strip mining shovels—like "Big Muskie" in Ohio—large enough to scoop up three buses at one time.

Meanwhile, in stark contrast to the public relations efforts of this advertisement, Bethlehem makes life very difficult for both the people and the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The state, it turns out, has been wasting a good deal of money on public work's projects which are being destroyed by the stripping.

Near Fishpond, for instance, is another dammed lake built by Kentucky. Called Fishtrap Dam, it is a flood control-multipurpose project whose other purposes—fishing and swimming—are no longer possible. What is more disturbing to the authorities is that silt is filling up behind Fishtrap so quickly that it will be rendered useless within 20 years. Siltation is one of the worst symptoms of strip mined lands. Harry Caudill, noted Kentucky lawyer, remarked sadly, "We keep building these things and they're being destroyed by the coal companies as fast as they're built."

In Hellier, Kentucky the Pike County Citizens Association (PCCA) also has had some bitter experiences with Bethlehem. The citizens there struggled with the giant corporation for over a year in an effort to lease 16 acres of economically useless land for a town park. (Hellier, incidentally, has a population of 102.) After the battle, Tom Ramsey of the PCCA said bitterly, "Bethlehem is king down here. The people don't count for anything."

Like many of America's other corporate giants, Bethlehem has invested a great deal of money in covering up something that should not exist. All of Bethlehem's money cannot return the area around Fishpond Lake to its former simple, natural beauty. Moreover—and worse—all of Bethlehem's money could not even make Fishpond Lake a nice place to visit.

THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL SHOULD BE FUNDED FOR CONTINUING CONSTRUCTION

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some very important reasons why the Cross-Florida Barge Canal should be promptly completed.

MY CONSTITUENTS' POINT OF VIEW: THE CANAL SHOULD NOT BE STOPPED ABSENT REPEAL OF LAW AND PUBLIC HEARINGS OPEN TO ALL

The press release of January 19, 1971, which halted the canal's construction has caused great anguish among my constituents who, looking forward to the benefits of the canal, have taxed themselves to the extent of many millions of dollars of local real estate taxes, all in support of the federally authorized and appropriated for Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

They know: That the canal was authorized in part for its defense values and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the canal will provide "an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast and the east coast" that would "reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack"; that the project has a generous cost-benefit ratio, economic justification, and will have a job-producing and price-reducing value to aid all citizens; and that ecologically it has been given a clean bill of health by

many ecologists, recreation experts and others keenly interested in ecology.

They strongly feel, unanimously as far as I can find, that the laws which established the canal should not be set aside except by duly enacted repealing legislation after opportunity for all points of view to be heard in open public hearings.

In response to their numerous requests, I seek to fulfill my responsibility by finding a solution and providing them with an answer that will, if possible, be acceptable to everyone. I think there is such a solution: Completion of the canal along the alternate route proposed by the Corps of Engineers while emphasizing ecological protections and environmental improvements in the area.

NO EFFECT FAVORABLE TO WILDLIFE IS ACHIEVABLE BY HALTING CANAL

The January 19 press release mentioned as the reasons for halting construction: preservation of wildlife and protection of the beauty of the Oklawaha River. Neither is obtainable by halting the canal. If the canal is abandoned almost all of its acreage will revert to private ownership, residential and commercial uses once already underway; so no wildlife would be protected by simply ending the canal. In fact, wildlife protection would be hurt by such halt because the canal route does, for its narrow strip, protect some wildlife. National forest lands are on 15 miles of the 130 miles of Oklawaha river banks but much of this is at the mouth of the river, never planned for use by the canal. I have used as the length of the Oklawaha River the figure of 65 miles of a substantial stream—130 miles of banks—but the Corps of Engineers uses a larger figure of 150 miles of the waterway, which takes it to its sources ten miles further south.

OKLAWAHA'S BEAUTY CAN BE PRESERVED 100 PERCENT THROUGH BY-PASSING THE RIVER

All the beauty of the Oklawaha River, as it now is, can be 100 percent preserved through by-passing this river as proposed by the Corps of Engineers. Its wild beauty would not, however, be preserved by halting the canal. On the contrary, such halt would allow full residential and commercial exploitation by the reverent owners; and the wild beauty would be thus destroyed, not preserved by halting the canal. Also, either the canal or another facility must be constructed to carry off the waters developed through the Four Rivers flood control project, or it will be necessary to use the Oklawaha River for that purpose.

A SUBSTANTIAL ECOLOGICAL PLUS IS ACHIEVABLE BY COMPLETION OF THE CANAL

Admittedly any new use of relatively undeveloped land surface will create ecological changes. This is not to say, however, that the changes will necessarily be detrimental. For instance, in Florida the coming to the same general area of Florida of Disney World will bring much greater ecological changes than the canal could ever bring about; but very few people would doubt the value of this project.

The canal, moreover, brings about some ecological pluses by insuring that most of the undeveloped areas of the Oklawaha Valley will remain wild, except for such places as are set aside for public recreation by the government; and the

canal also creates lake-type swimming, boating, and fishing areas not heretofore available for public enjoyment. Three hundred thousand such visitors came to these new Florida canal-produced recreation areas in the past year.

With easily attainable protection against possible negative ecological effects and with maximizing the beneficial ecological effects in the canal area, the end result will be a resounding ecological plus; and a really outstanding one if Government agencies coordinate their efforts in wildlife preservation in the nearby 430,000 acres of Ocala National Forest.

POTENTIAL ECOLOGY THREATS CAN BE ELIMINATED ENTIRELY WITHOUT ADDED COST

In 1970, the U.S. Geological Survey brought out a report on the canal which was universally, as far as I know, considered to be a report favorable to the ecological impact of the canal. It was generally so construed and only after the January 19 news release was doubt cast on this by a release issued February 24, 1971, stating that dissolved contaminants might enter the canal waters by canal traffic and that if they found their way into the aquifer of the State this might have an adverse quality effect on the water in the aquifer. I wrote the Geological Survey to ask what these contaminants might be; in what quantities; and whether or not they could be prohibited; or if allowed could their entry into the stream be protected against. By letter dated April 7 they agreed with me that the existence of a problem of contamination would depend on actions taken to prevent contamination and they went on to say that they did not have any data on the matter, saying:

Although the U.S. Geological Survey's report "Geohydrology of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal Area, With Special Reference to the Ocala Vicinity (January 1970)" discusses the movement of canal water into the ground water system, we have made no studies of probable traffic in the canal and, therefore, have no statistics on which to base an estimate of the quantity of water soluble substances likely to be transported.

They suggested that I contact the Corps of Engineers on the question. I did this and received reassurances that should any such contaminants be allowed to use the canal, proper containment, other protections, and operating procedures could absolutely prevent the presence of any such contaminants in the waters of the canal. Dr. J. A. Edmisten, director of the Office of Environmental Studies at the University of West Florida, has expressed the same opinion.

For any who might suggest that oil from propellers of tugs or barges in the canal might enter the aquifer, they should bear in mind that such oil would be miniscule, if any. Putting the matter in perspective, the above 1970 Geological Survey report shows that the drainage from Ocala Street sewers has already, for some time, poised a head of 35 feet of lubricating oil on the top of the water in the aquifer in the area of the canal. Nothing even remotely approaching this long-accepted penetration of the aquifer could ever be expected from canal usage. No oil from the canal need enter the aquifer at all. Plans for the canal in-

volve plugging any water entrances from the canal to the aquifer if any, in fact, occur.

The Florida State Geologist Robert O. Vernon recently commented on the canal as follows:

It's been claimed that it will ruin the aquifer; and that simply isn't true. It will not. It cannot.

We of the Division of Geology for the State of Florida are convinced that our water resources can be controlled and managed through the construction of the barge canal and no damage will result to these resources.

AN EXCITING, UNIQUE, ECOLOGICAL PLUS COULD BE ADDED IF THE OKALA NATIONAL FOREST IS COORDINATED WITH THE CANAL DEVELOPMENT IN A PROPER MANNER

There are 430,000 wild acres in the Ocala National Forest in close proximity and sometimes touching the Oklawaha River.

It is known today that some animals that are endangered and in dwindling numbers have to be protected by having very large wild areas made available to them. A Florida panther—cougar—for instance, requires 25 square miles and a bear requires about 15 square miles. There are 6,000 deer in the Ocala National Forest, scores of bears, hundreds of turkeys, and the following endangered species: 10 panthers, 50 sandhill cranes, 30 eagles, 200 to 500 alligators, and 200 to 300 ospreys.

There are other things of historic and geological interest in this national forest. Mud Lake is one of only four such lakes in the world, and has great archeological, historical, and scientific value. It is in its final stages before turning to oil and it is millions of years old. There are 32 known prehistoric Indian middens in the area, mostly formed at least 3,000 years before the birth of Christ. Some of the earliest pottery in the United States has been discovered in these mounds. The burial place of King Utina, a contemporary and friend of the European explorers of 400 years ago has been identified on the shores of Lake Kerr. Also included is the site of the Panton-Leslie Indian Trading Post of the late 1700's. Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings wrote beautifully of this area in the "Yearling." Frederick Delius wrote some of his most beautiful music about this area when he lived nearby on the St. Johns River.

There are four publicly owned springs in the Ocala National Forest: Alexander Springs, the 13th largest spring in the world; Juniper Springs; Fern Hammock Springs, and Pine Springs, which has recently been discovered. Also there is an unusual but privately owned salt spring on the edge of the forest. The forest land stretches for miles on the banks of the St. Johns River and along Lake George, which lake is 70 square miles in surface, one of the largest in the United States.

In addition to Lake George, there are three other large lakes in the forest—Lake Dorr, Lake Bryant, and Lake Kerr, and there are over 600 lakes of lesser size in the area. There are within or immediately adjacent to these lands 58,340 acres of lake surface.

These points of interest form the basis for what could become a magnificent ecological preservation in conjunction with the canal development on its northerly ridge. Given the rapid development in the

area which is already destroying the Ocala National Forest, this coordination of development and preservation could provide the last hope for significant wildlife preservation in this unique, subtropical part of our country.

The solution suggested would be a clear-cut manifestation of man's ability to preserve and utilize the environment not only for wildlife and natural beauty, but also for the progress of mankind. Such a solution could illustrate a perfect pattern for our future.

Mr. Speaker, I cite references here which sustain the contentions I have made on the defense, economic, and environmental aspects of the canal; also on the constitutional questions involved in any administrative discussion to terminate the canal:

REFERENCES

1. Defense Values: *Public Law 675* (H.R. 6999), 77th Congress, 2nd Session, July 23, 1942, authorizing the Canal for national defense.

Letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense to President Truman, May 29, 1951, outlining support by Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Letter from Congressman Carl Vinson, Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, to Congressman Clarence Cannon, Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, May 11, 1962, Canal should be constructed for defense.

Importance of the U.S. Inland Waterway System to Country's National Security, Richard B. Rhodes, Colonel, U.S.A., Industrial College of the Armed Forces, March 31, 1966, excerpt on need of barge traffic for national defense.

2. Economic Justification: *Potential Traffic and Transportation Cost Saving of Cross-Florida Barge Canal*, Arthur D. Little, Inc., report for Corps of Engineers, March, 1962 for economic justification.

Chief of Engineers Evaluation of Economic Benefits of Canal, June, 1962.

President Kennedy's request for initial construction funding for economic and defense reasons (House Document Number 128, 88th Congress, 1st Session, June 24, 1963).

Corps of Engineers testimony on economic justification (Hearings before House Public Works Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee, March 10, 1970).

Canal Has Already Stimulated Economy, article Jacksonville Seafarer, Jacksonville, Florida, April, 1971.

Food Prices Lower With Canal, Statement by Florida Commissioner of Agriculture, Doyle Conner, Jacksonville Seafarer, April, 1971.

Future Benefits of Canal Unlimited, article Jacksonville Seafarer, April, 1971.

3. Environmental Gains: *House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee Report for environment and economy* (House Report Number 91-1219, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, June 18, 1970).

Barge Canal Harmless to Underground Water, article from Miami News, Miami, Florida, November 6, 1970.

Letter from Dr. Joe A. Edmisten, Director, Office of Environmental Studies, University of West Florida, Pensacola, to Congressman Charles E. Bennett, April 28, 1971, on control of contaminants in Canal.

Letter from Col. A. S. Fullerton, Jacksonville District Engineer, to Congressman Charles E. Bennett, April 29, 1971, on rigid Canal inspection.

The Answers to the Council on Environmental Quality Summary of Environmental Considerations Involved in the Recommendation for Termination of Construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, a paper presented by U.S. Representative Charles E. Bennett of Florida, May 5, 1971.

4. Constitutionality of Halt Order: *Chamber Pledges Fight for Canal*, article from Jacksonville Journal, Jacksonville, Florida, January 23, 1971.

End Canal Dispute, editorial from Jacksonville Journal, January 25, 1971.

Canal Halt Could Cause Legal Snarl, article from Florida Times-Union and Jacksonville Journal, January 31, 1971.

Probe Canal Halt, Bennett to be Asked, article from Florida Times-Union, February 6, 1971.

Foul Play in Canal Death? editorial from Tampa Tribune, Tampa, Florida, February 28, 1971.

Action to Halt Florida Canal Unconstitutional, Congressman Charles E. Bennett, speech before Jacksonville Bar Association, April 15, 1971.

Adams Says Nixon Broke Faith With Predecessors, article from Jacksonville Journal, May 1, 1971.

JAMES W. STANCIL, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS RETIRE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 the Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, the Honorable James W. Stancil, will retire after having served the Federal Government for more than 36 years. In my efforts on behalf of the veterans of the 22d District of Pennsylvania, I have become well acquainted with this distinguished public servant.

His quiet, unassuming demeanor coupled with his calm, reasoned approach to the problems of the moment have earned for him the respect and admiration of official Washington and its environs.

I must say in all candor that we have not always agreed. In fact, we have probably disagreed more often than we have agreed about the decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. Despite the aura of argument that has surrounded our encounters, Jim Stancil has always been a gentleman, and an extremely effective advocate of his agency's position.

I have on several occasions sponsored legislation to authorize judicial review of Veterans' Administration decisions. Jim Stancil has consistently opposed judicial review. Judicial review has not yet become law. So, Jim Stancil retires from the battleground undefeated.

As the result of our friendly adversary relationship, however, the quality of the decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals has improved and the Nation's veterans have profited.

I for one will miss this ardent disciple of veterans law when he leaves the Washington scene.

Jim Stancil is self-made. He left his home in Clayton, N.C., when he was 15 years of age and located in the Washington area. He worked as a telegraph messenger to support himself and continue his education. He took a similar position with the naval powder factory in Indian Head, Md., and thus his Government career was launched. He was employed by Social Security in January 1937. While working in various clerical and administrative positions, he continued his education. He received his law degree and was admitted to practice in

the District of Columbia in 1941. The Navy called him to active duty in 1942. He served honorably in the South Pacific area. Upon release from active duty in 1946, he came to the Board of Veterans' Appeals as a junior legal consultant. He quickly made his presence felt as he moved from one responsible position to another. He was appointed a member of the Board in 1952, made Vice Chairman in 1956 and Chairman in July 1957. While holding down the top job, he still found time to pursue his education and was awarded a master of science degree in public administration in 1965.

During Chairman Stancil's tenure many important changes were made in the appellate procedures, all pointing toward more professionalism and assuring the appellants due process under the law. He is known among his associates as the guardian of the rights of those he serves and as a man who decides appeals with his heart as well as his head.

His excellent administration of the appellate program has not been unrecognized. He has received the two highest awards the Veterans' Administration can confer, the Meritorious Service Award and the Exceptional Service Award. In addition, he has been cited by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, the Department Service Officers of the American Legion and the B'nai B'rith.

The high regard in which Chairman Stancil is held by his contemporaries is shared by President Nixon, VA Administrator Don Johnson as well as former VA Administrators Harvey Higley and Sumner Whittier. Their feelings for Jim are expressed in the communications that follow.

And now as his long and illustrious career comes to a close, we wish this dedicated public servant and his wife, Pauline, many years of happy and healthy retirement.

The letters follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 7, 1971.

MR. JAMES W. STANCIL,
Chairman, Board of Veterans Appeals, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STANCIL: The Administrator of Veterans Affairs has told me of your decision to retire from the Federal Service.

For more than thirty-six years you have worked faithfully well in the cause of good government. In particular, your profound dedication to the goals of fairness and justice has done much to raise the stature and the effectiveness of the Board of Veterans Appeals. As Chairman, you have provided unusually able leadership to the Board during these past fourteen years, and I am confident that the legacy you have prepared will benefit America's veterans for years to come.

You have earned the gratitude of all of our fellow citizens, and I want to take this opportunity to express my personal thanks as well as my best wishes for the years ahead to Mrs. Stancil and to you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE
FOR REVENUE SHARING,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1971.

MR. JAMES STANCIL,
Chairman, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Veterans' Administration Central Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Warmest best on your retirement! I'm sure it will be lively.

But most importantly, I want to say thank you to you for literally thousands of people whose cause you served. Calmly, judiciously, you made decisions affecting individuals and their lives. With tranquility you administratively ran and presided over the whole tide of request and appeals that flooded to Washington and to the VA from all across America. In all of that time, the veteran has been well served and the agency too. It is no small task to see that appropriate decisions are made, that people for all their deep concerns and frequent emotions are made relatively happy. Your accomplishments have been towering.

So as one of your former bosses who admired you always—your integrity, your industry, your judicial temperament, my very best.

Most sincerely,

SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
Executive Director.

MARINETTE, Wis., May 12, 1971.

Mr. JAMES W. STANCL, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Tempus fugit! Sure does! It doesn't seem possible that you are about to retire. It seems only yesterday that I had the privilege and pleasure of working with you and Larry and the members of your very important Board, as well as the thousands of other V.A. personnel, all doing efficient and effective work for veterans.

Looking back, I take pardonable and understandable satisfaction in having had the opportunity of recommending your Board appointments to the President.

It will always be a source of great pride to you to look back on your years of service and know that you have daily been instrumental in bringing help and assistance to deserving veterans. To me this is the acme of a rewarding occupation.

And hearty congratulations to your successor. I know that he will carry on the tradition of genuine success so ably maintained by you and your grand predecessor, Bob Jarnagin.

Alice and I wish for Pauline and you a very happy, interesting and enjoyable retirement.

Yours sincerely,

HARVEY V. HIGLEY.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1971.

DEAR JIM: John Masfield once wrote, "Love is a flame to set the will on fire."

Your life-style is a life of achievement, a love of service, and the people of the Veterans Administration and the veterans of America will miss your sure hand, steady judgment, and sensitive conscience at the Board of Veterans Appeals.

Jim, I am sorry to see you leave because you have been able to fashion accomplishments and success far in excess of that expected of one man.

As you reflect on your 36 years of public service, you will have the enduring satisfaction of knowing that your daily work has meant so much in erecting our sturdy and compassionate system of benefits and programs for the Nation's veterans and their families.

I might mention that if you ever get the urge to handle a rating schedule again, from Stuart, you will only be 190.2 miles from the ten rating boards at the St. Petersburg Regional Office.

You have been a good friend, and so, my friend, may I tell you that my very best wishes for the years ahead go with you and Mrs. Stancl to your retirement home in Stuart, Florida.

Most sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

THE DESIGNATION OF "MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION DAY"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) to authorize the President to designate June 1, 1971, as "Medical Library Association Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee to make a brief explanation of the purpose of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 103 was passed by the Senate yesterday, and is a short resolution that is a tribute to the importance and to the dedicated work performed by the medical librarians throughout our country.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I support the resolution, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 103

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as a tribute to the important and dedicated work performed by the medical librarians, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the day June 1, 1971, as "Medical Library Association Day" to coincide with their annual convention.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, today the monetary value of the House of Representatives and Congress here has risen. Formerly the value was "one MILLS." Today there is another "MILLS" who has been added to the House of Representatives, so you can see the value of the House of Representatives has gone up.

I realize that one mill does not mean too much from a monetary standpoint, but I think on the Republican side it is a great gain for those over there for having elected Mr. WILLIAM O. MILLS to the Congress here.

I am not sure—and I think things will have to be straightened out—as to which of the "MILLS" is running for the Presidency, whether it is WILBUR MILLS on the Democratic side, or WILLIAM O. MILLS on

the Republican side. So I think he will have to be careful with any remarks or statements he may make relative to the Presidency.

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

PEACE INITIATIVE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS TO REOPEN THE SUEZ CANAL

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House the introduction of a bill which I hope will draw wide favorable response from all nations anxious to see peace in the Middle East. This measure—intended as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act—is being cosponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) and myself. It is designed to cool down the Middle East crisis and hopefully serve as a first step toward a Middle East peace settlement. It is a bipartisan congressional initiative which springs from the heart of the American people—and we pray that it will be received as such.

As you know, one of the major objectives of Secretary of State Rogers' recent visit to that troubled area was to see what could be done about reopening the Suez Canal. Virtually all of the experts agree the canal reopening could be the most effective first step to create a new atmosphere in which real progress for peace could be made.

At present the United States owns more than \$262 million in counterpart Egyptian pounds which are idle and subject to exchange rate losses, devaluations and inflation. It would be to the best interest of all if some of this U.S.-owned excess currency was put to a constructive purpose which cannot help but have a significant impact on the course of world history.

Our amendment would authorize President Nixon to make available up to \$55 million in Egyptian pounds for economic assistance in reopening the Suez Canal to the ships of all nations on an equitable basis. It also would authorize other assistance activities designed to help implement a Middle East peace settlement.

Virtually every nation of the world would benefit from the reopening of the canal in greater trade and development. It is estimated the world economic loss is now running about a billion dollars a year from the canal being closed. These savings on shipping surcharges should also result in higher U.S. exports which will benefit our own industries and workers.

You will note that our bill—as a condition of utilizing U.S.-owned excess Egyptian pounds—requires that the canal be made accessible to ships of all nations including Israel—on an equitable basis. So it should be with all international waterways.

The House may also be interested to know that no U.S. dollars would be used in helping to reopen the canal. The money would come from accounts where the United States currently has no main-

tenance of value guaranties. Of course, these are the accounts where we most often lose the value of our original investments—the income from the sale of Public Law 480 food commodities and repayment of other loans and credits. Since 1954, the United States has lost more than \$2.2 billion worldwide in exchange rate adjustments, devaluations, and inflation. In the case of the United Arab Republic, the losses have totaled more than \$200 million. This figure is almost four times the amount provided in our legislation which could accomplish something really constructive and lasting.

There is also ample precedent in using excess currencies for projects in the Middle East. The United States has done the same for Israel to help construct desalinization plants, schools and hospitals. I am pleased to say that I supported those programs also.

The reopening of the canal—with the proper priority and push—could be accomplished within 4 to 6 months. Despite the advent of supertankers, nearly 90 percent of the world's ships could use the canal if it were to reopen. This action would be a boon to the entire world and would reflect great credit upon our country.

The text of the bill follows:

To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to expend certain foreign currencies for the purpose of providing United States financial assistance in the reopening of the Suez Canal, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of America in Congress assembled, That title II of Representatives of the United States of 1961, relating to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 220A. SUEZ CANAL.—The President is authorized to furnish United States financial assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for assisting the reopening of the Suez Canal after agreement on the reopening by the parties involved for the ships of all nations on an equitable basis including Israel either immediately or in the context of a final peace settlement, and for other assistance activities designed to help implement such a Middle East peace treaty. For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of accounts not insuring maintenance of value, not to exceed \$55,000,000 in Egyptian pounds. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

REOPEN SUEZ CANAL?

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have noted with satisfaction the real progress made in the conduct of negotiations to reopen the Suez Canal. To my mind, such an action is an important first step on the road toward an eventual settlement of the Middle East conflict; one which offers both sides ample reason to stop the shooting

and get on with some serious bargaining.

That is why I applauded Secretary Rogers' important efforts of 3 weeks ago, and that is why I am joining my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) in sponsoring legislation that would authorize the use of \$55 million in U.S.-owned foreign currency to help reopen the Canal, once an agreement to do so has been reached by Egypt and Israel. It is our feeling that the Congress should be on record in support of an agreement of this type, and it is our intention to seek additional cosponsors from both sides of the aisle in identical bills to be introduced next week.

I believe certain points of our legislation bear particular attention:

First. Since the whole point of the proposal is to give the parties some incentive for a settlement, no funds will be released until an agreement between them has been reached.

Second. As a condition of utilizing these funds, the bill requires that the Canal be made accessible to ships of all nations—including Israel—on an equitable basis.

Third. No U.S. dollars are being used here. All of the \$55 million will be U.S. owned Egyptian pounds from accounts we have built up over the years and for which we have no maintenance of value guaranties. These are accounts where we most often lose the value of our original investments—the income from sale of Public Law 480 food commodities and repayment of other loans and credits. Since 1954, the United States has lost more than \$2.2 billion worldwide in exchange rate adjustments, devaluations, and inflation. In the case of the United Arab Republic, the losses have totaled more than \$200 million. So the figure we suggest in this bill is but a fourth of the money we have already lost in Egypt.

I would note further than there is ample precedent for using excess currencies on projects in the Middle East. We have already done so in helping Israel to construct desalinization plants, schools and hospitals.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my purpose here to put pressure of any kind on either side of these negotiations. I have long held that a lasting settlement of the Mideast dispute must be reached freely by both parties without even a trace of external influence. A coerced agreement is not going to resolve anything.

The reopening of the Canal can be accomplished within 4 to 6 months for use by nearly 90 percent of the world's ships. With this legislation, Mr. MOORHEAD and myself are merely trying to make this reopening process a little less painful and, thereby, speed a development which will surely be welcomed around the world; welcomed not only by those commercial interests so long denied access to Suez, but by all men who hope for lasting peace in the Mideast. No action would better advance the prospects for a settlement in this crucial area of the world.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we are all pleased to have BILL MILLS come with us today. Our new colleague brings with him a well-established background in the affairs of the First District of Maryland, having worked closely with the people of the bay country and the representatives of State and county governments for the past 8 years. The area which he represents in Maryland on both the eastern and western shores of the Chesapeake Bay has long been known as the land of pleasant living. This is due, in part, to the great and good work of his predecessor, Rogers Morton.

I think we can be assured that the land of pleasant living is going to become even more pleasant as BILL MILLS continues in Rogers Morton's footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to have BILL MILLS in our delegation.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I share the joy of my colleague from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) over the election of my good friend, BILL MILLS, as Congressman from the First District of Maryland.

I do not know of any man who comes to the House of Representatives better trained for the job than the man whom the voters in the First District of Maryland had the wisdom to elect—BILL MILLS. He served for a number of years as administrative assistant to Rogers C. B. Morton, our good friend and colleague, who is now Secretary of the Interior, and from our dealings with him over that period of time, we know of BILL MILLS' tremendous ability and devotion to his job. He comes to this job probably better trained than any of us came here because from his long experience in the legislative branch, BILL MILLS knows what it is all about.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome him enthusiastically and look forward to the pleasure of working with him for many years to come.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join with my colleagues from Maryland, both Democrats and Republicans, in welcoming WILLIAM O. MILLS to the Congress of the United States. We look forward to working with him here in the House of Representatives on the problems that affect our State and the Nation.

We know of his long experience with the workings of the Congress and we know he will make a great contribution to the work of this House and to the strength of our delegation. We welcome him here to the Congress, congratulate him on his victory, and look forward to the association that lies ahead of us.

**TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OPPOSES BIG BUS BILL**

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Representative Victor H. Ashe, who represents the Third District in the Tennessee House of Representatives. Enclosed in the letter was a copy of a resolution passed by the Tennessee General Assembly indicating their opposition to the big bus bill. The resolution calls for further study of the problems involved, before Congress acts on the bill.

This is an endorsement of a resolution I have had before the House for several sessions now, and I hope the action of the Tennessee General Assembly will quicken the interest of my colleagues in the further studies that my resolution calls for.

I am confident that this resolution is just the first indication of the strong grassroots opposition to any change in the permissible size of the vehicles on our highways.

I am inserting the resolution in the Extension of Remarks and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

**THE 1971 SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION BILL**

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

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1971, the House of Representatives met to consider and vote on the conference report on H.R. 8190, the 1971 second supplemental appropriation bill.

The total amount of money requested in this bill was just under \$7 billion to continue the operations of the Federal Government for fiscal year 1971, which ends on June 30.

The most controversial matter that the House took up in this bill was the SST. The House originally voted to use the funds in the bill—\$85 million—to revive the SST project, rather than as termination funds as the money was first intended. The Senate rejected the revival of the project, but increased the termination appropriation to \$155.8 million. The House rejected this amount of money, and agreed to an appropriation of \$97.3 million for the termination of the SST. The \$12.3 million appropriation, over and above the original cost the House agreed to, was merely for the administrative expenses of spending the other \$85 million.

My "no" vote on this conference report was a vote against using \$12.3 million of the taxpayers money to spend \$85 million of the taxpayers money when, in fact, the Federal Government has more than enough employees to handle this termination without spending one additional cent on administrative costs. The Department of Transportation, which administered the Federal Govern-

ment's involvement in the SST program, during fiscal year 1971, employed 106,517 people, and had a total budget of \$11,239,200,000.

There was a great deal in this bill that had merit and my enthusiastic support, including \$100 million for cancer research. However, the House, time and again, is forced to vote for wasteful, unnecessary and frequently hidden appropriations in order to save legislation that is worthwhile. This waste must be challenged. The President has requested, and the American people have supported, substantial funding in the area of cancer research. There are many bills pending in Congress to provide that funding—including one of my own—and further action is absolutely necessary in my opinion. I did not feel that it was necessary to continue to waste the taxpayers money on unnecessarily increasing the bureaucracy. In fact, that \$12.3 million should have been added to the cancer research money, and not the SST bailout.

**FEDERAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTION
FOR PURCHASERS OF ANTIPOL-
LUTION CONTROL DEVICES FOR
USED CARS**

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, along with 19 colleagues, a bill which will provide for a Federal income tax deduction for those who purchase qualified antipollution control devices for their used cars. I am convinced this bill will be of great economic assistance in lessening the causes of environmental pollution.

Specifically, the bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow an individual taxpayer to deduct from his gross income the purchase price and installation charge for an antipollution device for his used car. It also provides that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall determine the types of antipollution devices which meet set standards in controlling pollution, and are therefore eligible to receive the tax deduction.

I believe this legislation will have wide appeal among Americans and, more importantly, will provide an incentive for individual citizens to do something about pollution. Automobile pollution is one of the major threats to the quality of our environment and to the health of our citizens. Over 90 million cars are now emitting pollutants into the air and the automobile engine is responsible for three-fourths of the carbon monoxide, half the hydrocarbons, and almost half the nitrogen oxide pumped into the air each day.

While under the law today those cars produced since 1968 possess devices to lower their emissions, there are 60 million used cars which have no such protection. It, therefore, remains for us to encourage citizens to purchase and install on their pre-1968 cars pollution

control devices which have been tested and proved effective. Under this bill, the EPA will be given the authority and responsibility to perform tests and promulgate standards. With the assurance of a tax deduction for the antipollution control device, I am convinced that we can stimulate many Americans to equip their cars with these devices and thereby greatly reduce the pollution of our air and the hazards to our health. I am also hopeful that this will encourage the automobile industry and others to develop and manufacture effective antipollution devices.

I would like to urge all my colleagues to give this legislative proposal their careful consideration and to join me in working for its adoption.

APPRECIATION FOR GI EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following excellent letter by Dr. Fred Nelson of Palo Alto, Calif., to Veterans' Administrator Donald Johnson expressing his appreciation for the GI educational benefits and what they have meant to him.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE
EXAMINATION BOARD,
WESTERN REGIONAL OFFICE,
Palo Alto, Calif., May 6, 1971.

Mr. DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator, Veterans Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I was just reading in the April 30th issue of the ACE *Higher Education and National Affairs* that you recently reported that over one million men and women are currently receiving the benefits of the GI bill. While reading that report, I wondered how many of that million ever have, or ever will, write to the VA to express their thanks.

I have personally received the benefits of the current GI bill from the summer of 1967 until January of this year, since on January 7th I was awarded a Ph. D. from Stanford University. I do want to take this occasion to express my sincere thanks to the VA for that very needed assistance over the past four years. I can't say that the GI bill made my Ph. D. possible, since I'm sure I would have eventually gotten the degree without it, but I would have been in debt to NDEA loans (which are increasingly difficult to obtain) by an equal amount. So with a combination of resources, the GI bill, a working (and underpaid) wife, a research assistantship, NDEA loans and personal savings, it became possible for an aging ex-naval officer to become a "doctor."

Because the process of receiving the GI bill's benefits, like most government programs, is so impersonal, I doubt that many recipients think about the fact that there must be other people on the other end as well. Any large governmental program, by its very magnitude, must be impersonal in many ways (computer-printed letters are rather impersonal); and few individuals would even know what real person to write to in order to express their appreciation.

Therefore, let me extend to you Mr. Johnson, as well as to all of the friendly and munificent computers and check-writers at the VA, my sincere and heart-felt thanks for

the benefits of the GI bill that I have received over these past four years.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. NELSON, Ph. D.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS TO THE REPORT ON THE DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce an amendment to H.R. 3818, the defense procurement authorization bill, to limit a part of defense spending to last year's level when the bill reaches the floor sometime in June.

The bill was reported out of the House Armed Services Committee with a budget of \$21.8 billion for procurement and research and development. My amendment would result in a cut of \$1.9 billion from this area of the budget, leaving the Pentagon requests for manpower untouched because they are not a part of this particular authorization bill.

I would like to add these additional remarks to the report on H.R. 3818 in support of my amendment.

An increase in defense spending is not consistent with winding down the Vietnam war and changing spending priorities. In fiscal year 1971 a total of \$19.9 billion was authorized for procurement and R. & D. The fiscal year 1972 budget requests \$21.8 billion for these same items. This should not be allowed to happen.

A check list of possible weapons systems which could be cut from this year's budget is given in table I. The total of all these systems is \$4 billion, far more than is needed to reach last year's spending level. Given this choice of options, the Defense Department should be forced to hold spending to last year's level and Congress should impose a spending ceiling on procurement and R. & D. not to exceed last year's total.

Such a ceiling could be achieved by cutting some combination of weapons systems suggested in table I or it could be looked upon as a pure efficiency cut. To reach last year's level the \$21.8 billion requested this year would have to be reduced by \$1.9 billion or 9 percent. There is at least that much padding in this year's budget.

There are several examples. Excess base support is one. A look at the figures for the Navy will show why:

Pre-Vietnam, fiscal year 1965:	
Navy ships.....	956
Navy military strength.....	667,000
Navy civilian strength.....	343,000
Planned, fiscal year 1972:	
Navy ships.....	657
Navy military strength.....	599,000
Navy civilian strength.....	347,000

While the total number of active ships between the two dates has dropped by about 30 percent, military strength has dropped by 10 percent and civilian strength has actually increased.

New ships are more sophisticated and,

therefore, military strength would probably drop by less than the drop in number of ships, but the increase in civilian strength is a good example of padding.

As another example, the fiscal year 1972 Department of Defense budget request is based on an assumed and fiscal year 1972 Vietnam strength of 150,000 troops which is already out of date. The President's April announcement of accelerated troop withdrawal points to an end fiscal year 1972 Vietnam strength of 100,000. This reduction of 50,000 Vietnam troops would lower the procurement and R. & D. budgets by \$0.4 billion. There is every indication that further adjustments will bring the real end fiscal year 1972 Vietnam troop strength lower still with even greater budget savings.

The point of all this is that there is slack in this year's Defense budget. In these times of pressing domestic needs and taxpayers' revolt we must get the maximum benefit from every dollar spent. A \$19.9 billion ceiling by helping to tighten the budget, is designed to do just that.

Several other points should be made in defense of such an overall budget ceiling. First, it will not impose any hardship on the Department of Defense due to inflation. To buy last year's budget of \$19.9 billion at this year's prices—assuming a 6-percent inflation rate—would mean an added cost of \$1.2 billion. But offsetting this is a reduction in cost due to a winding down of the war.

INCREMENTAL COSTS OF THE WAR

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Net change
Procurement.....	3.90	2.30	-1.60
Research and development.....	.05	.02	-.03
Total.....	3.95	2.32	-1.63

While inflation increases the cost of last year's budget by \$1.2 billion, winding down the war saves \$1.6 billion. Thus even with the ceiling, the budget would be higher than last year's in net real terms.

Second, it is important to point out that we are talking about authorizations not appropriations. Even though authorizations last year were \$19.9 billion, only \$18.6 billion was appropriated. If we authorize the same amount as last year and the full amount is appropriated, there would be a significant increase in procurement and R. & D. even with the ceiling.

The end result is that the ceiling hardly imposes any real hardship on Defense spending. The net effect of inflation and winding down the war increases the budget by \$0.4 billion in real terms. If the full amount is appropriated that would add another \$1.3 billion. Thus, even with the ceiling, spending on procurement and R. & D. for fiscal year 1972 could increase by \$1.7 billion over fiscal year 1971.

In addition there are two possible side effects of a congressional ceiling. First,

it would help surface an issue that the Defense Department must face; that is the choice between quantity and sophistication in buying new weapons. One of the great problems in Defense spending is the exponential growth in the cost of replacement weapons. Table II shows what has happened to the cost in constant dollars of tanks, air-to-air munitions, and fighter aircraft. Similar charts could be made of other weapons. Because of increased—and in many cases unnecessary—sophistication the cost of weapons has grown at an accelerating rate.

Such cost increases have occurred largely because of our method of controlling forces by deciding the number of carriers, divisions, and wings that we wish to buy and then spending what is necessary to buy them. Under this system decisionmakers who are limited, for example, to the number of aircraft they can have will naturally choose the most sophisticated multipurpose model they can find. But if a ceiling were put on the dollar amount to be spent on aircraft perhaps they would choose to buy with the same money three aircraft of a less sophisticated model rather than one aircraft which is extremely sophisticated.

A second beneficial effect of a budget ceiling concerns the complicated problem of cost overruns. One possible way for Congress to cut through the cost overrun jungle of underestimated inflation, design changes, cost of spare parts, buying in, et cetera, is to impose a dollar ceiling on defense and force the Department of Defense to make its own realistic estimates and decisions.

A ceiling is not always an intelligent way to manage defense budgets or to control defense spending. But the cry for reordering of our national priorities and the cry of the taxpayers' revolt make it imperative that defense spending not exceed last year's levels. Thus it is desirable through use of a ceiling to hold spending to last year's \$19.9 billion level.

A ceiling leaves the choice of the cut up to the military and the Department of Defense. Some weapons systems could be cut, or there could be an efficiency cut and tightening of the budget. In addition, a ceiling has some important incentives, namely that it would help to force the Department of Defense to face the problems of increasing cost of weapon sophistication and the problem of cost overruns.

Given present political realities and alternatives, a ceiling is probably the best way of controlling defense spending that we have.

TABLE I.—List of possible weapons systems to be cut

[In millions of dollars]	
Weapon:	
Eliminate new DD963.....	600
Eliminate S-3A procurement.....	500
Eliminate F-14, more R. & D. on new plane.....	950
Cut 2 of 5 attack submarines.....	325
Cut ABM.....	1,200
Eliminate B-1.....	370
Eliminate AWAC's.....	145
Total.....	4,090

TABLE II.—INCREASED COST OF REPLACEMENT WEAPONS
(IN CONSTANT FISCAL YEAR 1970 DOLLARS)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Weapon	Date	Amount
(1) Tanks:		
M-3	Early 1940's	\$125
M-48	Early 1950's	175
M-60	Early 1960's	200
M-60A1E2	Early 1970's	500
MRT-70	Middle 1970's	900
(2) Air-to-air munitions:		
AIM-9B	Late 1950's	\$10
AIM-7D	Middle 1960's	50
AIM-7F	Early 1970's	120
AIM-54	Middle 1970's	400
(3) Fighter aircraft:		
P-51	Early 1940's	\$200
F-86	Late 1940's	400
F-100C	Middle 1950's	1,100
F-104C	Late 1950's	1,600
F-4B	Early 1960's	3,500
F-15	Middle 1970's	9,000

THE NEED FOR RENEGOTIATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1971, marks the termination date of the Renegotiation Board, and once more it comes before the Congress for an extension—for the 10th time since it was created in 1951. The Board is the only independent agency whose exclusive function is to recapture excessive profits on defense, space, and certain other Government contracts; and so, the need for it to continue, serving as a guard over the excess profits that occur despite the improvement in the procurement process.

Unique conditions surround the defense-space market, which are not found in the private market which makes it susceptible to limited and ineffective price competition; and hence, to the possibility of excess profits. The items supplied are specialized and complex, and the cost and production experience is not usually reliable or available. The lack of adequate price competition, and the need for predictions, leaves a great susceptibility for inaccurate "profits," especially during the surge of procurement contracts that arise during military involvement.

The Renegotiation Board, is the only agency that exists, to check these contracts after the fact to assure that unnecessary profits are not made at the expense of the taxpayer. It complements the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, which does not apply in all areas of procurement, and which does not afford protection against inaccurate cost estimates.

The essential role of the Renegotiation Board is attested to by the substantial recoveries it has made of excess profits.

During the past year, the Renegotiation Board made 123 determinations of excess profits, totaling \$33,453,457, according to the Board's 15th Annual Report of 1970. This brings the total amount of such determinations to \$1,030,309,655 since the beginning of the Board's work.

In addition, during fiscal year 1970 the Board reports that contractors voluntarily gave price reductions and refunds to the Government totaling \$18,168,705. This brought the total of such voluntary refunds and reductions to \$1,352,145,897.

Thus, like the draft, the Renegotiation Board brings in voluntary dollars as well as drafted dollars—more volunteers than draftees, in fact, over the long term. The record also indicates that 89 percent of their determinations are made by agreements with contractors.

And all these refunds are possible, even though it has a shortage of manpower. There are 232 employees who are required to oversee \$48 billion of procurement—not nearly enough to prevent backlog of cases and insure proper oversight.

The need to extend the life of the Renegotiation Board is apparent. I urge my colleagues to support this extension.

As you may know, the House Ways and Means Committee has just reported out a bill, H.R. 8311, which among other things provides for the extension of the Renegotiation Board for 2 years. Public hearings were not held this year, but was considered in executive session for less than an hour.

Among other things, the bill provides for the transfer of jurisdiction of the Board cases from the Tax Courts to the Court of Claims, and changes the interest charged on refunds. In light of the significant changes that are in this measure, I would hope that it will come before the House floor under an open rule. I am inserting a copy of the letter I have written the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee on this matter. I am also taking the liberty of enclosing an article written by the Chairman of the Renegotiation Board, Mr. Lawrence Hartwig. The material follows:

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Committee has acted on a bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951. Although I have not seen the bill nor a report on it, I understand that the bill is very similar to H.R. 8311.

I readily understand your heavy Committee schedule, which resulted in the decision not to hold public hearings on this bill.

In view of the fact that there were no public hearings, and since the bill as reported does make significant changes in the Act, I believe that it would be appropriate for the House to consider this matter under an open rule. Accordingly, I respectfully suggest that you ask for an open rule on this bill, so that the record can be developed more fully and the Members may have an opportunity to offer amendments.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

THE NEED FOR RENEGOTIATION

(By Lawrence E. Hartwig, Chairman, the Renegotiation Board)

On March 7, 1955, at a time when defense procurement was sharply reduced after Korea, President Eisenhower recommended the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 and stated: "I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it." Eleven years later, at the peak of the Vietnam buildup, President Johnson commented on signing yet another extension of the act: "We need this vital measure. It is another important tool in our constant quest to get a dollars worth of value for every defense dollar spent." Thus, in periods of both increase and decline in procurement renegotiation has been deemed nec-

essary for the national welfare. By June 30, 1971, the present termination date of the act, it will have been in force for 20 years through nine extensions.

The purpose of renegotiation is the elimination of excessive profits on defense and space contracts and related subcontracts.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Although the present act was adopted in 1951, statutory renegotiation as an instrument of national policy goes back to 1942. Prior to that time Congress sought to prevent excessive profits on ship and aircraft procurement by enacting the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934 and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; these statutes limited profits to fixed percentages of the contract price. The Renegotiation Act of 1942 provided for the renegotiation of individual contracts and subcontracts. Within a short time, however, the Renegotiation Act of 1943 was enacted. This act established a fiscal year basis for review of a contractor's total renegotiable business and prescribed specific factors to be considered in determining excessive profits. The 1943 act terminated on December 31, 1945. Subsequently Congress enacted the Renegotiation Act of 1948, which carried renegotiation to the effective date of the present act.

DEFENSE-SPACE MARKET

The continuing need for renegotiation was stated by President Eisenhower in his already quoted message as follows:

"In spite of major improvements, which we have achieved in our contracting and price redetermination operations, there nevertheless remains an area in which only renegotiation can be effective to assure that the United States gets what it needs for defense at fair prices. . . ."

The search for better ways to procure for defense and space needs has continued to the present time, and, indeed, significant improvements have been made. However, no conceivable improvement in the procurement process can alter two fundamental characteristics of that process: (1) the lack of a traditional market place to guide the pricing of most procurement, and (2) the fact that procurement is on a contract-by-contract basis.

There are significant differences between the defense-space market and the private competitive market. In the private market firms usually compete with each other in terms of quality and price and produce goods with a known technology and cost. These conditions, are not usually found in major segments of the defense-space market. Novel, costly and complex aircraft, missiles, space vehicles and other specialized items, which incorporate the latest advances in a rapidly changing technology, are purchased in that market. As Secretary Seamans said in the fall-1969 issue of this Journal (p. 3): "The desired characteristics of military systems frequently demand a quantum jump in the state of the art. In the commercial world this type of requirement is seldom laid upon large scale producers." Hence in the procurement of defense-space items, reliable production and cost experience is not usually available for accurately increasing costs. Contract costs are therefore but estimates, that is, predictions of future events. Like all predictions, they are subject to change by later developments. Thus, in the procurement of major weapons or space systems cost estimates may be widely off target.

EXCESSIVE PROFITS LIKELY

The pervasive cost uncertainty that characterizes most of modern defense and space procurement, coupled with the fact that in many of these contracts huge sums are at stake, makes price competition often too risky for contractors or too costly for the Government.

But even in the procurement of products similar in type to those traded in com-

mercial markets, where price competition would seem to be feasible, a reasonable profit outcome is not always assured. Notwithstanding this basic similarity such defense-space items are often specialized; the demand for them is often irregular and, in some cases, geographically concentrated. Under such circumstances, price competition may be limited and ineffective. Although this lack of adequate price competition is a possibility even under quite "normal" conditions in time of war or national emergency, when there are sudden surges in the volume of procurement, this possibility is much greater. It is obvious, therefore, that contractors who are able to take Government contracts under these conditions may well make unusually high profits.

All in all, the conclusion follows that vast governmental expenditures are being made in the defense and space areas under circumstances where, regardless of the diligence of procurement officials, there is no guaranty against excessive profits.

The opportunity for contractors to realize excessive profits on Government business is further enhanced by the fact that all such business is awarded on a contract-by-contract basis.

This aspect of Government contracting cannot be emphasized enough because an individual price that has been carefully arrived at may nevertheless, as a result of unforeseen developments, produce excessive profits. As the 1956 report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation stated:

"If all prime contracts and subcontracts could be made at prices that were fair, not only in the light of the facts and circumstances then existing, but also in relation to all pertinent developments occurring later in the fiscal year of the contractor, principally additional production volume, and if all such present and future facts could be known by the procurement officer negotiating each individual prime contract, and by each industry purchasing agent negotiating each individual subcontract, there would be no need or justification for renegotiation at any time. Since this is not possible, it follows that an individual price that has been soundly negotiated and is honestly believed to be fair and proper at the time of the negotiation may prove, in relation to subsequent developments, to be unfair and improper in the sense that it yields excessive profits to the contractor." * * * (Report of The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation Relating to Renegotiation, 84th Cong., 2d Sess., Senate Document No. 126, p. 13.)

Procurement agencies price each contract separately and independently. On the other hand, renegotiation reviews the profit results of contracts after the fact on a fiscal year basis because the profitability of a contractor's participation in defense-space business can only be judged on the basis of his aggregate profit. This aggregate profit can only be evaluated retrospectively.

RENEGOTIATION ONLY REASONABLE DETERMINANT

All the facts relating to a contractor's future operations cannot be known to procurement officers at the time a contract is let, no matter how sophisticated the personnel and procedures may be. Renegotiation therefore provides the only means to determine whether the profit of a contractor—or a subcontractor—is reasonable.

To the extent that the need for any activity can be measured by its results, the need for renegotiation is well attested by its achievements. Excessive profits determinations made by the Renegotiation Board from its inception amounted to \$997 million as of June 30, 1969; by now this figure has gone well over \$1 billion. These amounts are before Federal income tax credits; net recoveries by the Government as a result of the Board's determinations amounted to \$394 million as of the end of the last fiscal year.

Although the purpose of renegotiation is not the raising of revenue, the recovery of \$394 million is significant. Furthermore, the material benefits of renegotiation cannot be measured solely in terms of recovery. Voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions made by the contractors also reflect, at least in part, the impact of renegotiation. These refunds and price reductions are voluntary, that is, they are not made pursuant to contract terms. Consequently, it is probable that in many instances they were made because of, among other reasons, a realization that, were they not made, the amounts involved would be recouped in renegotiation. From the inception of the act through June 30, 1969, contractors and subcontractors reported to the Board \$1.3 billion of voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions.

DEFERS OVERPRICING

Renegotiation also has an impact on procurement as a deterrent against overpricing. Over the years, procurement officials have repeatedly testified to the value of renegotiation in their endeavor to negotiate closer prices; realizing that excessive profits will have to be refunded, contractors are more likely to agree to reasonable prices. The Senate Committee on Finance also recognized this effect of renegotiation in its 1966 report, in which it recommended an extension of the act:

"* * * the renegotiation process has had a deterrent effect on overpricing on Government contracts because of the realization that renegotiation is backstopping the allowable profits." (S. Rept. No. 1298, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1966).)

There is no way to estimate the savings that accrue to the Government as a result of this deterrent effect, but there is reason to believe that the amount is quite large.

Over and beyond these benefits to the Government and taxpayers, renegotiation benefits the contractors as well, and not only because they, too, are taxpayers. The national economy as a whole is sufficiently competitive to guarantee, in the long run, fairness in the profits of a business enterprise selling in the private market; this is not necessarily true in the defense-space market. Because of the peculiar characteristics of that market, unintended and unanticipated profits cannot be avoided and excessive profits realized by a contractor may give him an unfair advantage over his competitors. Renegotiation helps to protect these competitors against such occurrences.

NECESSARY SUBSTITUTE FOR COMPETITION

Our economic system is based on the idea of the objectivity of market forces in an environment in which competition is presumed to adjust prices and costs to yield a fair profit. To the extent that the defense-space procurement process introduces—quite unavoidably—non-competitive elements, it may endanger that system. Renegotiation in all its aspects—both as a deterrent against overpricing and as an instrument for recapturing excessive profits—tends to assure that the rewards of defense-space business are comparable to those that would be obtained by contractors in a price competitive market. Thus to the extent that renegotiation ensures that no one profits unduly from such business, it is a valuable tool.

HEALTH CARE REFORM NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for comprehensive reform in the financing and delivery of health care in the United States.

Americans last year spent \$70 billion

on health care—more than \$325 for each man, woman, and child—yet this Nation ranks worse than 10 to 17 other countries in life expectancy and infant mortality.

Not only are we spending more today on health care than we were a decade ago—a 170-percent increase from \$26 billion—but we are giving it a bigger share of our national wealth—from 5.3 percent of the gross national product to 7 percent.

Nearly two-thirds of that increase in expenditures in the last 10 years has not been for additional services but merely to meet price inflation. Overall medical costs have increased twice as fast as the cost of living; hospital costs alone have risen five times as fast as other prices.

And what are we getting for our \$70 billion?

We rank 13th among industrialized nations in infant mortality; 11th in life expectancy for women; 18th in life expectancy for men; about 150 U.S. counties do not have a single doctor and another 150 have only one physician; twice as many black infants die in the first year of life as whites; poor people suffer four times as many heart conditions, six times as much mental illness, arthritis, and high-blood pressure as their more affluent neighbors; there is a national shortage of 50,000 physicians, 150,000 medical technicians, and 200,000 nurses.

Let me put it another way:

There is a significant shortage of trained medical personnel—ranging from doctors and nurses to technicians and paraprofessionals—and of proper facilities; and the personnel and facilities which we do have are inadequately distributed geographically. Compounding this is the problem of skyrocketing costs.

What, then, should we be getting for our \$70 billion?

Everyone, all Americans, should be getting the same high quality of health care and at prices all can afford.

There is no conceivable reason why a person should get better health care because he lives in a better neighborhood, has a better job, has the right color skin or has more money. Health care should not be made available according to conditions of economics, age, sex, race, employment, or any other factor than one—need.

There is no conceivable reason why the wealthiest, most technically, and scientifically advanced nation on earth cannot also be the healthiest.

This has been aptly termed the paramount issue of the 1970's. I have joined nearly 80 colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 22, the Health Security Act of 1971. I endorse this bill not as the solution to the problem, but because I believe it comes closer than any yet offered to making the American health care system truly the best in the world.

This is a consumer program, not a health industry-insurance company program, and the consumer will have a major voice in setting policy and running the system. Of course, the medical profession will also play an important role, but this will be a health care partnership, not a dictatorship.

The essential key to health care reform is a fundamental shift in emphasis

from crisis medicine to preventive medicine.

The more we do today to prevent illness and keep the population healthy, the less we will have to spend tomorrow on cures and treatment.

Adequate health care is not a privilege. It is a fundamental right of all Americans.

This is basically contrary to the predominant philosophy of our present health care system—health service now centers around the independent practitioner, with care a privilege rather than a right.

We must revolutionize this system. We must step back at every level and critically reexamine the total health care system. The drastic revisions in health manpower, distribution, financing and training, the great task of reeducating both physicians and patients to a new health care system must begin now with innovations and encouragement at local, State, and Federal levels.

The President has shown he is aware of the national crisis in health care, but he has not demonstrated a willingness to take the steps necessary to solve it.

I welcome his support for the group practice concept, which he calls health maintenance organizations, and his support for increasing the supply of medical manpower in rural areas and urban ghettos. But I cannot support very much of his strategy for dealing with the problem.

One of the most serious shortcomings of the President's proposal, and of several others such as the American Medical Association's medicredit, is reliance on the private health insurance industry.

The private health insurance industry, which has traditionally shown far greater interest in wealth than health, must bear a large portion of the responsibility for the skyrocketing medical costs we are experiencing.

It has shown itself either unwilling or unable to do much, if anything, about keeping prices down. Its emphasis on treatment in hospitals rather than in less expensive outpatient facilities has helped send costs up.

The administration plan is industry oriented when it should be consumer oriented. The insurance companies can take care of themselves—it is time to help the American people for a change.

There are many other flaws in the administration plan—the poor, near poor, and the elderly would get far less protection than the rest of the population; even middle-income families would be hard pressed to meet the large deductibles and copayments required of them in major illnesses; medicare hospital coverage for the elderly would be decreased, as would medicaid help for the poor.

I am skeptical of the commitment to improving health care when its comes from administration that has vetoed several pieces of needed health legislation; impounded millions of dollars appropriated by the Congress for health programs; cutback spending on biomedical research and forced the closing of 19 National Institutes of Health centers.

As part of the new health care system that we must build, there must be a new health team. We need to expand the sup-

ply of medical manpower through the training of allied health personnel such as physician's assistants, child health practitioners, community health workers, and family planning aides.

Within the new health team system, duties and responsibilities would be allocated on the basis of actual capabilities for performing specific tasks, rather than by possession of a categorical title. Ideally, the distinctions among health personnel should be made on the basis of the nature of the judgments that each level is capable of making. This fluid system, directed by its most highly trained member, the physician, could provide superior health care with maximum efficiency, low cost, and better service for its recipients.

While I am hopeful of the President's new stance, his proposals should be carefully studied. I intend to exert all the pressure I can for legislation that will free health resources from their narrow, wasteful roles and divert them to the growth and expansion of the team system.

There is virtue in the concept of close physician-patient contact. But the population needs and environmental health problems stemming from neglect in housing, nutrition, and preventive medicine—shameful for a country of our wealth—have overwhelmed the capacity of the old system.

That system must be changed.

I support a system of prepaid national health insurance based on the proven social security concept. All the evidence indicates this public insurance system operates with greater efficiency and lower cost to the consumer than the private insurers.

I do not support a system that would abolish the personal doctor-patient relationship. Every person should be able to chose his own doctor, if he wishes, and all persons should have equal access to the same high quality of medical care and at prices they can afford.

I do not support a system of national health service in which the government owns and operates all facilities, and everybody works for the government. What I have in mind is a true partnership between the private and public sectors, between the health professional and the patient. There will be Government financing and administrative management, accompanied by private provision of personal health services through private practitioners, institutions, and other providers of medical care.

It must be a system truly responsive to the needs of the people, a health care system appropriate to our advanced and affluent Nation's needs and desires.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for today through June 1, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for the week of May 17 on account of official business as member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, THOMSON OF

Wisconsin, STEIGER of Arizona, WIGGINS, and LUJAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of official business May 27 through June 1.

Messrs. NIX, WRIGHT, DE LA GARZA, MOSS, KAZEN, UDALL, and RANDALL (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for today through June 1, 1971, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs), and to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHoup), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGL in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEGICH in five instances.

Mr. BRASCO in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. FLOWERS in six instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York in four instances.

Mr. DULSKI in six instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in three instances.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 485. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that certain aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall be eligible to operate amateur radio stations in the United States and to hold licenses for their stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 316, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on June 1 next.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 316, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 1, 1971, 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:

769. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an explanation of the delay in submission of the first annual report on the administration of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

770. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract for a research project entitled "Renovation and Operation of HRI Coal Gasifier," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

771. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 274, *The Creek Nation, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America*, Defendant, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

772. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to convert criminal penalties to civil penalties in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

773. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting prospectus for the construction of buildings at various locations in the United States, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

774. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improved review and coordination of the foreign affairs aspects of Federal research by the Department of State and other agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

775. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on more effective use of manpower and machines recommended in mechanized post offices, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. ADAMSO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. WOLFF, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 8762. A bill to provide States and localities with financial assistance to meet their

responsibilities and increasing fiscal problems by providing them a general grant of Federal revenue which shall be allocated on the basis of need and State and local revenue-raising effort, and to create an income tax commission to study the feasibility of establishing a single system of collecting Federal, State, and local income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 8763. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 8764. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8765. A bill to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, to raise the limit on the amount of direct housing loans which may be made by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8766. A bill to establish the statutory maximum interest rate of 6 percent for Veterans' Administration guaranteed and direct loans and to expand authority to make direct loans to veterans where private capital is unavailable at the statutory interest rate; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 8767. A bill relating to the requirements for proof of entitlement to black lung benefits under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8768. A bill to amend the black lung benefits provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, to facilitate proof of entitlement in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8769. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 with respect to the amounts of black lung benefits in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8770. A bill to extend for an additional year the existing program for payment of black lung benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8771. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to extend black lung benefits to orphans whose fathers die of pneumoconiosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 8772. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. VESSEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 8773. A bill to provide a Federal income tax deduction for expenditures for pur-

chase and installation of air pollution control devices on used vehicles, and to provide for certification of such devices by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 8774. A bill to designate certain lands in the West Sister Island National Wildlife Refuge in Ohio as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H.R. 8775. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to expend certain foreign currencies for the purpose of providing U.S. financial assistance in the reopening of the Suez Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 8776. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 8777. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide public service employment for Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8778. A bill to establish a comprehensive program of insurance and reimbursement with respect to losses sustained by the fisheries trades as a result of environment disasters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8779. A bill to amend the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to make municipal governments eligible for technical services under the act, to extend the act through fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 457. Resolution relating to expenditure of funds from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for certain allowances to Members, officers, and standing committees of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

196. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the appropriation of funds for improvements at the Tallahassee Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Appropriations.

197. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

199. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to providing a Veterans' Administration hospital for the Rio Grande Valley area; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SIKES introduced a bill (H.R. 8780) for the relief of James F. Rausch, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.