

tory. We are told we must change even if for the worst—just to change from our present system.

One such plan receiving much publicity is the Nixon Administration plan known as "National Health Insurance Partnership Act" introduced in the Senate on April 22. The estimated cost is about 5.5 billion dollars a year to the federal taxpayers plus far larger but still unestimated costs by contributions from employers and workers. The government's payments for health care would be on graduated basis—covering all or nearly all of the bill for poor people and paying a lessening portion of the bill as people move into higher income brackets. The more taxes you pay, the less you'd get back on medical expenses.

Another plan known as the "Health Security Act" was introduced in the Senate. Exeverybody would be covered from cradle to grave. The estimated cost of this plan is conservatively placed at from 44 to 77 billion dollars a year. Half of the costs would come from general revenue of the government and half from social security taxes. In other words, the working people would pay the doctor bills of the non-workers. The federal bureaucrats would operate the entire program through a Health Security Board, which would set standard charges and prepay the bills. Performance of doctors, hospitals, and others would be checked by impartial professionals such as we have experienced by Equal Employment Opportunity and Civil Rights experts.

A look at the quality of health care in countries which have undertaken equal medical care—socialized medicine—should raise serious questions as to abandoning our present workable system for an inferior program in the U.S.

When England embarked on socialized medical care in 1944, the estimated cost was \$500 million per year. In the first year the cost was double that and is now seven times what its promoters thought it would be. Discounting inflation the cost is still about three times its original estimate. And people complain about waiting lines and impersonal attention more than before.

Doctor Lloyd Dawe, one of the many British physicians who have in recent years immigrated to the U.S., commented as follows on his experience with the National Health Service:

"As an intern in a London hospital and later in general practice there, I witnessed an unbelievable waste, interference, and bureaucratic regimentation that have accompanied Britain's unwieldy social experiment. I paid government imposed fines for prescribing the best medicine for my patients. I spent anxious hours in search of hospital space for the critically ill. I saw hospital grants frivolously spent. . . . Practice

under the National Health Service soon became intolerable for me, as it has for thousands of British and European doctors who have left their countries to practice in America. . . ."

In England which has had socialized medicine since 1944, it is reported that the average wait for non-urgent operations is 22 weeks, and the waiting period may stretch to years. People have to wait up to seven years for treatment of hernias or varicose veins. But in jolly old England you have equal medical treatment for all—equal waiting.

The August 10, 1970 issue of U.S. News & World Report comments on the cost of the French system, where the average worker now pays 33%—1/3—of his wages for health services by the government. It supports a lot of dead head doctors who otherwise couldn't make a living practicing:

"In France, where the government pays about 80% of the fees of physicians cooperating in the national health plan, deficits are getting out of hand. The social security system's health fund will be about 165 million dollars in the red this year. If present trends continue, the deficit would rise to 1.8 billion by 1975."

Commenting on socialized medicine in Sweden, a U.S. News & World Report for Jan. 24, 1966 states:

"The average patient here finds his situation has worsened rather than improved. It is more difficult for him to get a doctor. He must wait longer to get into a hospital, and he may be forced to leave the hospital before he is medically ready for discharge. . . . Overburdened doctors must turn away thousands of patients annually—many of them old people who badly need medical care. . . . Waiting periods for special treatment are sometimes so long that patients become incurably ill, even die, before they can get adequate care.

"Gravely ill patients, in need of immediate treatment, had to be turned away from hospital emergency rooms. There were not enough medical personnel on hand to take care of them."

In Quebec province of Canada, the system of socialized medicine grew so bad that an estimated 3,000 medical specialists deserted—left—moving mainly to Ontario and to the U.S. Whereupon, the government of Quebec in October of last year, passed a law requiring all medical specialists to return to work on minimum notice. Those not returning were liable to a fine of \$200 to \$500 per day plus possibility of a one month jail sentence.

The Canadian's emergency policy included doctors who had, during the previous three months, moved to other provinces or to other countries. They could be fined even though they were permanently practicing in other provinces or nations. Penalty could include

confiscation of any property they might still own in Quebec. That's what liberty under law has deteriorated to in socialist Canada.

The experience of other nations with socialized medicine should serve as a stark warning to the U.S. to beware on embarking on such a course for political promises to get the votes of the poor and disgruntled.

The enactment into law of a national health plan would necessitate payrolling a whole new layer of bureaucrats to administer the program—to draft guidelines and to spy on doctors. The administrative cost of Medicare and Medicaid is estimated to be greater than the doctor cost, whereas the administrative cost of private insurance programs is only about 30% of the premium. So the current propaganda about the high cost of medicine as an argument for nationalizing health services simply doesn't hold water. Under socialized medicine the costs would go up and the quality of service would go down.

A minor factor never mentioned by the leadership of either of the two major political parties is that any national health care program is clearly unconstitutional. The sovereign states did not delegate the power of providing health care to the federal government. This power belongs therefore to the States and the people thereof in accordance with the 9th and 10th amendments—that is if the States and the people think they can improve medical treatment by hurrying doctors and providing inferior treatment at higher cost.

In Louisiana health services are provided by doctors in a free enterprise system. The doctors themselves, as well as patients, families, relatives, friends, some churches, and other charitable groups, help the less fortunate. In addition, our state of Louisiana has for many years operated charity hospitals to provide medical aid to the indigent. Our system may not be perfect, but it's superior and far ahead of any example suggested.

If the Nixon Administration really wants to return power to the people, why not allow the States and local governments to retain a certain percentage of the income taxes their citizens pay to Washington, say about 20% or 30% or even more. The State and local governments could then provide more and better services, including health care if their people prefer it that way.

When you want a doctor, you want one. You want him to be your doctor and not working for the Washington crowd. You know the man who pays the bills is always the one who is sought to be satisfied. And when it comes to you and your family and your doctor, you don't want Uncle Sam, federal judges, H.E.W., the Justice Department the U.N., or even the President looking over his shoulder.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 4, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rabbi Israel O. Goldberg, Ahavas Shalom Agudas Achim Anshe Sphard, Randallstown Synagogue Center, Randallstown, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty G-d, Sovereign of the Universe, we invoke Thy blessings upon this convention of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

We pray to Thee, to grant our chosen Representatives the wisdom and guidance, so that they may ever pursue the paths of justice, democracy, and brotherhood.

Enable them to be the instruments in

eradicating intolerance, prejudice, and malice from the midst of our great Nation.

Guard our beloved country from every enemy, pestilence, and sorrow; from distress, anguish, and gloom. Secure our borders to be free from totalitarian ideologies, pagan philosophies, and the anti-democratic principles.

Grant that our country may forever serve as a beacon light for liberty-loving people throughout the world.

May we in concert with all peoples who cherish freedom, achieve speedily the triumph of Thy kingdom of peace and good will on earth. 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.

RABBI ISRAEL O. GOLDBERG

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

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Rabbi Israel O. Goldberg

could be with us today to offer the prayer. Rabbi Goldberg is a distinguished religious and community leader in Randallstown, Md., and he has a background of interesting and challenging positions.

Rabbi Goldberg was born in New York City and received his ordination in 1960 from the Jacob Joseph Theological Seminary. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Brooklyn College and his master's from Yeshiva University where he is currently working on his doctorate.

He has served as rabbi of the Young Israel of New Rochelle, N.Y., for 4 years where he originated the Hebrew Heritage program. Rabbi Goldberg was also one of the founders of the Ohr Hameir Theological Seminary of New Rochelle.

In 1965 Rabbi Goldberg moved to Boston to become leader of Congregation Agudath Israel, Boston's largest orthodox synagogue. While there, Rabbi Goldberg served as treasurer of the rabbinical council of Massachusetts, a permanent member of the Bet Din of the Hawa'ad Harabbanim of Massachusetts, a member of the advisory committee to the Boston Housing Authority, and chaplain of two hospitals as well as Boston's penal institutions.

Rabbi Goldberg became the spiritual leader of the Randallstown Synagogue Center in the summer of 1970. He is the secretary of the Rabbinical Council of America, Maryland Region and liaison rabbi to the Council of Orthodox Synagogues of Baltimore.

I again want to thank Rabbi Goldberg for being here today and hope he can return again.

UNDERSTANDING, GOOD WILL JOIN BETHLEHEM, PA., AND TANDABAYASHI, JAPAN—SISTER "CHRISTMAS CITIES"

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged and proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an act of international understanding and good will which has evolved from the "sister city" relationship which links the people of Bethlehem, Pa., with the people of Tandabayashi, Japan.

In 1959, moving to participate in the sister city program which had been initiated 3 years earlier by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the city of Bethlehem, known as the "Christmas City of the United States," extended an invitation to the city of Tandabayashi, known as the "Christmas City of Japan," to become "sister cities."

Through the years, the bonds of international friendship between the citizens of the two cities have strengthened as the communities themselves, public officials, private citizens, and civic organizations participated in exchange of gifts, visits, and information about their respective history, industries, government, and culture.

Then, last fall, in an extraordinary gesture of good will, Yoshinaga Sakon,

a landscape artist from Tandabayashi, flew to Bethlehem at his own expense to design and develop the "Japanese Garden of Serenity" for the new Bethlehem City Center, a complex of city government office buildings, town hall and public library.

On May 15, the garden of serenity was dedicated in the presence of Mr. Sakon with the Japanese Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency H. E. Nobuhiko Ushiba, as guest and principal speaker. The final touch to the garden, a delicately shaped Japanese lantern, was presented as a gift from the mayor of Tandabayashi.

Mayor H. Gordon Payrow, Jr., of Bethlehem, expressing the city's gratitude, told the Japanese guests:

This has meant more to the people of Bethlehem in understanding the customs and people of Japan than anything that could be gotten from books.

The international good will is continuing as the people of Bethlehem reciprocate with a shipment of exhibits and complete furnishings for a "Bethlehem Room" to be established in Tandabayashi.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to invite the attention of my colleagues, to the remarks which I will insert in the Extensions of Remarks, of Ambassador Ushiba and to several articles which describe more fully the great good which is emerging from the sister city relationship which links Bethlehem and Tandabayashi.

MORATORIUM SHOULD BE DECLARED ON CONSTRUCTION OF FURTHER BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

AND NOW SKYSCRAPERS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I note by the papers that balloons will be floated from the top of the buildings in downtown Washington this weekend so that we can see how high the skyscrapers will be in the future. Also I note that legislation has been introduced relating to the Antietam battlefield, to preserve that most significant battleground from commercial or residential development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that we want to build additional buildings on Capitol Hill as recommended by the leadership on both sides of the rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, if this keeps up the District of Columbia will be an uninhabitable place for a seat of government within a matter of a few years.

I believe it is time that the leadership ask a moratorium on the planning and construction of any Federal public buildings in the District of Columbia if not for 75 years for at least 10 years. There is no more obvious, pressing national need in Washington today. Poverty, schools, crime, pollution, all of it hinges on the need for order out of disorder in this building mania.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 464) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 464

Resolved, That William O. Mills of Maryland be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8825) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8825, with Mr. MURPHY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the usual annual appropriation bill for the legislative branch of the Government for the next fiscal year. It includes funds for the operation of the House, various joint activities of the Congress, as well as related activities such as the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office.

Conforming to long practice, the funds for the operation of the Senate are not included but are left for the decision and insertion by that body.

I will give the Members a few highlights of the bill. We had extensive hear-

ings, and made a pretty complete record. Copies of the hearings are available if you are interested. We recommend a total of \$449,739,605. The budget request considered a total of \$455,744,595. The reduction recommended is \$6,004,990. The net increase over the 1971 appropriation is \$79,836,710 due mainly to the following:

Included in the bill is \$71,090,000 for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, a net increase of \$55,480,000 over 1971. The cost of Federal pay increases is over \$12 million. The impact of the Legislative Reorganization Act accounts for over \$4 million. The cost of various House resolutions approved by the House for special and select committees and additional allowances for Members of the House is over \$3 million. In connection with increased workload there is an increase of over \$3 million for official mail costs due to additional costs and an increase in the volume of mail handled. This includes outgoing mail for both the House and Senate. An additional \$6 million is to cover increased cost and volume of the congressional printing and binding. Four million dollars is in the bill for additional workload at the Library of Congress.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, some of these increases are for money-making activities such as the Copyright Office and the distribution of catalog card program in the Library of Congress, and the sale of books and publications by the Superintendent of Documents. Estimated revenues from these and other special activities are expected to total almost \$21 million in 1972.

There is nothing too special to note as to the appropriations for the House. One million dollars is included for the installation of the electronic voting systems in the House Chamber. This comes under the direction of the Committee on House Administration. No specific amount has been earmarked for the operation of the House restaurants. The House has approved the transfer of the overall jurisdiction from the Architect of the Capitol to the Committee on House Administration, and I feel it is in good hands.

An announcement was made yesterday for the first time, I believe, in history, at least in recent years, that a profit was realized from the operation of the two cafeterias on Capitol Hill.

An increase has been included for the Office of the Legislative Counsel.

The Legislative Reorganization Act included provisions to strengthen that office. The committee did not approve certain technical amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act requested informally by the Legislative Counsel feeling that they should be presented to the legislative committee having jurisdiction.

However, I understand amendments will be offered today to incorporate them in this bill. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and we are prepared to accept those technical amendments.

As to the joint items, I would point out only three.

Four hundred twenty-five thousand dollars has been provided for the new

Joint Committee on Congressional Operations which was created by the Legislative Reorganization Act. No funds are included for the expanded police force or for overtime.

The House acted on the resolution expanding the police force the day before yesterday and that resolution provides for the use of the contingent fund until otherwise provided by law. No doubt a supplemental request will be submitted for our consideration at a later date.

Three hundred twenty-eight thousand dollars has been provided for the new Capitol guide force with a limitation of 24 personnel.

The major item under the Architect of the Capitol is, of course, the appropriation of \$71,090,000 for the construction of the superstructure of the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. An architectural rendering of how this new building will look when it is completed is available in our committee room which is just outside the Chamber.

This building is badly needed and has been needed for a number of years. Rental costs alone have risen to over \$2.2 million a year to house those various activities which cannot be accommodated in the present building. The plans for the new building have been approved by the various commissions and committees vested by law with control over the project.

Other items for the Architect of the Capitol are for routine maintenance and operation of the various buildings. Funds are included for cleaning, caulking, pointing, and birdproofing the Cannon Office Building and also to replace the old elevators in the Longworth House Office Building, which we are told are in an almost dangerous condition at this time. They are so old that replacement parts are not available.

An increase of over \$14 million has been allowed for the operation of the Library of Congress—primarily to cover the costs of the general pay increases and to meet the increased workloads.

The Legislative Reorganization Act renamed the old Legislative Reference Service as the Congressional Research Service as well as authorized a considerable expansion.

The budget proposed 209 additional positions and the committee recommends 37 which will provide the CRS with a total of 400 positions for the fiscal year 1972.

As to congressional printing and binding, this item continues to grow and, as I mentioned earlier, an increase of \$6 million has been provided for the Government Printing Office to cover the increased cost of the volume of printing, generally, for the Congress. An example of the increased cost of congressional printing is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1965, the cost per page was \$108.50. In 1971, it is \$128 per page. For 1972, it is estimated to cost \$140 per page.

When I say "per page" I mean one side of the sheet in the RECORD.

The Legislative Reorganization Act added to the workload of the General Accounting Office. The committee has provided an increase of over \$6 million

to fund this impact, as well as other increases in workload, and also the cost of the overall Federal pay increase.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to touch the most significant matters in the bill. The report covers them in more detail, as do the printed hearings. We will try to answer any questions Members might have.

Mr. Chairman, before closing, I want to note the excellent cooperation from all concerned during the conduct of the hearings and in developing information on the various items in this bill. I have in mind the Clerk of the House, Mr. Jennings; and other House officers and officials; Mr. White, the new Architect of the Capitol; Dr. Mumford, the Librarian of Congress; Mr. Spence, the new Public Printer; and the Comptroller General, Mr. Staats. They and their staffs have cooperated fully in every way. I believe the record of the committee hearings bears witness that the various items were generally well documented and well presented. We always appreciate full cooperation and in securing orderly consideration and dispatch of the many items dealt with. I mentioned staff. Many of the staff on Capitol Hill have served for long periods of time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a personal tribute to one of them, an old friend, Tom Clancy, who retired from the Architect's Office on May 31, 1971, after nearly 35 years of service to the Congress.

Mr. Clancy began his service with the Architect in 1935, and, at the time of his retirement, he was serving as Supervising Engineer of the Capitol, in which capacity he had been serving since 1951. He appeared before the legislative subcommittee for a number of years as a witness on the varied and complex problems dealing with the structural and mechanical care of the Capitol Building and his extensive knowledge about this great building was invaluable to the Appropriations Committee, and to the Congress.

It has been a pleasure for me to work with an individual as dedicated to his work as Tom Clancy was, and I wish for him the best of everything in his retirement years.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I correctly understand that this proposed appropriation bill calls for the spending of \$80 million more than last year or a total of \$449 million for the same general purposes?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is approximately correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman a few moments ago mentioned some added expenditures to come later through a supplemental appropriation bill. Would he have any estimate of the extent of the supplemental appropriations?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The only item I had in mind was the resolution adopted a few days ago increasing the number of policemen on the Capitol Police Force and also providing for the payment of overtime. That will cost a little over \$2 million.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman, if he will permit an observation that it is becoming interesting to see appropriation bills brought to the floor of the House with a claim of economy for them, and then to get, as we did a week or so ago, a \$7 billion supplemental appropriation bill.

I wonder when this farce of pretended economy will end? This is not attributable exclusively to the Appropriations Committee, but when are we going to end this farce of \$7 billion supplementals that are add-ons to bills that were supposed to be holding the line on expenditures?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman's guess as to when that time will come is just about as good as mine, or better.

I will say this to my friend: So long as this Congress continues to authorize more and more programs the money will have to be appropriated. I am sure the gentleman has not been a party to the exceeding of the budgets of the past.

Mr. GROSS. But that scarcely corrects the situation in which we find ourselves around here these days.

As the gentleman well knows, the deficit in the first 10 months of this fiscal year is \$21.6 billion. That is the deficit. I do not know what it will be at the end of the next 2 or 3 weeks, which will be the end of the fiscal year, but it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$20 billion. Yet Congress continues to spend in the billions as though money was going out of style in this country. Perhaps it is.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman may be right.

Mr. GROSS. Here we have a bill that is up \$80 million for housekeeping purposes on the part of Members of Congress.

Of course, one of the big items is the new library building. The gentleman's committee has voted to continue that, rather than to turn to a House office building, as I understand the situation?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is correct. Money is in the bill that will exhaust the present authorization of the James Madison Library. The original authorization was \$75 million which was later increased to \$90 million. I am frank to say to the gentleman that in my opinion it will be necessary to have another increase in the authorization.

Mr. GROSS. I was afraid of that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If such happens there will be need for an increased appropriation. This committee feels very strongly that we need this Library building, and this committee has funded that Library program over a period of the past 4 or 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I see the hole is being dug for the purpose of construction of the Library. I would suggest that some of those who are voting for these tremendous expenditures; who are voting to continue committee staffs that are blown up out of all proportion—and I can name a couple, because I serve on them—are going to welcome a hole in the ground

that they can pull in after them when they appear before their taxpayers.

I hope that before action on this bill is completed that someone will offer an amendment to strike out the library. I do not think we have any business building that \$100 million structure at this time, with the Treasury of the United States in the condition that it is.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, I think it is economically sound to build or finish the annex. The Library of Congress continues to grow and it will always grow if it continues to be, as it is today, the greatest library in the world. They are having to rent space in the city of Washington or in the suburbs at 11 different places at a yearly cost of \$2.2 million just to meet the needs today. We are told that this new building will serve the needs of the Library of Congress for the next quarter of a century.

Mr. GROSS. How would that compare with the interest on the \$100 million or \$120 million that is going to be expended on the library?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know. I have not figured that out. But the need for space is increasing every year.

Mr. GROSS. Of course it is increasing because, as I just said, we have subcommittees and committees that we do not need. There was a reorganization just before I came to the Congress which was supposed to reduce the number of committees and the payroll of the Congress. Now it has ballooned out of all proportion again. Space is at a premium around here. The Periodical Gallery was taken away from the press. I do not know who has the space now or where the former occupants went. I am not carrying a torch for the press, but someone took over that space, and it is being taken over all over Capitol Hill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Well, I do not want to argue with the gentleman about the need for space around here. I agree with you that there are too many subcommittees and select committees, but this Congress creates every one of them. I did not want to say this to my friend, but since you brought up the subject, I will say to you that there is money in this bill to freshen up and refurbish the room for your Committee on the Garage—the Select Committee on Parking.

Mr. GROSS. To refurbish it?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. To do something to it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what you are going to refurbish down there other than to change the location of the office for the manager of the garage.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I understand the Parking Committee has quarters or headquarters and money is being used to do some kind of work on them.

Mr. GROSS. I do not have any quarters, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Your committee does not have any? Your Garage or Parking Committee?

Mr. GROSS. I said I do not have any. There are quarters for the manager, of course.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We were told it was the Garage Committee.

Mr. GROSS. So far as I know, that is the only headquarters for the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. They told us it was the Garage Committee, and we did not object to the use of the money, because we knew the gentleman would not make a request unless it was needed.

Mr. GROSS. How much did you give the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say it was not much. If I remember correctly, it was about \$3,600.

Mr. GROSS. About \$3,600?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Due to the fact that this discussion came up in connection with the Garage Committee, let me say that we operated for 4 or 5 years, as my good friend well knows, without any quarters whatsoever and without an office for the manager or for anyone else.

We did ask for and I might say I believe we received either \$3,600 or \$3,700 to provide for office space for the garage superintendent and for a very small office I might say in connection with that for the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Our committee felt that your Garage Committee needed good quarters.

Mr. SISK. We appreciate it and as I said, I think the amount was about \$3,600 or \$3,700—\$3,700 I am told not to provide elaborate quarters but for quarters where there is room for the three of us to meet together.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It is not plush, but we did not object to the \$3,700, because we did want the gentleman from Iowa and the members on the committee to have adequate quarters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if I understand what the gentleman is talking about it is a garage waiting room that never should have been built. There are four or five waiting rooms that no one ever uses in the garage.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If your Committee on the Garage wants to give up its space, that is all right with me.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am operating out of my own office as I have for 23 years and will continue to do so. I want others to do the same thing.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has certainly adequately described this bill. The subcommittee members on this side of the aisle are in full agreement with the gentleman from Alabama. I think it is a good bill and I think the bill should pass as it is submitted here to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. I shall not impose upon the time of the Members by repeating some of the statements made by our distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder about this item of \$222,350 for the Speaker's office.

As I understand it, \$187,350 was made available to the Speaker last year. This appears to be an increase of about \$40,000.

Can the gentleman give me some reason for this kind of an increase?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The Speaker requested it and said he needed it, that he needed more of an office force, and we agreed to it.

Mr. GROSS. Is there authorization for this increase?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No, there is no authorization for this additional amount.

Mr. GROSS. On pages 6 and 7, for instance, telephone and telegraph allowances, line 19, there is stated that the provisions of House Resolution 418, 92d Congress, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

I take it that is legislation on an appropriation bill and the same thing would be true in all similar instances in which that language is used.

By permitting this language to be approved by the House would it apply in any way in any instance to provide for economy in the Federal Government or any more efficiency in the House of Representatives?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Iowa restate his question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Would this language to which I have referred lend itself to any more economy, efficiency, or any benefit to the House of Representatives if it is left in the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It depends upon the use that Members make of their telephone and telegraph allowance. The House passed a resolution increasing the units available to Members. Many Members use more than their units and many Members do not use half of them.

Mr. GROSS. The question is whether making it permanent by way of legislation brought to the floor of the House by the Appropriations Committee, which can only properly apply limitations on appropriation bills, adds anything by way of economy or efficiency in operating the House?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We did it at the request of the House Administration Committee and we have done it through the years and I assume will continue to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I notice in this rather plush housekeeping bill that there are automobiles for the leadership at a price tag of \$17,930 a copy. What does this entail, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The driver or the chauffeur. The automobile. The automobile is rented.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. These automobiles are rented at \$1,000 a year. Also there is the expense of gasoline,

oil, tires, and as I said the salary of the chauffeur. We had a request for more than we allowed.

Mr. GROSS. Is this not, in each instance, an increase of more than \$2,000 over last year?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Part of it is the pay increase to the driver. The driver is a Federal employee. When the Congress increases salaries, he is eligible for an increase.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am asking these questions because of the bind in which we find ourselves throughout the Federal Government in the matter of funds. We are borrowing billions of dollars—altogether too many dollars. We are spending money that we do not have for too many things we do not need.

I cannot think of a better place—

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

As I started to say, I cannot think of a better place to set an example of economy than right here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I could not agree with the gentleman more. But I must point out to the gentleman that most of the increase in this bill over last year's bill is due to the salary increases voted by the Congress. Now, I do not know whether the gentleman realizes it or not, but the Federal employees have had two salary increases since January 1, 1970, and each of them was for 6 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Alabama well knows that I did what I could to put an end to some of this.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. And so did I.

Mr. GROSS. Including the 40-percent increase to the Members of the Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I voted against that also, and I voted against the Federal employee salary increases.

Mr. GROSS. And I repeat that this is a good time to put a stop to this kind of spending.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. But this Congress voted for these increases.

Mr. GROSS. Here is a good place to start.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes, but there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and when a majority of them vote, as you well know, they voted for the salary increases—

Mr. GROSS. I say that this is a good place and a good time to start to put a stop to some of the spending, including the \$71 million in this bill for an annex to the Library of Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If the gentleman will look at the requests made for additional employees and look at the number that this committee allowed,

I think the gentleman would say that this little committee has done something to bring about that Utopian day that the gentleman from Iowa is hoping for.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt that anyone expects to see any Utopia in this matter. But we can stop packing employees into the Federal Government and up here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. And the Congress is doing it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. There is no question about that. But when is it proposed to stop?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the gentleman from Iowa always makes an excellent presentation, but it would seem to me that these arguments that are being made at this time could better be made when the bills are authorized to spend these amounts of money by the Congress, and when the Committee on House Administration brings in some of their bills.

I might also point out that when the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which the gentleman from Iowa is a Member, brings in these big spending bills that that is a good time to defeat them, in the authorizing of them, and that is when the majority of the House approves these bills. It seems to me that we try our best in this committee to make reductions where we think they are proper, but we cannot thwart the will of the House when they have voted on these bills.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just try to clarify this parking garage situation, and in order to do so, I would like to read from the hearings of the committee.

I was speaking on some of these items, and I said:

Mr. Bow. One catches my eye here. Improvement of House Parking Committee's quarters in the Rayburn Building.

Mr. CAMPIOLI. We were requested to provide a subdivision of the lounge in the G-2 level on the First Street side for use by the Parking Committee. It has been subdivided into three spaces, two offices and a committee room. That work is under construction right now. The walls are up and we are in the process of completing the work.

Mr. Bow. As you come in the G-3 level of the Rayburn Building, there is a large, nicely furnished room which I have never seen anybody use. Are we going to put more rooms similar to that one, in the G-3 level? What is it going to cost to provide the House Parking Committee with the subdivision they requested?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. We estimated that work at \$3,600 I believe.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, you are going to have a committee room for the garage committee?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. A committee room and office for the Parking Committee.

Then the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) asked an additional question.

But it seems to me, this shows the type of thing. That is only 3,600 of these piled up.

I did want to clear that for the RECORD

because it was thought that this was for the manager of the parking space—but it is not—it is for a committee room.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Our committee was unanimous in our decision that the garage committee was entitled to a committee room.

Mr. BOW. I do not know whether we went into the question of whether they were entitled to it or not. They did not ask to appropriate for it because it came out of the other funds. But it did catch my eye here that it was not a garage we were setting up but a committee room, and I thought perhaps the committee could have met without a special committee room.

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

Mr. BOW. Well, I am a little afraid to because the gentleman's questions are sometimes so penetrating. But I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I just do not understand the gentleman's timidity on this occasion.

Mr. BOW. You know when I look at that glint in the gentleman's eye and see him move his hand back to throw the spear, I tremble but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. As to this magnificent committee room that you are talking about, I thought it was to be an office for the garage manager. I would ask the gentleman—what is the progress report on it?

Mr. BOW. They are building it as they state in the RECORD here. It is under construction at this time. There were two offices—a committee room. I suppose they may put some orange crates in there at sometime in the future for you to sit during your meetings—it will probably not be a luxurious suite.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that we of the committee transact most of our business in the Committee of the Whole on the floor of the House. The Committee is composed of the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), and myself. But I would like to take a trip to the garage with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio to see this plush new \$3,000 hearing room.

Mr. BOW. I did not say it was a plush room, I said it probably would not be a luxurious room and would probably put some orange crates or something of that kind for you to sit on because they know the gentleman's position on these things and I would not think they would make it too luxurious.

But I would like at this time, while I am on my feet, to say that in spite of this colloquy about this committee room, I think they deserve it because that committee on that garage is well run and well operated and I think it is a great asset to this Congress to have it.

I would like to say that Mr. Mike Preloh has done an excellent job as manager of the garage. I have no objection to this little committee room.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Being the shrinking violet

that I am, I am not so sure that I deserve such plaudits. From what I have heard this morning, I am somewhat surprised that the Appropriations Committee voted as it did to approve a meeting room in the garage.

Mr. BOW. We did not approve it. It was just in there. They said they were building it and the money was coming out of, I think, the contingent fund or something of that kind. We did not put the money in for it. I am afraid that if there was a request for the money for it, we might have looked at it a little differently.

Mr. GROSS. I can think of some Members of the House of Representatives, at least of one Member who has four offices, and I can think of several others who have an office in the Capitol as well as in the office building.

Mr. BOW. I think that is right. There is no question about that. But I was not discussing that. I was discussing the committee room.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for yielding me 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I might say I am not taking this time to defend the parking committee. I appreciate the colloquy that occurred. Frankly, I think the parking committee would be very happy to submit its total budget over the years including the staff and other facilities to compare it with any committee in the House. The facts are that we have had no staff, no office space and no committee room, so we do appreciate the small space now allowed us.

I have asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, to discuss a matter which I think should be of concern to this Congress and I would hope that the Members would give us a few moments of their attention to discuss where we are going in connection with what the Committee on Rules thought was one of the most important parts of the legislative reorganization act.

I recognize that Congress has a habit of going up hill and down hill, so that is not really an unusual procedure. But certainly that is exactly what we are faced with this morning, in taking action here which I would interpret as a complete veto and a complete backing away from what this Congress did only 8 months ago by an overwhelming vote of some 326 to 19. Only 19 Members opposed that Reorganization Act.

What many of us felt was one of the most important parts of the Reorganization Act was the establishment of the Congressional Research Service. The Congressional Research Service was brought into being, as I say, through the act, to render a special type of service to the Congress and specifically to the committees of the Congress.

I want to call attention to the Reorganization Act, Part 2, titled "Congressional Research Service."

Most Members were here last fall when we took final action, after having spent a good part of the summer debating a legislative reorganization bill. In that act section 203 starts out:

The Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress is hereby continued as a separate department in the Library of Congress and is redesignated the "Congressional Research Service".

It is the policy of Congress that—

Then we proceed to outline a long series of responsibilities and duties and obligations of the new Congressional Research Service, through some two or three or four pages of the basic law.

Again, I do not desire to criticize anyone. In fact, to some extent I criticize myself, possibly, for not having called the committee and requested an opportunity to appear before it. At least, some of us who were concerned with carrying out what Congress did some 8 months ago probably should have appeared there and made statements.

I refer to the very excellent statement made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) just a few moments ago, with reference to the time when we should be concerned about increasing costs, which is at the time of the authorization. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio on this, because that is the time. Once the Congress has authorized, then of course the Appropriations Committee, in my opinion at least, has no recourse but to go ahead and appropriate money to meet the requirements of the authorization so passed by the Congress.

That is the issue we are talking about today. Only 8 months ago we authorized the creation of the Congressional Research Service to do a specific job. Unfortunately, the committee saw fit to veto that effort by a failure to appropriate the funds and to make the additional spots available for personnel.

As I say, I am not being unduly critical. I have been attempting to read the RECORD to find out why the committee reached that kind of a decision because in essence, as I say, this is going back down the hill and in a sense repudiating what the Congress did last year.

In order to fulfill the vast amount of obligations spelled out in the law, the Service asked for an increase of approximately \$4 million and for 209 positions, to begin to meet the requirements and obligations and duties of the Congressional Research Service. The committee instead saw fit to merely authorize enough increase in personnel to meet the increased workload of the old Legislative Reference Service. According to the testimony offered by the Library people, that requirement had increased slightly over 10 percent. The committee saw fit to increase the personnel by approximately 10 percent and the funding by an equal amount, completely eliminating, then, the amounts required to meet the obligations of the new Service and their new requirements.

So far as I am personally concerned, this means absolutely nothing to me personally any more than I feel it should to any other Member of the Congress.

But, after some years of study and after 18 months of work by a subcommit-

tee and by the Committee on Rules, and because of bills introduced by over 200 Members of this body concerned with getting more information to Members and members of a committee, in order to meet their responsibilities to the American people, it was determined that this kind of service, to give us the kind of expertise, to give us the knowledge, to give us the understanding, to give us alternatives to the programs proposed by the executive branch of the Government, was needed.

If it was needed just 8 months ago, is it not still needed? Or are we today prepared to say, "No. Let us go back to the same old routine; let us go back to relying on the same old situation we have been faced with."

When I discussed this matter briefly with a member or two of the committee, they raised the question, "My gosh. You are going to have as many people in the Congressional Research Service as Members of Congress. You will have more than 400 people." Well, for goodness sakes, whenever an executive agency of the Government comes down here before any committee of the House, in back of it is the Office of Management and Budget, with how many people in it—1,200, 1,500, 2,000? I have no idea how many. Plus hundreds of back-up people in each department of the Government. And the 150-plus Members of Congress who appeared before our committee asking for the reorganization plan and for the very thing that the Congress authorized last year said that the Congress is totally out-gunned and out-matched; we do not have the expertise, we do not have the knowledge, and we do not have the manpower to meet the need and to give us an understanding about what these proposals are and come up with alternatives and come up possibly with better ways so that Congress might act rather than simply react to what is proposed by the executive branch of the Government.

My friends, as I say, this means nothing to me personally any more than it should mean to any Member of the House, but many people have worked very hard to bring about this reorganization plan and to try to give to us more knowledge and better knowledge and more expertise to meet the demands of the age in which we live. I simply feel that Congress should recognize what we are doing.

A little bit later, when an opportunity presents itself, we will offer an amendment not to go for the full \$4 million but simply increase it by \$1.5 million at least and take a step in the direction of beginning to augment and to make possible meeting the responsibilities on the part of the Congressional Research Service, with the employment of about 100 persons additional rather than 209.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to refer the gentleman to the Committee on Rules' own report on this subject when the Reorganization Act was adopted. I quote:

A sudden large expansion staff is probably inadvisable and perhaps even impossible, given the difficulties of recruiting expert re-

search personnel. The resources of both agencies will therefore develop gradually. We nevertheless expect the buildup of those resources to be substantially completed within 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has stated that this was 8 months ago that this reorganization plan was adopted.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BOW. So, this is a rather gradual thing. This was 5 years ago under the mandate of the Committee on Rules. They do suggest to us there that a sudden large expansion of the staff is probably inadvisable and impossible. So it seems to me that the committee has done pretty well.

Will the gentleman yield for one further observation?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has suggested that this is a change in the approach in the reorganization plan and there should be no change in the plan adopted by the Congress and the Committee on Rules, but I recall the first vote in this Congress was to change the reorganization plan that had been adopted by the full Congress. That reorganization plan permitted the minority to have staffing, and the very first vote that came along changed that reorganization plan. So I do not believe that the gentleman should complain about the possibility that there might be some deviation from the plan as it came in, since the first vote here was a change in that reorganization plan.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate that well, I will say to my good friend from Ohio, and I have objected to some of the changes in the reorganization plan. I would hope that we will know what we are doing and the issue should be brought out clearly and precisely on the matter of changing the legislative authorization. I am sure and in fact there are now pending some additional changes in the legislative reorganization plan. The Lord knows it is not perfect, in spite of all of the work that was done on it and all of the work on the part of all of the Members. I am sure that perfecting of the work will go on.

And, I have no objection to that. I would hope, though, that we would do it under the legislative rules and by authorization.

I recognize that there are problems involved and I recognize the time it took to bring about a change of procedures.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would do it legislatively rather than what we have here as a veto by the Committee on Appropriations, but to appropriate according to the needs.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will agree with me that the testimony was to the effect that the workload had increased over 10 percent and the committee actually funded a 10-percent increase in personnel which in essence would not carry out what we felt to be an obligation on the Appropriations Committee to meet the requirements of Public Law 91-510.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr.

Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). I think that probably my record over the 14 years I have been here is about as conservative as the record of anyone else in this Chamber. I do not recall ever taking the floor and asking for an increase in appropriations or for funds for any facility located in my district. I think I have supported the Appropriations Committee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. Bow) on every proposal that he has brought to the floor of the House, whether it be a 5-percent across-the-board cut, or whatever it happened to be. But it looks to me like we will either have to do one thing or the other. We overwhelmingly passed a reorganization bill last year. I would like to read some of the provisions we did place in the bill as to the intent of the Congress, if we are going to have this Legislative Reference Service and if we are going to expand it, we should provide the funds with which to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of arguing or in any way attempting to refute the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) that we do not want this service to get into a great big expanded monstrous situation. I do not want that either. But I think we ought to give them the necessary people and the funds with which to do what we have told them we wanted done.

Mr. Chairman, the workload has been increased by 10 percent and we are without any funds to permit them to carry on the responsibilities which we have assigned to them in the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Let me read some of the language which we enacted when we expanded section 203(d)(1):

(1) Section 203(d)(1) expands the duty of the Service in existing law to advise and assist committees of the House of Representatives and Senate, and joint committees of the Congress, in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals and recommendations, by prescribing three additional duties and objectives: (A) to assist committees in determining the advisability of enacting particular proposals or recommendations; (B) to assist committees in estimating the probable results that would follow enactment of such proposals, as well as the probable results that would follow enactment of alternatives to such proposals; and (C) to assist committees in evaluating alternative methods of accomplishing the results those proposals seek to achieve.

(2) Section 203(d)(1) expands the duty of the Congressional Research Service otherwise to assist in furnishing committees with a basis for the proper evaluation and determination of legislative proposals and recommendations, which in effect is provided for in existing law, by directing the Service to provide committees with such other research and analytical services as those committees consider appropriate.

Fourth, section 203(d)(4) provides that, upon appropriate request or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, the

Congressional Research Service will collect, classify, and analyze, in the form of translations, indexes, digests, compilations, bulletins, reports and otherwise data having a bearing on legislation and will make such data available and serviceable to committees and Members of the Senate and House and joint committees of the Congress.

Fifth, section 203(d)(5) provides that, upon appropriate request or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, the Congressional Research Service will prepare and provide information, research, and reference materials and services to committees and Members of the Senate and House, and to joint committees of Congress, to assist them both in their legislative and in their representative functions.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to place all of this additional responsibility upon them which we did by a very big vote in this House, we ought to give them something with which to work.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to join in supporting an amendment which will be offered to increase this amount by \$1.5 million, not by \$4 million. An increase that will give them 100 employees, none of which will be supergrades. We have a list of each and every one of them and what they will do. We attempted to work this out with them based upon the responsibilities we have placed upon them. If we require them based upon the responsibilities we have placed upon them, if we require them to do this, then I think we should give them some funding with which to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I use the Library of Congress very, very little. Some people say we should first determine what they have done. However, based upon the contacts which I have had with them, which has been a very few times when I have used them, their services have been very, very satisfactory to me.

I am inclined to think from the testimony we heard before the Reorganization Commission that they get all kinds of requests over there, some of which are almost unbelievable. I think they do a fine job under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman for the additional time. I am not trying to upset the appropriation bill, and I will state to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), that I have never done that in my 14 years and, indeed, this is the 15th year that I have been here. I have supported the gentleman wholeheartedly, but I think the Committee has an obligation to support us a little bit and to give us some additional funding. Do not cut us off completely and say you cannot have anything. Give us a few more, Mr. MAHON, so we can see how it works, and then next year if you do not think it is working out satisfactorily, then recommend a change. We have voted that they should do these things, and they cannot do it if we do not permit them to do so, and without them doing so, we cannot establish what they can do unless we give them some personnel to work with.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am impressed with what the gentleman from California is saying. I feel that we do need an effective and efficient research group in connection with the work of the Congress and the Congressional Research Service in the Library of Congress. However, the committee felt we ought to move a little more slowly and carefully than was proposed in the budget estimate, so that we would not build up a bulging bureaucracy. If it develops later on in the year that there is a real need for more, and that competent people are available, then we could bring in a supplemental. But I would hope that the House today would stand pat with the committee and not move any more rapidly in this direction than the committee proposes. And that is the position of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOW). We are all interested in doing whatever is appropriate. But, as I said, we thought it best to move slowly and carefully in this matter.

Mr. SMITH of California. The law provides that the people have the approval for employment. I agree with what the gentleman from Texas says about going slowly. I completely agree with that, but if we do not move at all, then we are definitely moving too slowly. So why do we not give them just a little bit to start carrying out the obligations that we have placed upon them rather than waiting 2 or 3 more months and then saying we have got to have more money to carry out the program. Give us a little, so we can get started on this program.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment to strike the \$71 million sought for the Library of Congress' new James Madison Memorial Building. Abandoning this building now—after years of painstaking planning to make sure it answers the Library's most pressing needs, after months of excavation work to make the site ready for construction—would be nothing short of absurd. Millions have already been spent on this project. And \$2 million more, hardly a trifling sum, would be simply squandered to pay cancellation costs for the building.

The Library's need for more space is beyond dispute. Driven to renting storage space at high rates, the Library spends more than \$2.2 million each year in rental costs. Other costs—these for leasing space to maintain routine operating activities—now approach about \$350,000 a year. In economic terms alone, Mr. Chairman, the new building is more than warranted.

Without it, the Library simply cannot carry out its responsibilities to the Congress and the public at large.

One alternative is possible, but it is chilling to contemplate. It would mean

eastward expansion from the Library's present site—a move that would threaten the Folger Library, housing a Shakespearean collection celebrated the world over; St. Mark's Episcopal Church, a historical landmark in the District of Columbia; and scores of private townhouses restored to their original beauty.

The only rationale for abandoning the new library building—at least the only one I have heard—contends the site should be reserved for a fourth House office building. Yet, to my knowledge, no convincing evidence exists to support this argument. In any case, other sites for such an office building are readily available on Capitol Hill—to cite just one example, the sites of the underground garages, heralded when first constructed as inviting locations for any new office buildings.

The following letter—from Lillian Bradshaw, president of the American Library Association—points out the "absolute necessity" of the James Madison Building:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 1, 1971.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: As President of the American Library Association, I am writing to urge your active support for retention of the funds requested for construction of the James Madison Memorial Library Building in the FY 1972 Legislative Appropriations Bill to be considered in executive session of the House Appropriations Committee this afternoon at 3 p.m.

Association members throughout the country, working for continuing improvement of library services for citizens in all walks of life, are appalled to learn through newspaper, radio and TV accounts that a halt to work has been called for on the new third building of the Library of Congress. This news is particularly shocking considering that plans for the building have been several years in the making and that excavation is now actually underway.

Additional space is an absolute necessity if the Library of Congress is to continue to properly assist the Congress, other libraries, and the public that they serve.

We respectfully urge your assistance so that the construction of the James Madison Memorial Library Building can move ahead as quickly as possible on the present site between 1st and 2nd Streets and Independence Avenue and C Street, S.E.

Respectfully yours,

LILLIAN BRADSHAW,
President, American Library Association.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I joined in the debate against the so-called Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building appropriation of \$71 million as provided on page 18 of H.R. 8825, not because I enjoy being negative but rather because I am completely convinced that the time has come to clamp the brakes on all construction that proceeds piecemeal here on Capitol Hill, without the benefit of any plan or plans which carefully delineate not only needs for the near future but needs for the distant future.

Space on Capitol Hill is precious. It is priceless. The square block under consideration is one of the last remaining plots of ground that is close enough to the Capitol to serve the future needs for

any type of housing directly connected with the legislative process. Please pay special attention to the fact that I used the word "housing" connected with the legislative process, and that I made no reference to a fourth House office building. There is quite a difference. There is also a vast difference between using this precious, priceless land for a warehouse for books, which is what is proposed, when in fact such a warehouse could be located anywhere between here and Richmond on the south, or here and Baltimore on the north just as well as here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not necessarily enjoy being cast in the role of a Devil's Advocate. As I look back I see that I could have improved my advocacy many-fold had I been privileged to have had access to the content of a certain report at the time I used my 5 minutes to speak in support of my amendment to strike all of the appropriation bill that sets up the money for the superstructure of the third Library of Congress. As I pointed out during my earlier remarks it seemed rather unusual that there was no architect's drawing or even a picture of the building sitting in the well. As soon as I made that comment someone rushed in an architect's drawing and set it on an easel. I welcomed the privilege to see a picture of the structure which was undoubtedly made available at the personal request of the genial gentleman from Alabama and the able chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ANDREWS. But when I took my first look at the drawing I was forced to react with the comment, "It has no windows. It looks like a beautiful mausoleum."

Now it has been suggested that the real issue here this afternoon, whether the money for the superstructure of the Madison Library is appropriated or not, has something to do with a fourth House office building. The minority leader stated that if one votes to knock out this money, he is voting for a fourth House office building. I am sure he must know that is not true. I am sure he knows, that he is advancing a deceptive, specious argument. While we are on the subject of an office building I think it is a fair appraisal to conclude that the building which is proposed is neither a warehouse for books nor an office building, but a sort of monumental type structure which seems to have a little bit of everything in it in an effort to try to please every occupant.

When I upbraided my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, as to why he had not made available the beautiful blue brochure entitled "Report and Recommendations of the James Madison Memorial Building" his reply was, "You did not ask for it." I suppose he was right. I did not learn the content of that report until the roll was being called on final passage. During these moments I walked over on the minority side and talked to a member of the Appropriations Committee. He was good enough to suggest that I get the report and then take a look at volume 1, page III-9 dated April 1967.

Immediately thereafter I asked the committee staff on our side of the aisle for a copy of that report. I proceeded to

turn to the specified page. To my utter amazement I found that this proposed structure which has an admitted price tag of \$100 million, and before it is finished will cost \$150 million or maybe twice its estimated cost for a total turnkey price of \$200 million—here is what I found:

In this mammoth structure I found there is a total of 1,660,700 square feet but only 693,100 feet of that total is what is described as "collections and storage facilities." That leaves a total of 967,600 square feet which, according to the plans is assigned to "work and public functions." I was curious as to what this last assignment of space really meant but it did not take long for me to find out. Very quickly I found out that there was a plan for an assembly room for 200 persons. The plans call for a cafeteria to seat 1,000. There is space which is marked "private dining rooms," and in another place the plans call for "snack rooms and lounges." Another item called for in the plans is what is called a "staff lounge." Still other space is assigned to what is called "health room." Now I do not know whether this later space means a gymnasium, or a kind of an indoor spa, or whether it is a clinic of some kind or maybe a first aid station or just exactly what? If we vote this money today, I predict none of us will ever be privileged to find out until the building is completed.

No, a look at the blue brochure will reveal the building that is proposed is much more than a warehouse for books. The report which I referred to a while ago provides that 5,600 employees will be housed in the building. It provides an almost unlimited number of offices to be filled up with GS-10's, most of whom will have to have their own secretaries, under the operation of Parkinson's law. A most interesting item called for in the report is space for a "welfare and recreation association," and not omitted is an office for a credit union.

Mr. Chairman, the items included in the plans which I have enumerated point out very conclusively that this may very well be an office building, but it is certainly not just an ordinary office building but certainly much more than a warehouse for books.

Remember it is proposed to build this kind of windowless mixture on land so close to the Capitol that it cannot be duplicated anywhere else—here on this unique piece of real estate—if we pass this appropriation bill with this item of \$71 million, we will be starting something that will likely run \$200 million before we are through.

The report and recommendations is contained in a beautiful blue brochure where I learned all I needed to know in volume I, page III-9. There I learned enough to alert me to raise the flag of caution that the auditorium, cafeteria, staff lounges, snack lounges, health rooms, Welfare and Recreation Association offices, Credit Union offices are not just conveniences but are luxuries we cannot afford in this year of 1971 when our deficit may run as high as \$20 billion and when our national debt stands at nearly \$400 billion.

I am not sure that these luxuries should

ever be included in a so-called warehouse for books but I am most certain that we cannot afford these unnecessary luxuries at this time.

Mr. Chairman, as we come to a vote on this amendment, the issue is not a fourth House office building. Rather, the issue is whether we close off all of our options, or whether we keep our alternatives and options open. This choice piece of real estate cannot be duplicated anywhere else on earth because there is only one Capitol in the United States, and this is the only piece of real estate adjacent to the present complex of House office buildings.

The plans as revealed by that beautiful blue brochure indicate that we are not really erecting a repository for books but are we erecting a building that at some future time can be converted into a House office building? The photograph on the easel in the well of the House shows that it is a monumental structure but one that has very few windows on either of its four sides. Certainly the cost to try to adapt it for a House office building in the future would be prohibitive.

Not only should we keep our options open but we should hope before too long there will be some kind of long range plan for the future expansion of Capitol Hill. There is a lot of space elsewhere for books. We have an outstanding Architect of the Capitol. While I have not met him personally I understand he is well qualified. He has said to stop this construction. One does not ordinarily hire a lawyer and then disregard his advice. If we have to find a place to store books there is a lot of Government owned property nearby. One area would be the Navy Yard in Southeast Washington, not very far away. All the weight of logic is on the side of holding up on construction of this third library at this time.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, to go ahead with this library in my judgment of several others who spoke in favor of this amendment is a terrible mistake. I predict those who vote to go ahead with the James Madison Library today will regret it in the future. We all recall with pleasant memories our good friend from Virginia, the former chairman of the Rules Committee who was so intent on the establishment of this library. If there are those who still feel a compulsion to vote for these funds as memorial for the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Smith, then of course that is their prerogative. But let us make no mistake about it, it is not intended to be a memorial to James Madison.

The plans shows it may not even be a good library when only about 60 percent of the space is for storage facilities and 40 percent of the space is for such so-called administrative facilities, other than shelving, which I have painstakingly described in detail right out the blue brochure known as the report and recommendations booklet.

One final prediction is that if the luxuries that are called for in this new building are carried through to completion and if the plans are not some way curtailed it will not take \$100 million or \$150 million but it will take at least \$200 million before it is finished.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot better places to put a repository for books than on Capitol Hill. This monumental building is without windows but is replete with luxuries. It will make life much easier and better for employees who are to be housed in this building, but it will add little to the basic fundamental purpose and objective of the Library of Congress which is to serve Members of Congress themselves in their daily needs and then the students and the general public who use the library for reference and research. No, a careful review of the plans will reveal we are building neither a repository for books nor an office building but a poor combination of both which includes a lot of luxuries we cannot afford.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 8825, under consideration, is entitled "Making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes."

At first blush, one assumes that legislative appropriations consist of appropriating moneys for Members and their staffs. It is the "for other purposes" taking up some 27 pages of the bill that reveals the high cost of Government by delegated powers to a congressional bureaucracy.

The compensation of the 435 Members and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and the nonvoting Delegate from the District of Washington, D.C. is given as \$20,262,420, but this is just the start.

As we go down the list, we see that such nonlegislative bodies as the House Democratic steering committee and the House Republican conference are to receive \$62,990 each; the majority floor leader, \$144,220; the minority floor leader, \$128,465; and the Republican and Democratic Party whips, \$104,075 each; the Office of the Speaker, \$222,350; mileage, Members and Speaker's expense allowance, \$200,000; the Parliamentarian, \$178,080; Chaplain, \$19,770; Office of the Attending Physician, \$92,900; Sergeant at Arms, \$3,737,615; Doorkeeper, \$2,953,180; Clerk, \$2,852,030.

None of these allowances includes staffs of the Members at \$55,320,000, committee employees which are listed at \$8,162,000 and elsewhere at \$1,219,000, the contingent furniture fund at \$587,000, the miscellaneous items of salary, automobile hire, and so forth, at \$7,325,000 nor special and select committees at \$10,770,000. The bill earmarks for telephone and telegraph expenses \$4,000,000; for stationery, \$1,529,500; and allows each Member and official to have a separate postage stamp allowance in addition to the frank totaling \$324,000.

It provides an allowance for the purchase, and maintenance of limousines and chauffeurs for the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader at \$17,930 each, or totaling \$53,790.

Then follow lists of such appropriations as joint committees between the House and Senate, the Architect of the Capitol and his staff, \$1,095,700; and the Architect's contingent "unforeseen" expense fund of \$50,000.

I pass over the controversial new

James Madison Memorial Library of Congress at \$71,090,000; and the Botanic Garden at \$738,540.

In short, the bill, considered by many as paying the salaries of the Congressmen and staffs, has been turned into a literal Christmas tree bearing gifts for all on Capitol Hill. I am certain that the members of the committee have done their best to protect the taxpayers, otherwise the asking prices would have been much higher, but we all know what tremendous pressures our colleagues who scrutinize money bills operate under—always to continue existing programs and to enlarge them for more effectiveness. The bureaucracies of Congress have now become so large and powerful that the tail is now wagging the dog.

But I feel confident that the majority of the people who sent me up here to represent them would examine these astronomical figures and side benefits with raised eyebrows. Especially is this true as they examine the ever-increasing national debt and consider the certainty of additional income taxes. I do not hesitate to vote against the bill merely because it contains my salary, including the 42-percent increase. Had we been given a chance to vote against the salary raise when it was first authorized, I would have done so at that time.

I cannot see that time has changed the issue.

I must, therefore, cast my people's vote against H.R. 8825.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

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

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
For the Office of the Speaker, \$222,350.
POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order on page 2, and to point out to the Chairman that I was on my feet when that portion was read, and I am referring to line 18. I rise to a point of order on that as having been unauthorized, and it is, therefore, legislation in an appropriation bill, and that specifically the increase of \$40,000 is not only unauthorized and therefore legislation as an appropriation bill, but that it is against the Reorganization Act of 1970, which sets a ceiling on this office, which is exceeded here by \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order, and we shall offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and is therefore sustained.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. As I understand it, the point of order is to the \$40,000.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the benefit of the gentleman from Alabama, as set forth on page 23 of the report, in the table, and in the bill, it is line 18.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is this, is the point of order to all of line 18 on page 2 of the bill, or to the \$40,000?

Mr. HALL. The point of order is to all the language, it has to be, Mr. Chairman, I will state, and the amendment, obviously eliminates only the unauthorized \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that the Chair agrees with the gentleman. All of the language on line 18 has been stricken by the point of order, which has been conceded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: On page 2, line 18, insert: "For the Office of the Speaker \$182,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a question to any member of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the use of the limousines that were referred to by the gentleman from Iowa.

I wonder if any Member, or perhaps the gentleman from Alabama who is rich in his knowledge of American history, or any member of the Committee on Appropriations can say for the record at what point in history four leaders of the House and the Speaker of the House of Representatives began to be afforded chauffeur-driven carriages or automobiles.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know. But there is an old saying in the law—"since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary."

Mr. JACOBS. Well, you see, somebody's memory runneth to the contrary. I remember that when Thomas Jefferson was sworn in as President of the United States that he had a breakfast in his boarding-house close by over here and walked to his inauguration. So the memory of man runs to the point where the President of the United States, being a public servant, was able to walk to work. I realize that maybe for security reasons that has changed somewhat but I wonder why it is that a floor leader or the Speaker of the House, who really do not have any place to go except right here in this Chamber to perform their duties.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO. I do not know about this memory of man insofar as this appropriation is concerned, but I do not object to the House of Representatives providing its leadership with these three automobiles. I submit that unless the Representatives in this Congress have the courage to face up to the mammoth growth problem that has been taking

place in this area, pretty soon you will have to accommodate our leaders with helicopters—never mind Cadillacs—if you intend them to get to work on time because unless we quit building in this area, and help reduce congestion and sprawl, it is going to be an uninhabitable capital in maybe the next 15 years.

Mr. JACOBS. Well—how in the world do the rest of us get to work on time? I have always wondered why public servants should be served by servants.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am just amazed at the statement that the gentleman just made in the well of the House. Every bureaucrat downtown has a car and he has a driver, if he is in any kind of position of importance in the executive bureau where they have hundreds of cars at their beck and call of the people who need it for transportation, or who claim they need it. Here we are, the greatest legislative body in the world, advised to deny our leadership an automobile and a driver. How penny pinching can you get? These men are leaders of the House and they have positions of prestige and dignity which has been conferred upon them by the full membership of the House of Representatives. They have obligations to go to places and they need a man to drive their automobile while they go into an office. Their time is valuable. It is inconvenient for me many times to go down to one of the agencies for a 30-minute or 15-minute interview with some top official. I usually have someone in my office drive the car and stand by because you frequently cannot find a place to park in lots of places. I think it is getting pretty bad when the House of Representatives does not think enough of its leadership to give them the prestige that you give to a low-level division leader down in one of the executive departments. I just do not go along with that kind of denigration of the dignity of the leaders of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman asked a question—how penny pinching can you get—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is exactly what I asked.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know, but I do not have many constituents who regard limousines and chauffeurs as being in the penny pinching category.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I doubt if your constituents have public officials who have the dignity and leadership and responsibility of the leaders of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman very much for his compliment to my people. A man is dignified, not according to his car and servant, but according to how he behaves—not according to what he has—at taxpayer's expense—but according to what he is.

I have a bill to do away with nearly all servant-driven Federal cars. To say downtown bureaucrats have such autos does not excuse our having them. Two wrongs do not make a right.

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

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For the Office of the Chaplain, \$19,770.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to attempt to ascertain what is the purpose of the Appropriations Committee with regard to the Congressional Research Service?

First I should like to find out whether the statement of the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Rules Committee on Reorganization (Mr. SISK) is accurate with regard to the amount of money provided, I guess, to what was called in the bill the Legislative Reference Service. The chairman (Mr. SISK) who spent many, many hours dealing with this problem of reorganization, has stated that as he understood the situation the Appropriations Subcommittee and full committee recommends to the House an increase in funding which will provide in essence for the increase in workload.

I should like to have the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee advise me as to what the facts are as he sees them.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We did not specify what the positions were. We gave them 37 new positions.

Mr. BOLLING. What is the relationship of the 37 people to the request made by the Legislative Reference Service?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Well, now they have a wide discretion about how they use employees. We are funding 400 employees for that service. They requested 209 additional. As against the 209 we gave them 37, bringing the total up to 400.

Mr. BOLLING. Is it possible to answer my question?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Not for me to answer it.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman does not have any information as to how the workload increased, and the relationship?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. They say the workload has increased.

Mr. BOLLING. What did they say it had increased?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Approximately 10 percent.

Mr. BOLLING. Apparently the gentleman from California is essentially correct. The increase provided is essentially the same as that of the increase in the workload.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I will say that workloads are always a matter of opinion. It was the opinion of the Appropriations Subcommittee that the workload of the legislative counsel would be increased because of the Reorganization Act, but we did not believe it would increase as precipitately as the budget request indicated it might.

Also, we are not sure in this period of time it is possible to get employees who would be adequate employees to staff such a large increase as was requested. It was our opinion that the 37 new positions in the bill would be completely adequate.

Mr. BOLLING. I believe I have estab-

lished the preliminary brush clearing I was interested in. Now I should like to ask a specific question.

What is the intent of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and its members, its chairman and ranking minority member, with regard to funding the program provided by the Congress to change the Legislative Reference Service to the Congressional Research Service?

One who has worked on this for a very long time has one view if this is only a gradual step in the direction of complying with the law just passed and another view if it is a deliberate effort to cut off this baby early in its life.

I have been here long enough—and so have most other members—so that I have seen the Appropriations Committee come in many times, shortly after a matter was enacted, shortly after the public was advised that the Congress had done this or that, to eliminate that particular provision. No doubt everybody in the Congress has understood what was going on. No doubt the public understood that the Congress just changed its mind from one year to the next. But I believe it is very important to establish here what is going on.

We passed the Reorganization Act 8 months ago overwhelmingly. Did we mean it, or are we merely going through some motions to placate the people who do not think that up to that time we were working very well?

The question of intent is a very important question, and I hope that the gentlemen either on my time, if they choose to get me more time, or on theirs, will explain what is the intent.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) asked questions of the ranking minority member I shall attempt to answer.

Mr. BOLLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I have been asked what the intent of the ranking minority member is on this question. I want to point out before I give that intent that this brings this research group up to 400 members. Now, let us not be fooled by the 37 increase. There are now 400 bodies on board in this Congressional Research Service. We have taken the mandate of the Committee on Rules—I will read it again, although the gentleman did not want to hear it—in which the Committee on Rules commented with regard to this reorganization plan.

Mr. BOLLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will not yield at this time. The Committee on Rules said as follows:

A sudden large expansion of staff is probably inadvisable and perhaps even impossible, given the difficulties of recruiting expert research personnel. The resources of both agencies will therefore develop gradually. We nevertheless expect the buildup of those resources to be substantially completed within 5 years.

Now, we have followed that mandate. We are going slow to start with. We will

begin to examine where there are qualified people to fill these positions up to 572 if they are necessary. It is the intent of this Member each year to get the testimony of the Congressional Research Service and I would think the testimony of Members of the House who could come in before the committee and testify as to the need for the increase and if that increase is necessary. If they make a case up to 572 over a period of 5 years, then certainly it ought to be funded. However, I agree with the Committee on Rules that it would be a mistake just suddenly to go in and give them what they ask for, 572 members, which is an increase of several hundred. They could not have done it and could not have gotten qualified people to come in. It is the intent of this Member on the evidence submitted to the committee by Members of the House and by the Congressional Research Service to evaluate this.

It would seem to me to be a mistake for this committee today and this House today to go in and put in all of these members or even the amount that the gentleman from California has suggested he will offer an amendment for later in committee.

Again I want to point out the gentleman (Mr. BOLLING) talks about this overwhelming vote on the reorganization plan with a very few votes against it. It was adopted, however, that is true, but Mr. BOLLING was one of those who came in on the very first vote in this Congress and amended the Reorganization Act in order to take the staffing away from the minority. So there can be changes that can be looked at.

I further want to point out to the gentleman that the Reorganization Act may have some good things in it, but it is one of the most expensive things that has happened around Congress for a long time. Even with the small increases that we have made in this bill today, the Reorganization Act calls for an increase of over \$4 million in the cost of this bill. If we go ahead with all of the building up of personnel, we will get up to about \$10 million or \$15 million in additional cost because of the reorganization, and the minority still does not have the staff that they were promised when the bill passed originally.

Now I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted that the gentleman is prepared to yield, because you heard me explain that I could not yield to you before because my time ran out.

The fact is I could not have yielded because my time ran out. I think it is important to be a little factual. There has not been any answer to the question.

Mr. BOW. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to ask a question I neglected to ask earlier. Is there any provision in this bill for the hiring of elevator operators in the Rayburn Building?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. Now, let me turn to page 23.

Could the gentleman give me a brief explanation of the meaning of the language beginning on page 22 dealing with "Not to exceed 10 positions in the Library of Congress" and with particular reference to the language on page 23 dealing with the Foreign Book Service, single employees in the Foreign Service, and so on and so forth.

What is the meaning of all that?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, these people are paid in foreign currencies, but the Americans who serve overseas and who administer the programs are paid in American dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Are these foreigners employed in this country?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No.

Mr. GROSS. These are foreigners employed overseas?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct; wherever the country has a foreign exchange program. But the positions you are referring to are only for the single employees who work for the Library of Congress. However, those who work overseas in the foreign countries where the foreign library books programs of acquisition is carried out—

Mr. GROSS. Well, most of this is unquestionably legislation on an appropriation bill. But I would like to know whether the gentleman can make a case for it on the basis of equity, on the basis of economy or efficiency, or anything else?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that this program has been underway for a long time and there is a tremendous amount of interest in this program throughout the entire country on the part of the library researchers, and so forth. We had, as you know, foreign currency stacked up—

Mr. GROSS. In some places.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. These are the points where the Library does this book exchange work. Now, you have got to have employees in the country where they are collecting the books. All of the employees, except in management, are foreigners or natives of the country, but the library managers so to speak are not.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that this language permits payment in foreign currency and counterpart funds?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. For the acquisition of books and for the employment of natives of the country.

Mr. GROSS. I see. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my taking this time is to refer to the language which appears on page 15 of the bill where it says, "for necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies," and so forth.

The purpose of my taking this time is to inquire of the committee, what I think is clear, but I want to make some legislative history on the subject, there is nothing contained in this bill to allow for any step forward or any beginning of construction on the west front of the Capitol?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct. As a matter of fact, the Architect has not come up with his recommendations for the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol, as to whether it should be restoration or otherwise.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure the chairman of this committee would do everything within his power to see that if any effort is made to make a new front on this Capitol, that Members of Congress will be fully advised and will have full opportunity to debate it and it will not be slipped in through some language tucked away in the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct.

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

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$739,-160.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 118]

Abourezk	Edmondson	Peyster
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Podell
Anderson,	Erlenborn	Price, Tex.
Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Anderson,	Fish	Pucinski
Tenn.	Flowers	Purcell
Annunzio	Flynt	Quillen
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Railsback
Ashley	Fulton, Tenn.	Rangel
Badillo	Gallagher	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Gettys	Reuss
Barrett	Giatmo	Rooney, N.Y.
Bell	Goldwater	Rosenthal
Bevill	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Blaggi	Hanna	Roy
Biester	Hansen, Idaho	Runnels
Bingham	Harvey	Ruppe
Blanton	Hawkins	St Germain
Blatnik	Hays	Schmitz
Bray	Hébert	Schwengel
Broomfield	Heckler, Mass.	Sebellus
Brown, Mich.	Henderson	Shipley
Brown, Ohio	Hicks, Mass.	Shoup
Burleson, Tex.	Hillis	Sikes
Byron	Horton	Spence
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Stafford
Carney	Hungate	Staggers
Celler	Hunt	Steed
Chamberlain	Ichord	Steiger, Ariz.
Chappell	Jarman	Steiger, Wis.
Clark	Karth	Stokes
Clawson, Del	Kemp	Stubblefield
Clay	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Cleveland	Landrum	Symington
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Conte	McCloskey	Thompson,
Conyers	McCulloch	N.J.
Culver	McDade	Thone
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Waldie
Delaney	Mich.	Ware
Denholm	McMillan	Whalen
Dent	Mathis, Ga.	Whalley
Derwinski	Metcalfe	White
Devine	Michel	Whitehurst
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Wildnall
Dorn	Mink	Wiggins
Drinan	Nelsen	Williams
Dulski	Passman	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	Patman	Wyatt
Eckhardt	Pepper	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8825, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 286 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

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

On May 18, 1971:

H.R. 4246. An act to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits and economic stabilization, and for other purposes.

On May 21, 1971:

H.R. 7500. An act to provide for the placement of Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, on the retired list in the grade of general.

On May 25, 1971:

H.R. 8190. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

On June 1, 1971:

H.R. 5352. An act to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sisk: Page 4, after line 23, insert:

"Section 522(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-510; 2 U.S.C. 282a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) One of the attorneys appointed under subsection (a) shall be designated by the Legislative Counsel as Deputy Legislative Counsel. During the absence or disability of the Legislative Counsel, or when the office is vacant, the Deputy Legislative Counsel shall perform the functions of the Legislative Counsel.

"(2) The Legislative Counsel may delegate to the Deputy Legislative Counsel and to other employees appointed under subsection (a) such of his functions as he considers necessary or appropriate."

"Section 525 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-510; 2 U.S.C. 282d) is amended to read as follows:

"OFFICIAL MAIL MATTER

"Sec. 525. The Legislative Counsel may send the official mail matter of the Office as franked mail under section 3210 of title 39, United States Code."

Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code (Public Law 91-375), is amended—

"(1) by inserting "and the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives," immediately after "terms of office," in the first sentence; and

"(2) by striking out "or Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives," in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, or Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives."

"Section 3216(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives," and inserting in lieu thereof "Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives."

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I should also like to make a point of order against the amendment and will reserve the point of order against the amendment to ask if the gentleman from California will let us know what the purpose of this amendment is since it is quite obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, of course, that this amendment had been cleared with both sides of the aisle and I will try very briefly to explain it.

Mr. BOW. There was a suggestion that there would be a change in the name of the deputy. But as the amendment was being read, I see that there is a great deal more than simply a change in the name of deputy. I have not seen the amendment. The amendment was not submitted to us, and that is the reason I would like to have the gentleman explain the amendment to us.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. First, let me apologize to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio. I am very sorry. It was my understanding that copies of the amendment and an explanation of it had been delivered to the gentleman and to his staff. I certainly do apologize. But I was apparently misinformed.

The purpose of this, actually, is really to provide two amendments, putting them together in the legislative counsel's office and the purpose was to perfect

what was omitted through some inadvertency in connection with the office in the legislative counsel. That is really all it does.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, and I hope if I might get a copy to the gentleman so that he could see the amendment. As I said, I understood the gentleman did have copies.

The first part of the amendment deals with the matter of placing in the law the fact that during the absence or disability of the legislative counsel, the deputy counsel should perform those functions. That is merely a technical matter. There was some thought that this could be handled administratively and at present it is being done. But this does make it official.

The second part of the amendment deals with permitting the legislative counsel to have the franking privilege as other officers of the House such as the Sergeant at Arms have, subject, of course, to other limitations of law.

In other words, that is the requirement that the franking privilege be used only for official business.

Let me say that in the consideration of this request before the gentleman's committee, I notice reference made to it in the report to the subcommittee of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), that this matter would be left open without any intent to be against the situation subject to the approval of the legislative committee. The legislative committee in this case, first, will be the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in connection with the second.

My understanding is that the first part has the full approval of the Committee on Rules and as to the second part, I believe, by the action only yesterday of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I will be glad to yield either to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) or the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) to comment on this. They also approved the use of the franking privilege for the legislative counsel's office.

That is what this amendment does.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman with reference to the second page of his amendment.

"(2) by striking out 'or Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives' and other changes apparently of responsibility." Just what does that do?

Mr. SISK. That in no sense changes the authority of the Sergeant at Arms in connection with this use of the frank. This is merely a technical change required by law in combining the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. It is a technical matter fitting in the legislative counsel along with the Sergeant at Arms in connection with the use of the frank.

Mr. BOW. It does not change the responsibility of the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. SISK. Not one whit.

Mr. BOW. As I understand this amendment, and correct me if I am wrong, it simply provides for a deputy legislative

counsel and gives to the legislative counsel the right of the franking privilege.

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. Those are the two things being done.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the franking privilege, it was represented to us yesterday that the cost for postage is approximately \$50 a year. In using penalty mail, the costs as represented to us are several times \$50 because of the necessity to file forms and keep certain accounts.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I have had some occasion to look into this matter, and I agree with the position of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Iowa. I believe the amendment should be approved. It appears to be in the best interest of the operation of the office of the Legislative Counsel.

I believe that this amendment is on solid ground and is well supported by all those who are most familiar with it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I concur in what the chairman of the committee says. So far as I am concerned, it is agreeable.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) in support of his amendment.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I simply ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

For contributions to employees life insurance fund, retirement fund, and health benefits fund, as authorized by law, \$5,245,000, and in addition, such amount as may be necessary may be transferred from the preceding appropriation for "miscellaneous items".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language to be found on page 6, line 7, after the figures "\$5,245,000." It is this language:

And in addition, such amount as may be necessary may be transferred from the preceding appropriation for "miscellaneous items".

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this language on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa this is merely a facilitating provision. This is an amount that must be paid. It is subject to a point of order, but it is going to be paid one way or the other, because it is provided by law for Government contributions. We have no way of determining precisely what amount will be needed.

Some Members have 15 employees. Some have 16. Some have four or five. Regardless of the amount, it has to be paid.

Mr. GROSS. Then I submit, Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House have no way of knowing what constitutes "miscellaneous items."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It refers to the "preceding appropriation for 'miscellaneous items'." This is transfer authority. That is what it amounts to.

Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I insist on the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama concede the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

For salaries and expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, \$10,770,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the legislative appropriation bill I would hope that funds could be found for travel expenses to Europe for several of the Members of Congress who fought so hard and so successfully in killing the American supersonic transport program. I am thinking particularly of the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

In this body 2 years ago, our late colleague L. Mendel Rivers eloquently explained what the SST meant to America's aviation industry. And, he spoke of the coming competition from the Russians and from the British-French consortium which has built the Concorde. Yet, his prophecy fell on many deaf ears.

While the gentleman from South Carolina was warning us not to develop myopia over the pending competition, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) was responding, saying:

I am not sure there will be competition . . . we do not know now whether the British or the French plane will fly.

And, in the other body, Senator PROXMIRE was making an equally short-range observation, saying we were touting the SST—"To provide unneeded protection for our thriving aviation industry—and our national prestige against the grossly

overblown threat to an overrated foreign competitor, the Concorde."

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the last week in Paris has set the record straight as to whether or not these two gentlemen were mistaken.

The Concorde is flying as we said it would. And, several U.S. airlines now are negotiating with officials of this Anglo-French company on specifications and guarantees which would lead to purchases of the faster than sound commercial jet.

Our Secretary of Transportation, Senator GOLDWATER, and reporters who have ridden in the Concorde have praised it and predicted it will succeed.

Likewise, there were voices of scorn when we said there was pending competition from the Russian TU-144. Now, it is reported from Paris that the Soviet counterpart to the Concorde is quieter and cleaner, and experts who saw the Russian craft land said that it apparently could meet the United States new standards for noise, and that it emitted no smoke.

I take no satisfaction in saying I was right and they were wrong, but I do say a trip abroad for the most vocal opponents of a U.S. SST would be a most justified expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE

For telegraph and telephone service, exclusive of personal services, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of House Resolution 418, Ninety-second Congress, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against lines 19 and 20 on page 6, under the general heading of "Telegraph and Telephone". After the proviso in the paragraph it states: "shall be the permanent law with respect thereto."

I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Missouri as including in his point of order the language on page 6, line 18, after the "\$4,000,000: *Provided*," and all from there to the end of line 20?

Mr. HALL. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that we should have a proviso which is obviously legislation in an appropriation bill. I do not believe that this law should be permanentized in this manner, and I make the point of order that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of order only against the proviso?

Mr. HALL. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. This is an old practice that has been followed by this committee at the request of committees for many, many years and is in accordance with the intent of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman

from Alabama concede the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POSTAGE STAMP ALLOWANCES

Postage stamp allowances for the second session of the Ninety-second Congress, as follows: Clerk, \$1,120; Sergeant at Arms, \$840; Doorkeeper, \$700; Postmaster, \$560; each Member, the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, the majority and minority whips, and each standing committee, as authorized by law; \$321,090: *Provided*, That the provisions of House Resolution 420, Ninety-second Congress, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language to be found on page 7, line 7, which states as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of House Resolution 420, Ninety-second Congress shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

I make a point of order against that language on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Alabama if he wishes to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Again we were following the intent of the House and a custom which is established.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman concede the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order against the proviso is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

For an additional amount for "Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building", \$71,090,000, authorized by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 986-987), as amended by the Act of March 16, 1970 (84 Stat. 69), to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANDALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: On page 18, strike all of line 10 through line 16.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment should not be difficult to understand. It provides no more or less than to eliminate the funding for a third library, known as the James Madison Library, at this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat again, or once more emphasize—at this time. When there is so much construction going on all over town, including the Metro, the FBI building, and many other projects, there is created a demand for construction workers which I am reliably informed has caused construction workers to be imported to Washington from several hundred miles away. I ask you to think what this adds to the inflationary spiral in this area.

Let me say to the members of the Committee of the Whole, that the ground or real estate of the proposed library, if the superstructure is not built, will still be preserved. I would suggest you walk a

block east at this time. A few days ago you would have seen a vacant square of land. Our options up to that point had been preserved. The land was cleared. It was not going to suddenly disappear. But now, if you go a block east you will see at this moment piledrivers and bulldozers. I suppose funds for the foundations have been duly appropriated, and there is no way to stop that work. But remember that foundation when completed can be adapted to any one of a number of other uses or purposes for which there may be a demand or need in the future and which might or could have a much higher priority than that library.

I know we have talked about building a library for a long time. I am not now suggesting the construction of a fourth House office building. But I do submit that one of the most urgent needs when our constituents come to the Capitol area is for parking facilities. Certainly, these visitors—who are our constituents—here to see Members of Congress, cannot park any place except on this Hill.

Before we go ahead with this monumental superstructure let us make a careful survey to see if we can house these books somewhere else besides Capitol Hill.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is to suggest we wait until future needs can be more clearly determined. Why do we have to rush into this thing? Why do we have to hurry, hurry, hurry? Now, let me enumerate the reasons for my opposition to this superstructure.

I have been advised by the committee staff a few moments ago that we are paying \$2.2 million in rent for space to house books. It is true some of the books may be scattered into different areas. But they are not so far they cannot be made readily available or any Member cannot call for them or make use of them on request.

Now let us look at the economy aspect of this appropriation. The superstructure is going to cost \$100 million based upon present estimates, we know we are going to have overruns. We know we will never get out for \$100 million.

Let us, for example, take a rate of interest of 6 percent. That means a \$6 million cost for debt service annually that is going to be paid from now on. Then, what is it going to take to amortize the cost of this superstructure? Assuming a life of 30 years—this will mean an amortization figure of over \$3 million a year on the conservative side. What about operation and maintenance? You cannot get by on \$1 million or \$2 million per year when you begin to talk about the operation facet of the library. We must remember that every employee you hire over there as high as the grade of GS-10, is going to have to have a secretary. It is going to be hard to figure the ultimate cost of operation.

To put the issue of economy into perspective—it is much better to pay \$2.2 million a year for space to store books than \$10 million a year in debt service costs—and new operational costs that may go much higher.

Mr. Chairman, we talk a lot in this House about decentralization. But, most unfortunately, there is a heavy concen-

tration of buildings and more buildings on Capitol Hill. It has been my experience that books are available at any time. You can call and get a book whenever you want it. I suspect that there are more books over there than any of us will ever be able to read—and enough now for all of our research needs.

Mr. Chairman, my appeal to my fellow members is to adopt this amendment at this time. This way we can keep our options open. We can proceed with the foundation, but not beyond that. Let us leave the options open for the future for uses which, perhaps, we cannot even now anticipate. Then think a while and compare present costs of \$2.2 million for space rental annually as compared to the new costs for interest amortization and operation of \$10 million to \$12 million a year, next year and every year thereafter.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the full 5 minutes, I will say to my colleagues, but I rise in support of this amendment. I support the Randall amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the moment of truth is fast approaching when we can no longer afford to willy-nilly pass appropriation bills without realizing that the highest officials in free government cannot set a standard or quality of life for others and not abide in themselves. In other words, you cannot have accommodations more and more on the Hill. We have parking facilities for ourselves and for our staffs, more and more money and personnel who work in our offices, but we decry expenditures and growing bureaus downtown in the Federal agencies.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I had two national leaders in the equestrian field come to see me in my office, but they were over 30 minutes late. They were late, because they could not find a place to park. You know who they were? They were taxpayers, common citizens, John Q. Citizen taxpayers, but no place to park their car on this Hill. There is plenty of room for me to park and for my staff and staff people and assistants to park all over this Capitol, but there is not room for the people to park whom we public servants are supposed to serve.

I believe we should place plans for this new library building in abeyance. We do not need another new building on the Capitol Hill. Instead, let us put in some parking spaces for visiting groups of people who come to see their Congressman and who also wish to visit the Library of Congress, the buildings that are already here.

There are literally thousands upon thousands of books here that will never be read, let alone the others that are stored around the country.

As the Members know, we are now in the day of instantaneous transmission. We can use instantaneous transmission to secure any page from a book with just a simple flick of our fingers. We do not have to have the books where we can get at them right away in this stage of our technology. Let us preserve the beauty of Washington and put in more parks, more grass, more trees, so that we

can preserve the beauty of the Capitol itself.

The only way is to avoid congestion in our highways, in our buildings, so that the beauty of the environment of our Nation's Capital will be preserved.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Chairman, the Congress is not acting willy-nilly or fast in constructing this Madison Memorial Library as a part of the Congressional Library for this has been authorized over the years. There was financing for this last year for the substructure, and now comes the question of the building itself.

There has been talk about this two and a half million dollars for storage and these volumes being available. That is not the fact. The fact is that the two and a half million dollars is used for storage in buildings all over this area where boxes are stored with important volumes in them that are not available, they are not indexed, so that the people can see them out in the library. These are for the students and the people who come to use the library.

You know, when we speak of the Congressional Library, whether we like it or not, the Congressional Library is the greatest library in the world. It does not only serve the Congress, but it serves the entire academic world. Scholars from all over the world come here. It is one of the finest libraries in the world.

I would feel that since the Congress has decided some time ago to go forward with this building that we should continue with it. We now have built the substructure. If we were to cancel today, I am advised that it would cost us \$2 million on cancellation alone.

You talk about the parking situation and the complaints on that score and wishing that we had places to park for the visitors, and the fact that we have parking available and our staff also. I do not object to those complaints. I would like to see some parking places available where visitors could park, such as the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) just spoke about. And insofar as finding places to park, I might suggest that the Rayburn Building was built with an understructure wherein you can put four additional floors underneath it. There is a place if you want to find parking places on Capitol Hill, we can go on and have the Library built and we can also have a garage built with four more floors under the Rayburn Building if you want it.

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

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Ohio has brought out a point that I neglected to mention in my remarks. That is that the future changes on Capitol Hill are proceeding without any plan. The gentleman has pointed out the fact that the real estate to the east is almost the only

available space on Capitol Hill. We should all recognize there has been no overall plan for Capitol Hill.

I read in the morning paper the fact that the other body on the north side of the Capitol are taking more land for a possible third Senate Office Building—but still there is no plan.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman from Missouri that when the original Capitol was put up here, there was a plan for development of the Capitol Hill. If the gentleman would care to go back into the history of Capitol Hill, he will find that the plan provides for a continuation of the Mall beyond where the Library is, and the Capitol clear down to the river. There have been a number of plans.

But some years ago the Memorial Library was planned and action was taken by the Congress, by the proper committees of the Congress, authorizing its construction. It was funded last year. I might say to you that we have got to get some space. These books are not available to get at as they are now, because they are stored in these various buildings. Therefore, I would hope that you will support the subcommittee on this and vote to go forward with the building of the Memorial Library Building.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are not moving headlong into this proposition of building the James Madison Memorial Library, because this building has been in the planning stage for some 10 or 15 years. It was authorized in 1965 and plans for it were made years before that. A total of \$18,910,000 has been appropriated to date. The contract for excavation and sheeting, foundation, mat, and walls up to grade was let on April 23, 1971, and initial work is commencing.

As I stated earlier, we have a great library, the greatest in the world, and for a library to be great, it must grow.

The library has outgrown its present facilities. It has been said, and I will repeat, that the library occupies space in this city beyond the library complex in some 11 different places and the yearly rental for those spaces is \$2.2 million and is increasing every year. We have been talking about storing books but there will be other uses for this new building, such as offices for the Patent Office rather the Copyright Office, the Administrative Departments, the division for the blind and physically handicapped, the Congressional Research Service, as well as public space, and not to mention the James Madison Memorial hall.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO. Would the gentleman give me one good reason why the U.S. Patent Office has to be in Washington, D.C.—just one reason?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We are talking of the Copyright Office—I said the Patent Office in error. The Copyright Office is a part of the Library of Congress.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. By our chairman's last statement, it indicates that it is going to be used for that purpose rather than the library—as you just said.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No, the Copyright Office has always been a part of the Library of Congress.

Mr. RANDALL. May I inquire now if this issue that has been raised about the \$2 million, which I understand the chairman confirms, that because at this time is only \$2.2 million?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is right. It is growing every year.

Mr. RANDALL. The interest certainly is growing every year and the cost of the building maintenance is growing every year.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. A former chairman of this committee, the late Clarence Cannon from the gentleman's home State, said many, many times that you cannot balance the Federal budget in the legislative appropriation bill which includes the Library of Congress. Now I am told they will be paying \$2.2 million for rent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion if you want to know how much we need a new House office building on Capitol Hill, which we need like a hole in our heads, vote for this amendment, and I will predict if anything is built on that site, it will be a House office building. The issue is as clear as the noon day sun.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time rise in support of the amendment nor in opposition to the amendment. What I would like to do is to try to lay before the House certain facts relating to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the population of this country is steadily growing. The demands upon the House and the Senate and Members are also steadily growing. But if we permit the building of a third library building on this choice piece of ground—square 732—it will mean that to some extent we will have hemmed ourselves in, at least insofar as future expansion for House accommodations is concerned.

I agree with those who think that within this decade, let us say, we certainly do not need a fourth House office building. I would certainly oppose it. Whether or not we should reserve this particular location for the future use of the House is a question for the Congress to decide. I would not undertake to urge anyone to take any particular position on that question. But I would say that the Library is the creature of the Congress; that the Congress is not a creature of the Library; and that we should give consideration to our potential long-range needs.

Now, it may be that if a Library building is built on square 732, and at some future date a fourth House office building were decided upon, it may be that with considerable expense the Library building could be converted. I personally would

like to see the west front of the Capitol extended. I would also think serious consideration could be given, when we need to, to building on top of the underground garages immediately south of the Rayburn and Longworth Buildings. But I do think we need to give consideration to the problem that confronts us—a problem that arose quite suddenly.

The new Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White, who was appointed by President Nixon, was endorsed by the American Institute of Architects. He recently made a study of the physical resources of the Capitol and the space around the Capitol at the request of the Speaker of the House. He made a report to the Speaker of the House that it would be ill-advised for the library building to go on this spot because this particular location ought to be reserved for the future use of the Congress itself. He was not at all in opposition to the needs of the library, but he felt that some other spot ought to be made available for that purpose.

The House Office Building Commission, which is made up of the Speaker of the House and two other Members, requested the Committee on Appropriations to withhold action on the \$71 million appropriation until this question of location could be further explored—not that any change would ultimately be made—but that the matter might be further explored. But by the time this request came to us, the subcommittee which handles the matter had already fixed its position with respect to it and it was not considered feasible to throw on the brakes and suddenly change the course.

I am not now asking that we change course. In the circumstances, I am supporting the committee in connection with this matter, but I do want to again point out that the Architect of the Capitol, who is a very eminent man in his field and who made this study, made the recommendation that this particular spot—square 732—be reserved for the use of the House of Representatives.

It was on that basis the issue arose. If we had had a few weeks to explore this matter further, the Committee on Appropriations might have made some different recommendations to the House today.

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

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

Mr. RANDALL. The comments of the chairman point up the fact that the Architect of the Capitol indicated the present basis of the use by Congress itself. I ask if the Architect ever submitted a plan to the Appropriations Committee beyond this, showing plans for Capitol Hill? Certainly it is not suggested that we move in and tear down the new Capitol Hill Club, being built. That is the only place for expansion beyond that. I would suggest we might receive some opposition from the other side of the aisle on that.

Mr. MAHON. I believe we should have—and we are in the process of having—a more exhaustive study made of the space requirements of the House of Representatives.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the other body has to some extent allowed for its requirements by leaving itself available space to move toward the east. It was the thought of the Architect of the Capitol that we should preserve this contiguous property—square 732—for the use of the House of Representatives. Our legislative work must be in close proximity to the Capitol. Members and committees must be close to the House for the purpose of voting and otherwise.

I thought I should make this statement for the benefit of Members who have not been in on the play-by-play developments, so to speak, of recent days.

This is a matter of judgment and, I would add, to some extent a matter of emotion. I am supporting the committee, but with some reluctance. We may be making a mistake, but it is not feasible at this point to reverse the situation. Any changes would have to be made at a later date.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain factual circumstances which should be set forth at this time.

First. According to the new Architect there is an absolute need and necessity for additional space for the various committees and for the Members of the House of Representatives and their staffs. The new Architect has made a very thorough space check on a personal basis, and this was the conclusion he made to the Speaker and to others who attended a recent meeting with the Speaker.

Second. It is my judgment that if we want to solve the problem of office space most quickly—and I agree there is a need—we can best do that by the extension of the west front of the Capitol. The sooner we get to that the better.

Third. The Library of Congress also needs additional space. The legislation authorizing this project was approved a number of years ago and initial appropriations were made. The contracts have been let for the foundation. The foundation is under construction at the present time. It would seem foolhardy to me to stop that construction, to pay whatever termination costs we would have to pay, and then to start from scratch again.

Let me add, as a footnote, there are alternative solutions right now for additional office space—whether it is the west front extension, whether it is adding two or three more floors over on the parking area, whether it is the termination of the lease for the Congressional Hotel and the utilization of that space for whatever additional room we need—nevertheless a vote for this amendment to delete this funding and to kill the Library in effect is a vote for a fourth office building. I just suggest to Members that they ought to bear that

in mind. I am not sure this is the right environment for that kind of a vote at this particular time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I disagree very vehemently with the assertion that has been made here twice that a vote for this amendment is a vote for a fourth House office building. While I will vote for the amendment, I am not convinced that is the place for a fourth House office building. There are several other alternatives for space which I believe are better. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to think the best thing for that lot would be an underground garage with a park on top of it. I think it is ridiculous for this Congress, which has appropriated millions and millions and millions of dollars long-range planning for cities in this country, to have no long-range plan for Capitol Hill.

One of the problems is that we have made a mistake over the past few years in locating a library annex on that spot and some people do not want to admit that they have made a mistake. They have hardly started digging for this building on this spot. Let us face it. It was a mistake. It is the last spot that has a direct line of sight to the Capitol. Are you going to take that last choice spot for a warehouse for the Library of Congress? We have all of the space between the Library of Congress and Baltimore for warehouses. But, no, we will take the last block that has a line of sight to the Capitol, and then bore two holes under U.S. Highway 50 to get to it. How much sense does that make?

We have made errors over the past few years, but let us admit it and at least hold up construction. To build on that site, we will have to have a building that blends with the Capitol, with the Library of Congress, and with the Cannon Building. That kind of a building costs three times as much as is needed for an annex to the Library of Congress. For an annex, we do not need a building with walls two feet thick and which blends with the other buildings here on Capitol Hill. It could be built behind the present annex.

We do not even need to keep the street there. We could block the street off and build a more accessible building for about a third of the cost. It would also be much more possible to provide parking for users of the Library.

Anyway, we should not have anything built on that valuable site until we have a long-range plan. Let us face up to the fact that we made an error and let us change it before it is too late.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. I just discussed with the committee staff the suggestion of the minority leader, Mr. GERALD FORD, when he alleged the cost of cancellation would be large. I am told this work can go forward up to the point of the superstructure. The substructure can come up with a platform completed. Then at that point

we still have our options open. There is no money lost. There are no cancellation costs if we do stop it at that point.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I also want to say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) that we do want to continue to have the greatest library in the world, and it is about time we started thinking about having the greatest legislative body in the world which faces problems logically, too.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I concur with the gentleman from Iowa's remarks. I also concur with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriation's remarks, and I am going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, how many times over the years has this Congress been criticized because of the fact that the press said we had a political hack as an Architect. I do not know whether that was true or not, but the American public believed it. I do not know anything about his background. How many times have you read in the press criticism of the Rayburn Building as a monstrosity? Personally I think it is beautiful. Personally I think it is adequate in every way. Was there a mistake? There was a mistake in the planning when it was built. How they ever could have built a building like that over a former lake I do not know. It cost them about \$50 million to build a foundation for it. That is where the great amount of money was spent on the Rayburn Building. However, to me it is a beautiful building. Criticism, criticism, criticism by the press. Poor old George, who was around here, was criticized every possible time that the press could poke fun at him. They said that he was never an architect; he had been a former defeated Member of Congress and that is why he got the job. When George died and the appointment of a new Architect to the Congress of the United States came up it was bruited about that a former defeated Republican Member of Congress was going to be appointed by the President. Speaker ALBERT was upset about it and talked to Minority Leader FORD, who went to the President of the United States. He said that no such thing is going to happen. He said, "I am going to select the most capable man I can get, he will be one of the finest, architects in America." So he went to the American Institute of Architects and asked them to present to the White House the names of five men for that position. So they had a committee and decided on five names that they presented to the President of the United States, and he chose one of them. I presume that all of those in the field of architecture can no longer make fun of Congress, because we have one of the outstanding architects of the country in this position. I have never met the man myself, but I take it on face value that he is an outstanding authority in his field. So now he came here and was asked to make a survey—to survey our needs—to make a survey of the buildings. And the properties on Capitol Hill.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we have an outstanding expert and he submits his recommendation in his first report only 2

weeks ago. And, what does he say? He said to stop the building over there next to the old Cannon House Office Building; let us preserve the land, that is the wrong place for a building at this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is like hiring a lawyer and paying him a quarter of a million dollars but saying thank you for your advice, I know you are an expert, but we are going to do what we damn well feel like doing.

Mr. Chairman, just because there appeared an article in the New York Times criticizing the Congress, and because a few people in that gallery have homes over there and, "By God they are not going to let the Congress possibly encroach upon our property," they would destroy Capitol Hill for their own selfish reasons.

You have hired a man who is a real expert and this is a decision which has to be made by the committee and the Congress. Let us show him that we have a little confidence in him.

I hope you will vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this matter, although I feel quite strongly about it. I happened to have built a home on this site. The only time during my 29 years of service in the House of Representatives I voted "present" when the appropriation bill came up to take that block. I felt I should not vote either "yes" or "no" on the question. I owned a house in that area as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) and others. That was about 8 or 9 years ago. I moved out and moved into an apartment and have been in an apartment ever since. I had a most difficult time getting my money out of that house, I might add that because the Department of Justice handled the case and they got some of these appraisers—I had about \$65,000 in the house for which I showed proof with canceled checks and mortgages and bills—this Government appraiser wanted to give me only \$55,000. I went into Federal court and pled my own case. It is said that you have a fool for a lawyer in pleading your own case. However, I felt it was a question of equity and I laid all of my receipts, canceled checks, bills, and other papers before the judge and left it up to his tender mercy. I received back every dollar I had placed into the house and I can say that I was made whole by the system of justice in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced by the logic of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON's) presentation and the logic of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL). This is a unique site over there. It is close to the Capitol Building. If at some future time—and I am not saying this is the time—there might have to be another House office building. I call your attention to the fact that there is already pretty well founded rumors that the Senate with only 100 Members is going to build a third Senate office building. But, if that time should come when we need a fourth House office building, where would you be? If you placed such an of-

fice building very far away, you would not have time for an underground train to get the Members to the Capitol Building to vote, unless you put the new building on the west front. I concede that that is the location that might be used, we have plenty of ground there but you cannot use it because people cause trouble about changing the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEAL) to the effect that we have hired an architect. He has given us his professional opinion and I think it is worthy of consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about what mistakes we have made, if we made a mistake, a few years ago with reference to the James Madison Library.

How many of you use the Library? Everyone does use the Library and it is a great tourist attraction and it is a great library and we do not want to denigrate it in any way. We have millions of volumes of books over there. However, we have a site on the river, the naval gun factory, with many acres of ground that might just as well be used as an annex to the Library. We do not have to have it up on Capitol Hill. We can go east for the extension of the Capitol buildings and build toward the Anacostia River. This would mean taking the homes of some other people, but they took my home and the home of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) as well as a few other people, and we lived through it.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that my friend from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) said on the floor of the House at one time that we would not have a fourth House office building. I recognize that the gentleman is committed to that statement which he made at that time. Chairman MAHON is somewhat committed to the action of his committee. However, there will be a great deal of money tied up in this building at this site. The cancellation amount would be very small in relation to the investment which we will have of approximately \$150 million before we get through if we build the type of building that my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), spoke about, with the improvements and furnishings which will be required, it will well go over that amount in my judgment.

And the work that has been done would be available as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL), has said, for any other purpose.

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

(On request of Mr. RANDALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLIFIELD was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman in the well if he, or, for that matter, whether any of the other Members of this body have a chance to look over the plans?

Usually and ordinarily when we are considering such buildings, we have a

model of the proposed building in the well of the House to consider. I looked at the plans this morning, and with all due praise, and without criticism but compliment to the Architect, I would, however, suggest that probably some of the plans were drawn long before he got here, but as I look at those plans, there is not a window in the whole place, there is a monumental bunch of columns extending all around it and not a window in the place.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not an architect myself, but I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), that the Rayburn Building—and I have had offices in all these three buildings since I have been here—that the Rayburn Building is the first building where we have had a decent office and where the Member did not have to walk through the office where his clerks were to get to the door. This is the first place where he has had an office by himself, had an office for his administrative assistant and also a receptionist room, and other things that are necessary.

As far as the two older buildings are concerned, we have opened up a lot of the offices, we have used three rooms in place of two rooms. I remember when I first came here, I had two very small rooms, and I was in the basement, or practically in the basement when I started. Then I moved from one office to another to where I am now in the Rayburn Building. I am very pleased with it. It is the first time that I have had an office that I thought was a workable office and a practical office.

But, in addition to that, I know that there have been all kinds of calls for additional committee rooms—

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would rather not, I just want to finish my statement, and I will do so by saying this, that I think we might well end up with further expenditures on top of those that we have already spent. With all due respect to the work of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I would also state this would not be the first time that an appropriation bill had been changed or a legislative bill had been changed by the will of the Members of this House.

I think that this could be a good time to hold our options open, let this new Architect, who is a professional architect, come before us with the kind of plans that we can look at. Let us take a little more time. There is no real rush on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the question of the Architect of the Capitol and his qualifications. Having known the Architect for some 20 years, I am somewhat familiar with his experience and ability. His father before him was an architect. He now holds a master's degree in management, and a master's degree in planning. He supervised a corporation of 2,000 employees. His qualifications for the post he holds are ex-

traordinary, for the job of the Architect of the Capitol is a unique one, requiring skills in management, in planning, and in architecture.

Therefore, I recommend that the leadership of this House and the Members of this body follow the advice of a man who is skilled and talented in the planning of a program for the future needs of our Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on a limitation of time within which to discuss this amendment?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have had a lot of discussion on this amendment, and it seems to be revolving around the qualifications of the new architect of the Capitol. But I say to you that the qualifications of the architect have nothing to do with this vote. You are either voting for a new House Office Building or a new Library. It is just that simple. Contracts for the library have been let. The pile-drivers are working over there.

Now, we can have a two and a half million dollar expenditure to close out those contracts, which does not make any sense to me at all. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) says that we can let that contract go, and then we will have a beautiful understructure and we can decide what we want to put on it later.

If we do that, all we are going to be doing is increasing the cost of whatever goes over there.

We have plenty of room if we need a new House office building. There is room over the garages and over the space where the Congressional Hotel is. As a matter of fact, one of the things to consider is that if we do not build a new House office building, we might not create so many new commissions, and all those kinds of things around here that require so many new employees, and we might be able to get by with a little less space.

One of the reasons we need a new library over here is because the Legislative Reorganization Act, itself, sets up a Congressional Research Service.

It is for the Congressional Research Service and the Committee on Rules itself said that it will go to 1,100 employees from the present 363. You are going to have space for these people and space where the public can use it sensibly. I think one of the most serious mistakes that could be made is to vote for this amendment. Let the library go where it should go. It is right off there—I do not see anything wrong with that. What is the difference whether we go east or south? There is plenty of space to the

south if we need more House office space. The worst mistake we can make now is to decide that we are going to have an office building instead of a library.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman I have very little, as a new Member, to offer in addition to the remarks we have just heard except to say that I do intend to support this amendment.

I came to the Congress just this year and I have not been privileged to take part in the previous deliberations which have occurred in this body on whether or not the Library annex should take the place of a fourth House office building.

I would like first, however, to extend my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who, in his brief remarks a moment ago, gave some of the background on this matter which certainly helped me in making my mind up today.

I would also like to point out to the assembled committee that recently we were told to support the SST, because termination costs were too high relative to the costs to continue production. Today, we are asked to halt the Library construction regardless of the termination costs involved.

I would like to say, as a new Member of the Congress, that I am right now struggling to set up an office in the Longworth Building where we have two very small offices and where people are standing one on top of another. A disconnected storage room and a disconnected annex just add tremendously to the difficulty of doing the work of the Congress and the legislative work of our districts.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this point that I have no reluctance whatsoever in indicating to this assembled committee that we do need a fourth House office building and, in fact, if the appropriations were to come along for a fourth House office building, I would vote for that appropriation.

When you look at the space limitations of Capitol Hill, there is no question but that the library annex site in the prime location for the proposed fourth House office building. So I think we ought not to be obfuscating the obvious issue and beclouding these deliberations with oratory and beautiful words.

The simple truth is: We all realize we need a fourth House office building dramatically.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying one thing and that is—I would hope that if the fourth House office building is erected on the site, now reserved for the library, that the committee system be looked at very carefully so that this very prime space and very needed office space will not be grabbed and gobbled up by the great number of select committees and other committees that we have on Capitol Hill. The needs of the Members must get first consideration.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. Is the gentleman agreeing with the statement that has been made that a vote for this amendment is a vote for a fourth House Office Building?

Mr. MAZZOLI. Personally, and I can only speak for myself—you have described my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, what we find here today is a paradox. We find that all of the speakers, both for and against this amendment are correct. I handled the legislation which authorized this building back in 1965. I brought forth for your consideration last year an amendment increasing the authorization by an additional \$15 million, making the total authorization \$90 million. By 1980, we expect to have 300 million people and there will be more than 435 Members of this House. The Speaker is eminently correct—we will need more office space. He should be commended, not criticized for calling this to our attention. But it is a question of priorities. When we authorized this project in the House Committee on Public Works in 1965, we had just finished the Rayburn Building. The Architect of the Capitol, the Speaker of the House then, the House Office Building Commission, all said there was an urgent need to build the Library annex. We still need a Library of Congress annex. We use this not only for the Members of Congress, but for all Americans. Libraries all over this Nation, elementary and secondary level schools, junior colleges, and universities use this great facility.

So I say to you my friends, while we have been planning—and I use that word “planning” advisedly—a Library of Congress annex the costs have catapulted from \$75 million already to \$90 million.

I would say to my friend from Missouri, it has already cost the taxpayers \$15 million additional while we have been working on design. The rent he talks about is merely a pittance compared to what we are spending here waiting, because inflation is adding an extra \$7 million a year to the cost of this building.

If the architect is as good as he has been pointed out to be here—and I assume he is—there is no reason why, at this juncture, after this appropriation is approved here today, this building cannot be designed both for Library and House office building use. Let us give it to the Library of Congress for their most pressing needs and if our needs become so great, with 450 or 500 Members of the House, we could then phase into this building some 50 or 100 suites for Members of Congress.

This is the way to save money. This is the way we could intelligently appropriate funds. Let us go ahead and build it now, when it can be built for \$90 million, and design it for multipurpose use. Our committee certainly will encourage the architect to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it has already been testified to here today by the

chairman of the subcommittee that this Library of Congress annex is going to cost more than \$90 million. It will not be built for \$90 million. It will probably come nearer, based on other construction costs, including the Rayburn Building, based on cost overruns and all the rest, \$120 million.

Be that as it may, it is not a \$90 million structure.

I support the amendment. I am opposed to the building now of this Library annex or a House office building for the reason that every cockeyed dollar for either purpose will have to be borrowed, and thus put another mortgage around the necks of the youngsters of this country. This is not the time to add another mortgage plaster, with a \$21.6 billion deficit for the first 10 months of this fiscal year in Federal expenditures.

I am not very much worried about the building of a House office building on this site, because my good and able friend from Alabama, Mr. ANDREWS, assured me 3 or 4 years ago, when I opposed this Library annex as well as construction of a fourth House office building, that there would be no House office building constructed on this site. Members will find the colloquy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I renew my pledge to the gentleman, as much as I can. That is the reason why he ought to vote for the Library, to keep from having an office building put there.

Mr. GROSS. We can delay the construction of this building, which I understand is going to be replete with dining rooms, private and public, all kinds of them. This is not a Library annex in the true sense of the word.

I do not know whether there is going to be a swimming pool in it. I hope, if one is constructed in this proposed building, that it will be constructed low enough so that a diving board can be installed and a swimmer would not bash his brains out on the ceiling, as would be the case in the Rayburn Building.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. I should like to make the record crystal clear. Last year when we asked the House to vote for an additional \$15 million we stated, and I now repeat, that the Legislative Committee will not increase the cost of this building. If they cannot build it for \$90 million they will have to draw an additional design and go back out for bids. So long as I serve as the chairman of the subcommittee, that will be the situation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois has been around here for a number of years, and I am sure he is not that naive. If \$90 million is plastered into this building everyone can be sure that if it costs \$120 million to finish it will be finished. All anyone has to do is drive a bulldozer over a block of ground and he has got himself another building around here financed with Federal funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will not impose on the patience of the Members any longer. I do not know whether I am right, but my opinion is that it is either this library building or another House office building. The issue is clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama) there were—ayes 48, noes 69.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of the Reorganization Act of 1970, (2 U.S.C. 166), \$6,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration or the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISK: On page 20, line 11, strike “\$6,600,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$6,800,000”.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as is obvious to all the Members, has been substantially compromised over what I proposed to offer when I originally came to the floor. As indicated in my earlier remarks today, under the direction of the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year, in which it directly authorizes the director of the new Congressional Research Service to propose his budget and that it be so submitted and be considered as a separate budget, because we have brought about an autonomous situation in connection with the Congressional Research Service, that budget asks for an increase of \$4 million for the service to begin to bring in the expertise and kind of people necessary to meet the requirements of the Legislative Reorganization Act. The committee saw fit, of course, not to allow any funds for the actual Congressional Research Service, according to our interpretation. They actually did permit an increase of 37 people, which was, according to the testimony in the Library of Congress, the increased workload of the old Legislative Reference Service. After having discussed to some considerable extent this matter with other interested members of the Committee on Rules and other Members interested in

it, we agreed to ask for \$1.5 million, which would only be half of the additional amount sought by the Congressional Research Service. Again after considerable discussion which occurred here this morning, in consultation with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOW) we have modified our request so as simply to ask for an increase of \$200,000 to begin to man, to begin to develop the personnel, the manpower, and the ability to meet the requirements that this Congress voted for overwhelmingly last September.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think we are all interested in a proper Congressional Research Service.

And, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from California. It seems to me that the amendment which has been offered to provide the \$200,000 rather than the \$1.5 million to initiate and build up this staff is a step in the right direction and a reasonably appropriate compromise.

As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to state that I am in support of the amendment. Of course, I cannot commit the entire committee but I believe that this is a good resolution of the problem now pending before us. I trust that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Texas very much for that statement.

I would like, briefly, in a colloquy here with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama to establish a little legislative history, because it would be my understanding that what we are doing here is recognizing the act which the Congress passed last year establishing the Congressional Research Service and are permitting a very, very small number of people to be brought aboard.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he would comment as to the possibility of future consideration of this matter, subject to the Library and the Congressional Research Service justifying research personnel at a time that a supplemental might be considered later in the year?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we always give consideration to requests made to our committee, always. I am not going to promise the gentleman that we will give him whatever money he asks for, but we shall consider it.

Mr. SISK. In other words, the gentleman is saying, is he—and I do not wish to put any words in the gentleman's mouth—it is his intent to recognize on behalf of this Congress and this Appropriations Committee, and this action we are taking today, the act passed by Congress establishing the Congressional Research Service, and this is the first step in the process to meet our obligation? Does the gentleman agree with me on that?

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I really do not know what the gentleman is asking me to say.

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman agree with my statement or not?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That we had a reorganization plan?

Mr. SISK. Yes; and that this represents the first step in creating the manpower to build the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I agree with that.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman agrees with that?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is a part or the first step toward implementing the Reorganization Act. Insofar as the old Legislative Reference Service is concerned—

Mr. SISK. Of course, we are dealing with the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will tell the gentleman that what we deal with is positions.

Mr. SISK. Yes, I understand.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman that the Legislative Reference Service has grown like Topsy since 1962. We had 208 employees. In 1970, they had 363; and they asked for an additional 209 this year. We gave them 37 new positions.

What I would like to see, to be frank with the gentleman, is perhaps better use made of these 400 employees which they now have.

Mr. SISK. If I can comment on that point—and I think the gentleman from Alabama is pretty clear on it in his own mind—exactly what I propose is that in the past history of the Legislative Reference Service it was designed to meet the needs of the Congress and in my opinion it has done a good job, but that has no relevancy to the matter pending before us today where we are attempting to start the development of the Congressional Research Service to meet a specific purpose establishing a number of additional duties outlined in two full pages of the law.

What I am saying is that I appreciate the fact that the gentleman's committee is now willing to go along, even though in a very modest amount which we reluctantly agreed to, and would take into consideration in a supplemental additional funds for this service and certainly permit testimony before his committee by the Members, along with representatives of the Congressional Research Service, in trying to justify the request, and subject to justification that additional personnel is needed, his committee would give it consideration?

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment although I do so with reluctance. My support is reluctant because

I think this step is a very modest one, although it is in the right direction.

I am disappointed that the proponents of an expanded Congressional Research Service, as provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, have consented to such a modest increase in the sum appropriated. This body may well have reason to be grateful for the heroic efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) to establish a legislative intent that we will proceed with implementation of that Reorganization Act even though the first step be a small one.

The Reorganization Act of 1970 has not had an easy time in implementation. First the majority party saw fit the opening day of this Congress to reverse the decision of the 91st Congress to provide to the minority one-third of the investigative staff funds for the standing committees of the Congress. Next the Speaker, in his wisdom, has not seen fit to implement the provisions of that Reorganization Act which were designed to shorten the length of time consumed by this body in quorum calls. We hope this provision still will be implemented, but as yet needless time is being wasted in the sterile act of establishing the presence of more congressmen than constitute a quorum.

Now we find great reluctance on the part of the Appropriations Committee to carry out the clear intent of the Reorganization Act that our Legislative Reference Service be expanded into a Congressional Research Service of some magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, the development and expansion of the Congressional Research Service is not so much an act of reform as one of legislative survival. Congress is frequently criticized for acquiescing in a junior partnership role in relation to the executive branch. It is frequently pointed out, not just in this Chamber but in the universities and newspapers of this country, that Congress has little opportunity to match the expertise hired by the departments and bureaus of the executive branch. There are two ways we can go to try to rectify this imbalance: First, we can expand our personal staffs; second, we can develop and sustain a pool of skilled manpower available to the Members of Congress on call. I very much favor the second course. Placing as we do the highest priority on the service of our constituents, it is almost inevitable that expanding our personal staffs will be dedicated by the individual Congressman not to increasing legislative skill but to the service of his constituents. There is a kind of Parkinson's law which causes us to create new expectancies and to provide new services as representatives rather than as legislators if we have the personnel to take on new responsibilities of office. It is doubtful that the individual Congressman could ever get a staff large enough to permit him to hire a large number of specialists considering the tremendous scope of Government in these times. In addition, space problems and the constantly increasing pressure on our legislative fiscal resources make it inevitable that expanding our personal

staffs would be the more expensive solution.

A Congressional Research Service of expanded scope would relate almost entirely to our legislative function, and that is the function which must be brought into balance with the executive branch. We need a large pool of highly skilled people, subject to our control and available to us on short notice for special assignments. The Reorganization Act of 1970 sets out with some care the manner in which the scope of the Legislative Reference Service can be revised and extended in order to make expertise available to us when we need it. Nothing is more important to the quality of our work as legislators. To settle for a \$200,000 increase in the appropriation provided by this bill is extremely unfortunate unless it is understood that we are prepared with all due dispatch to move ahead with the design so carefully sketched in the Reorganization Act of 1970. Supplemental appropriations can be added later, once it is understood that this amendment is a further token of our intention of proceeding with the plan.

Before this matter comes up again I urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the work of the Congressional Research Service, to satisfy themselves as to the types of assistance available there and to confirm, each for himself, that in this direction lies the improvement of our function as skilled legislators in a complex government.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to continue to work for implementation of the Reorganization Act of 1970. The need for reform continues, just as the resistance to reform is pervasive. I hope we can continue to maintain our momentum in the type of institutional renewal that is necessary to the vitality of any government, even one that embodies such a liberal concept as our own democratic Government.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use all of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California. I want to make allusion to the views of theorists in government about the relationship between the Congress and the President.

Mr. Chairman, a great many people today feel that Congress has lost ground in its relationship with the President. One reason certainly is the fact that the President has immense resources and manpower at his command which the Congress does not have. The President has thousands of professional people at his command to look up statistics and to write bills.

A great many of the bills that come before this House are from the executive branch, if you please. They come up here on a silver platter to be dealt with by the Legislative simply because the Executive has the legislative resources with which to do this job.

The executive has 4 or 5 thousand computers across the board to handle the statistical needs of the executive, whereas the Congress has only about one com-

puter, as far as I know, which is used for payroll purposes, if you please.

This is one of the reasons why the Congress is in a secondary position with relation to the executive.

I think the matter should be considered in its broadest light. It seems to me that the Congress has a very widened perspective about its responsibilities for services, legislative reference, computers, statistics and all the other back-up things that are needed to carry this Congress forward in its responsibilities to the Nation. Part of this is the manpower that is required over there in the research service of Congress.

I would certainly say that the gentleman's amendment is very little—and I wish it was much greater—because we do have to broaden our perspective about this. We have to open the range on where we are going and how our work is to be carried on, if we are going to keep the Congress up as a coordinate branch of the Government in its relationship with the President.

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

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is presently before the body is perhaps one of the most worthwhile, if modest, amendments that has come before this body in some while.

My colleague, the gentleman from New York, has indicated that the Congress has had a difficult time in maintaining its position of due importance in decisionmaking policies of the Federal Government.

Perhaps its greatest failure has been its inability to properly evaluate and properly generate the kind of understanding among the Members that is necessary for wise action.

This Congress has many complex and difficult questions before it. During the past session of the Congress, we were faced with the problem of determining whether or not we would for example, spend \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money to guarantee the Penn Central's obligations. This was presented to us with a solid phalanx of administrative support without any least bit of staff preparation by the Congress. We were told it was either we do this or we would cause a depression in a railroad industry which would ultimately jeopardize the entire economy.

You know, the Committee on Rules, in its 1970 reorganization proposal, recognized a hard fact, they recognized that the research staff of the Congress was totally inadequate to its needs. They recognized the need for a centralized research and study function inside the Congress. They wanted to give us a tool by which the committees, both of the House and of the Senate, would be able

to do things in a commensurate and common frame of reference. To accomplish this end, they set up a Congressional Research Service. This, I think, was, perhaps, one of the very important actions of the last Congress. And failure, I think, to properly implement it now would be one of the most pennywise and pound-foolish actions that the Congress could take.

The Committee on Rules in its report stated that the Congress requires a supplementary staff to provide legislative aid in policymaking decisions and for this purpose they propose that the Congress expand its functions and facilities of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and the effect of that according to their report was to be as follows:

To supply committees with experts capable of preparing, or assisting in preparing, objective, nonpartisan, in-depth analyses and appraisals of any subject matter. These analyses and appraisals will be directed toward assisting committees in determining the advisability of enacting legislative proposals, of estimating the probable results of such proposals, and alternatives thereto, and of evaluating alternative methods for accomplishing the results sought.

Certainly if the Congress is to maintain its position of responsibility in this country, this is one of the essential tools which we must have.

As an individual Member, I think I have observed for a very long time some of the results of serving in the Congress where I am faced with the enormous efficiency in terms of research capability and presentation on major issues by the Executive and by the lobbies that appear before me. And to assist us in carrying out our proper functions, the act would require that the Congressional Reference Service provide Members with a concise memorandum on any legislative measures scheduled for a hearing. The memorandum is to include a discussion of the purpose and effect of the measure, its legislative history, and whether any like measures were previously introduced in Congress, and, if so, their legislative history.

It also requires the service to employ or contract with such outside experts, consultants, or research organizations on a temporary basis as may be needed from time to time to serve the research needs of the Congress.

As a subcommittee chairman, I have found that I have a very limited staff to properly approach and decide questions involving policy, legislative history, and the happy experience I have had has been to be able to turn to the Congressional Reference Service for assistance in preparing legislation, in looking up the legislative history, in evaluating the legislation and in arriving at an intelligent understanding of the impact of the legislation before us.

I have also received invaluable assistance from them in carrying on the legislative oversight function in that committee, in that they report on changes that have occurred with respect to what Congress has enacted, and this has been of significant value insofar as our congressional responsibilities are concerned.

So I support the amendment. I commend the gentleman from California and the members of the committee and the other Members who have joined in co-sponsoring this amendment and hope that it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 10, page 20, for the purpose of offering an amendment to correct a technical error.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the gentleman is requesting to return to page 20, line 10, and that this is simply a conforming amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is on page 20, line 10, to correct a technical error or a typographical error.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: On page 20, in line 10, strike the word "Reorganization" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Legislative Reorganization."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point and be subject to points of order.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, without doubt there is another typographical error in this bill—I cannot find it at the moment but I assume the gentleman would like to correct that. I cannot put my finger on it at this moment.

Mr. HALL. May I suggest to the gentleman that permission may be obtained by unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct such typographical error.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk or whoever is responsible be authorized to correct any typographical errors in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentleman that that request must be made in the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that we will make such a request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point and subject to points of order.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any further amendments to the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8825) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 26, answered "present" 3, not voting 145, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—259

Abbutt	Bolling	Cederberg
Abzug	Bow	Chamberlain
Adams	Brademas	Clancy
Addabbo	Brasco	Clausen,
Anderson,	Brinkley	Don H.
Anderson,	Brooks	Clay
Anderson, Ill.	Brotzman	Colmer
Andrews, Ala.	Broyhill, N.C.	Conable
Andrews,	Broyhill, Va.	Corman
N. Dak.	Buchanan	Cotter
Aspin	Burke, Fla.	Coughlin
Aspinall	Burke, Mass.	Daniel, Va.
Baker	Burlinson, Mo.	Danielson
Baring	Burton	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, S.C.
Begich	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Wis.
Bergland	Byron	de la Garza
Betts	Cabell	Delaney
Bevill	Caffery	Dellenback
Blackburn	Camp	Dellums
Boggs	Carter	Dennis
Boland	Casey, Tex.	Dickinson

Diggs	King	Reid, Ill.
Dingell	Koch	Rhodes
Donohue	Kuykendall	Riegle
Dow	Kyros	Roberts
Dowdy	Leggett	Robinson, Va.
Downing	Lennon	Robison, N.Y.
Duncan	Lent	Rodino
du Pont	Link	Roe
Edwards, Ala.	Lloyd	Rogers
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.
Ellberg	Lujan	Roush
Esch	McClure	Roy
Evans, Colo.	McCormack	Roybal
Fascell	McEwen	Ruth
Findley	McFall	Ryan
Fisher	McKay	Sandman
Flood	McKevitt	Sarbanes
Foley	Macdonald,	Satterfield
Ford, Gerald R.	Mass.	Scherle
Ford,	Madden	Scheuer
William D.	Mahon	Scott
Forsythe	Mailliard	Seiberling
Fountain	Mann	Shriver
Fraser	Martin	Sisk
Frenzel	Mathias, Calif.	Slack
Frey	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Fulton, Pa.	Mazzoli	Smith, Iowa
Fuqua	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Galifianakis	Melcher	Snyder
Garmatz	Mikva	Springer
Gibbons	Mills, Md.	Stanton,
Gonzalez	Minish	J. William
Goodling	Minshall	Steele
Grasso	Mitchell	Steiger, Ariz.
Gray	Mizell	Stephens
Green, Oreg.	Molchan	Stratton
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Sullivan
Griffin	Montgomery	Tallcott
Griffiths	Moorhead	Taylor
Grover	Morgan	Terry
Hagan	Morse	Thompson, Ga.
Hamilton	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Hammer-	Moss	Thompson, Wis.
schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.	Tiernan
Hanley	Myers	Udall
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Ullman
Harrington	Nedzi	Van Deerin
Hathaway	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Hechler, W. Va.	Nix	Vank
Helstoski	Obey	Veysey
Hicks, Wash.	O'Hara	Vigorito
Hogan	O'Neill	Waggonner
Holifield	Patten	Wampler
Hosmer	Pelly	Watts
Hull	Pepper	White
Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Winn
Johnson, Pa.	Pettis	Wolff
Jonas	Pickle	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Pike	Wylder
Jones, N.C.	Pirnie	Wyman
Jones, Tenn.	Poff	Yates
Karth	Powell	Yatron
Kastenmeter	Preyer, N.C.	Young, Tex.
Kazen	Price, Ill.	Zablocki
Keating	Purcell	Zion
Kee	Quie	Zwach
Keith	Rees	

NAYS—26

Archer	Hutchinson	Roncaglio
Bennett	Landgrebe	Saylor
Collins, Tex.	Latta	Schmitz
Crane	McCollister	Schneebell
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Skubitz
Gaydos	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Gross	Pcage	Wylle
Gubser	Randall	Young, Fla.
Hall	Rarick	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Haley	Jacobs	Rousselot
		NOT VOTING—145
Abernethy	Carey, N.Y.	Eckhardt
Abourezk	Carney	Edmondson
Alexander	Celler	Edwards, La.
Anderson,	Chappell	Erlenborn
Tenn.	Chisholm	Evins, Tenn.
Annunzio	Clark	Fish
Arends	Clawson, Del	Flowers
Ashbrook	Cleveland	Flynt
Ashley	Collier	Frelinghuysen
Badillo	Collins, Ill.	Fulton, Tenn.
Belcher	Conte	Gallagher
Bell	Conyers	Gettys
Blaggi	Culver	Glaimo
Biester	Daniels, N.J.	Goldwater
Bingham	Denholm	Gude
Blanton	Dent	Halpern
Blatnik	Derwinski	Hanna
Bray	Devine	Hansen, Idaho
Broomfield	Dorn	Harsha
Brown, Mich.	Drinan	Harvey
Brown, Ohio	Dulski	Hastings
Burleson, Tex.	Dwyer	Hawkins

Hays	Michel	Sikes
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Heckler, Mass.	Mills, Ark.	Stafford
Henderson	Mink	Staggers
Hicks, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.	Stanton,
Hillis	Nelsen	James V.
Horton	Passman	Steed
Howard	Patman	Steiger, Wis.
Hungate	Peyster	Stokes
Hunt	Podell	Stubblefield
Ichord	Price, Tex.	Stuckey
Jarman	Pryor, Ark.	Symington
Kemp	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
Kluczynski	Quillen	Teague, Tex.
Kyl	Railsback	Thone
Landrum	Rangel	Waldie
Long, La.	Reid, N.Y.	Ware
McClary	Reuss	Whalen
McCloskey	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalley
McCulloch	Rosenthal	Whitehurst
McDade	Rostenkowski	Whitten
McDonald,	Runnels	Widnall
Mich.	Ruppe	Wiggins
McKinney	St Germain	Williams
McMillan	Schwengel	Wilson,
Mathis, Ga.	Sebelius	Charles H.
Matsunaga	Shipley	Wyatt
Metcalfe	Shoup	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Collier against.
Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Thone against.
Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Peyster.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Bureson of Texas with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Staggers with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. McClary.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Drinan with Mr. Rangel.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Steed with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Sebelius.
Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Spence.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. ROUSSELOT changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. MORSE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 8825

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed, the Clerk be authorized to make appropriate corrections in punctuations and spelling.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CLEAN ENERGY NEEDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-118)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For most of our history, a plentiful supply of energy is something the American people have taken very much for granted. In the past twenty years alone, we have been able to double our consumption of energy without exhausting the supply. But the assumption that sufficient energy will always be readily available has been brought sharply into question within the last year. The brown-outs that have affected some areas of our country, the possible shortages of fuel that were threatened last fall, the

sharp increases in certain fuel prices and our growing awareness of the environmental consequences of energy production have all demonstrated that we cannot take our energy supply for granted any longer.

A sufficient supply of clean energy is essential if we are to sustain healthy economic growth and improve the quality of our national life. I am therefore announcing today a broad range of actions to ensure an adequate supply of clean energy for the years ahead. Private industry, of course, will still play the major role in providing our energy, but government can do a great deal to help in meeting this challenge.

My program includes the following elements:

TO FACILITATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR CLEAN ENERGY

- A commitment to complete the successful demonstration of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor by 1980.
- More than twice as much Federal support for sulfur oxide control demonstration projects in Fiscal Year 1972.
- An expanded program to convert coal into a clean gaseous fuel.
- Support for a variety of other energy research projects in fields such as fusion power, magnetohydrodynamic power cycles, and underground electric transmission.

TO MAKE AVAILABLE THE ENERGY RESOURCES ON FEDERAL LANDS

- Acceleration of oil and gas lease sales on the Outer Continental Shelf, along with stringent controls to protect the environment.
- A leasing program to develop our vast oil shale resources, provided that environmental questions can be satisfactorily resolved.
- Development of a geothermal leasing program beginning this fall.

TO ASSURE A TIMELY SUPPLY OF NUCLEAR FUELS

- Begin work to modernize and expand our uranium enrichment capacity.

TO USE OUR ENERGY MORE WISELY

- A New Federal Housing Administration standard requiring additional insulation in new federally insured homes.
- Development and publication of additional information on how consumers can use energy more efficiently.
- Other efforts to encourage energy conservation.

TO BALANCE ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY NEEDS

- A system of long-range open planning of electric power plant sites and transmission line routes with approval by a State or regional agency before construction.
- An incentive charge to reduce sulfur oxide emissions and to support further research.

TO ORGANIZE FEDERAL EFFORTS MORE EFFECTIVELY

- A single structure within the Department of Natural Resources uniting all important energy resource development programs.

THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM

A major cause of our recent energy problems has been the sharp increase in demand that began about 1967. For decades, energy consumption had generally grown at a slower rate than the national output of goods and services. But in the last four years it has been growing at a faster pace and forecasts of energy demand a decade from now have been undergoing significant upward revisions.

This accelerated growth in demand results partly from the fact that energy has been relatively inexpensive in this country. During the last decade, the prices of oil, coal, natural gas and electricity have increased at a much slower rate than consumer prices as a whole. Energy has been an attractive bargain in this country—and demand has responded accordingly.

In the years ahead, the needs of a growing economy will further stimulate this demand. And the new emphasis on environmental protection means that the demand for cleaner fuels will be especially acute. The primary cause of air pollution, for example, is the burning of fossil fuels in homes, in cars, in factories and in powerplants. If we are to meet our new national air quality standards, it will be essential for us to use stack gas cleaning systems in our large power and other industrial plants and to use cleaner fuels in virtually all of our new residential, commercial and industrial facilities, and in some of our older facilities as well.

Together, these two factors—growing demand for energy and growing emphasis on cleaner fuels—will create an extraordinary pressure on our fuel supplies.

The task of providing sufficient clean energy is made especially difficult by the long lead times required to increase energy supply. To move from geological exploration to oil and gas well production now takes from 3 to 7 years. New coal mines typically require 3 to 5 years to reach the production stage and it takes 5 to 7 years to complete a large steam power plant. The development of the new technology required to minimize environmental damage can further delay the provision of additional energy. If we are to take full advantage of our enormous coal resources, for example, we will need mining systems that do not impair the health and safety of miners or degrade the landscape and combustion systems that do not emit harmful quantities of sulfur oxides, other noxious gases, and particulates into the atmosphere. But such systems may take several years to reach satisfactory performance. That is why our efforts to expand the supply of clean energy in America must immediately be stepped up.

1. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS FOR CLEAN ENERGY

Our past research in this critical field has produced many promising leads. Now we must move quickly to demonstrate the best of these new concepts on a commercial scale. Industry should play the major role in this area, but government can help by providing technical leadership and by sharing a portion of the

risk for costly demonstration plants. The time has now come for government and industry to commit themselves to a joint effort to achieve commercial scale demonstrations in the most crucial and most promising clean energy development areas—the fast breeder reactor, sulfur oxide control technology and coal gasification.

A. SULPHUR OXIDE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

A major bottleneck in our clean energy program is the fact that we cannot now burn coal or oil without discharging its sulfur content into the air. We need new technology which will make it possible to remove the sulfur before it is emitted to the air.

Working together, industry and government have developed a variety of approaches to this problem. However, the new air quality standards promulgated under the Clean Air Amendments of 1970 require an even more rapid development of a suitable range of stack gas cleaning techniques for removing sulfur oxides. I have therefore requested funds in my 1972 budget to permit the Environmental Protection Agency to devote an additional \$15 million to this area, more than doubling the level of our previous efforts. This expansion means that a total of six different techniques can be demonstrated in partnership with industry during the next three or four years.

B. NUCLEAR BREEDER REACTOR

Our best hope today for meeting the Nation's growing demand for economical clean energy lies with the fast breeder reactor. Because of its highly efficient use of nuclear fuel, the breeder reactor could extend the life of our natural uranium fuel supply from decades to centuries, with far less impact on the environment than the power plants which are operating today.

For several years, the Atomic Energy Commission has placed the highest priority on developing the liquid metal fast breeder. Now this project is ready to move out of the laboratory and into the demonstration phase with a commercial size plant. But there still are major technical and financial obstacles to the construction of a demonstration plant of some 300 to 500 megawatts. I am therefore requesting an additional \$27 million in Fiscal Year 1972 for the Atomic Energy Commission's liquid metal fast breeder reactor program—and for related technological and safety programs—so that the necessary engineering groundwork for demonstration plants can soon be laid.

What about the environmental impact of such plants? It is reassuring to know that the releases of radioactivity from current nuclear reactors are well within the national safety standards. Nevertheless, we will make every effort to see that these new breeder reactors emit even less radioactivity to the environment than the commercial light water reactors which are now in use.

I am therefore directing the Atomic Energy Commission to ensure that the new breeder plants be designed in a way which inherently prevents discharge to the environment from the plant's radio-

active effluent systems. The Atomic Energy Commission should also take advantage of the increased efficiency of these breeder plants, designing them to minimize waste heat discharges. Thermal pollution from nuclear power plants can be materially reduced in the more efficient breeder reactors.

We have very high hopes that the breeder reactor will soon become a key element in the national fight against air and water pollution. In order further to inform the interested agencies and the public about the opportunities in this area, I have requested the early preparation and review by all appropriate agencies of a draft environmental impact statement for the breeder demonstration plant in accordance with Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act. This procedure will ensure compliance with all environmental quality standards before plant construction begins.

In a related area, it is also pertinent to observe that the safety record of civilian power reactors in this country is extraordinary in the history of technological advances. For more than a quarter century—since the first nuclear chain reaction took place—no member of the public has been injured by the failure of a reactor or by an accidental release of radioactivity. I am confident that this record can be maintained. The Atomic Energy Commission is giving top priority to safety considerations in the basic design of the breeder reactor and this design will also be subject to a thorough review by the independent Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, which will publish the results of its investigation.

I believe it important to the Nation that the commercial demonstration of a breeder reactor be completed by 1980. To help achieve that goal, I am requesting an additional \$50 million in Federal funds for the demonstration plant. We expect industry—the utilities and manufacturers—to contribute the major share of the plant's total cost, since they have a large and obvious stake in this new technology. But we also recognize that only if government and industry work closely together can we maximize our progress in this vital field and thus introduce a new era in the production of energy for the people of our land.

C. COAL GASIFICATION

As we carry on our search for cleaner fuels, we think immediately of the cleanest fossil fuel—natural gas. But our reserves of natural gas are quite limited in comparison with our reserves of coal.

Fortunately, however, it is technically feasible to convert coal into a clean gas which can be transported through pipelines. The Department of the Interior has been working with the natural gas and coal industries on research to advance our coal gasification efforts and a number of possible methods for accomplishing this conversion are under development. A few, in fact, are now in the pilot plant stage.

We are determined to bring greater focus and urgency to this effort. We have therefore initiated a cooperative

program with industry to expand the number of pilot plants, making it possible to test new methods more expeditiously so that the appropriate technology can soon be selected for a large-scale demonstration plant.

The Federal expenditure for this cooperative program will be expanded to \$20 million a year. Industry has agreed to provide \$10 million a year for this effort. In general, we expect that the Government will continue to finance the larger share of pilot plants and that industry will finance the larger share of the demonstration plants. But again, the important point is that both the Government and industry are now strongly committed to move ahead together as promptly as possible to make coal gasification a commercial reality.

D. OTHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

The fast breeder reactor, sulfur oxide controls and coal gasification represent our highest priority research and development projects in the clean energy field. But they are not our only efforts. Other ongoing projects include:

—*Coal Mine Health and Safety Research.* In response to a growing concern for the health and safety of the men who mine the Nation's coal and in accordance with the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, the Bureau of Mines research effort has been increased from a level of \$2 million in Fiscal Year 1969 to \$30 million in Fiscal Year 1972.

—*Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion Research.* For nearly two decades the Government has been funding a sizable research effort designed to harness the almost limitless energy of nuclear fusion for peaceful purposes. Recent progress suggests that the scientific feasibility of such projects may be demonstrated in the 1970s and we have therefore requested an additional \$2 million to supplement the budget in this field for Fiscal Year 1972. We hope that work in this promising area will continue to be expanded as scientific progress justifies larger scale programs.

—*Coal Liquefaction.* In addition to its coal gasification work, the Department of the Interior has underway a major pilot plant program directed toward converting coal into cleaner liquid fuels.

—*Magnetohydrodynamic Power Cycles.* MHD is a new and more efficient method of converting coal and other fossil fuels into electric energy by burning the fuel and passing the combustion products through a magnetic field at very high temperatures. In partnership with the electric power industry, we have been working to develop this new system of electric power generation.

—*Underground Electric Transmission.* Objections have been growing to the overhead placement of high voltage power lines, especially in areas of scenic beauty or near centers of population. Again in cooperation with industry, the Government is

funding a research program to develop new and less expensive techniques for burying high voltage electric transmission lines.

—*Nuclear Reactor Safety and Supporting Technology.* The general research and development work for today's commercial nuclear reactors was completed several years ago, but we must continue to fund safety-related efforts in order to ensure the continuance of the excellent safety record in this field. An additional \$3 million has recently been requested for this purpose to supplement the budget in Fiscal Year 1972.

—*Advanced Reactor Concepts.* The liquid metal fast breeder is the priority breeder reactor concept under development, but the Atomic Energy Commission is also supporting limited alternate reactor programs involving gas cooled reactors, molten salt reactors and light water breeders.

—*Solar Energy.* The sun offers an almost unlimited supply of energy if we can learn to use it economically. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation are currently reexamining their efforts in this area and we expect to give greater attention to solar energy in the future.

The key to meeting our twin goals of supplying adequate energy and protecting the environment in the decades ahead will be a balanced and imaginative research and development program. I have therefore asked my Science Adviser, with the cooperation of the Council on Environmental Quality and the interested agencies, to make a detailed assessment of all of the technological opportunities in this area and to recommend additional projects which should receive priority attention.

2. MAKING AVAILABLE THE ENERGY RESOURCES OF FEDERAL LANDS

Over half of our Nation's remaining oil and gas resources, about 40 percent of our coal and uranium, 80 percent of our oil shale, and some 60 percent of our geothermal energy sources are now located on Federal lands. Programs to make these resources available to meet the growing energy requirements of the Nation are therefore essential if shortages are to be averted. Through appropriate leasing programs, the Government should be able to recover the fair market value of these resources, while requiring developers to comply with requirements that will adequately protect the environment.

To supplement the efforts already underway to develop the fuel resources of the lower 48 States and Alaska, I am announcing today the following new programs:

A. LEASING ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—AN ACCELERATED PROGRAM

The Outer Continental Shelf has proved to be a prolific source of oil and gas, but it has also been the source of troublesome oil spills in recent years. Our ability to tap the great potential of offshore areas has been seriously hampered by these environmental problems.

The Department of the Interior has

significantly strengthened the environmental protection requirements controlling offshore drilling and we will continue to enforce these requirements very strictly. As a prerequisite to Federal lease sales, environmental assessments will be made in accordance with section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Within these clear limits, we will accelerate our efforts to utilize this rich source of fuel. In order to expand productive possibilities as rapidly as possible, the accelerated program should include the sale of new leases not only in the highly productive Gulf of Mexico, but also some other promising areas. I am therefore directing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the offerings of oil and gas leases and to publish a schedule for lease offerings on the Outer Continental Shelf during the next five years, beginning with a general lease sale and a drainage sale this year.

B. OIL SHALE—A PROGRAM FOR ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT

At a time when we are facing possible energy shortages, it is reassuring to know that there exists in the United States an untapped shale oil resource containing some 600 billion barrels in high grade deposits. At current consumption rates, this resource represents 150 years supply. About 80 billion barrels of this shale oil are particularly rich and well situated for early development. This huge resource of very low sulfur oil is located in the Rocky Mountain area, primarily on Federal land.

At present there is no commercial production of shale oil. A mixture of problems—environmental, technical and economic—have combined to thwart past efforts at development.

I believe the time has come to begin the orderly formulation of a shale oil policy—not by any head-long rush toward development but rather by a well considered program in which both environmental protection and the recovery of a fair return to the Government are cardinal principles under which any leasing takes place. I am therefore requesting the Secretary of the Interior to expedite the development of an oil shale leasing program including the preparation of an environmental impact statement. If after reviewing this statement and comments he finds that environmental concerns can be satisfied, he shall then proceed with the detailed planning. This work would also involve the States of Wyoming, Colorado and Utah and the first test lease would be scheduled for next year.

C. GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

There is a vast quantity of heat stored in the earth itself. Where this energy source is close to the surface, as it is in the Western States, it can readily be tapped to generate electricity, to heat homes, and to meet other energy requirements. Again, this resource is located primarily on Federal lands.

Legislation enacted in recent months permits the Federal government, for the first time, to prepare for a leasing program in the field of geothermal energy. Classification of the lands involved is

already underway in the Department of the Interior. I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to expedite a final decision on whether the first competitive lease sale should be scheduled for this fall—taking into account, of course, his evaluation of the environmental impact statement.

3. NATURAL GAS SUPPLY

For the past 25 years, natural gas has supplied much of the increase in the energy supply of the United States. Now this relatively clean form of energy is in even greater demand to help satisfy air quality standards. Our present supply of natural gas is limited, however, and we are beginning to face shortages which could intensify as we move to implement the air quality standards. Additional supplies of gas will therefore be one of our most urgent energy needs in the next few years.

Federal efforts to augment the available supplies of natural gas include:

- Accelerated leasing on Federal lands to speed discovery and development of new natural gas fields.
- Moving ahead with a demonstration project to gasify coal.
- Recent actions by the Federal Power Commission providing greater incentives for industry to increase its search for new sources of natural gas and to commit its discoveries to the interstate market.
- Facilitating imports of both natural and liquefied gas from Canada and from other nations.
- Progress in nuclear stimulation experiments which seek to produce natural gas from tight geologic formations which cannot presently be utilized in ways which are economically and environmentally acceptable.

This administration is keenly aware of the need to take every reasonable action to enlarge the supply of clean gaseous fuels. We intend to take such action and we expect to get good results.

4. IMPORTS FROM CANADA

Over the years, the United States and Canada have steadily increased their trade in energy. The United States exports some coal to Canada, but the major items of trade are oil and gas which are surplus to Canadian needs but which find a ready market in the United States.

The time has come to develop further this mutually advantageous trading relationship. The United States is therefore prepared to move promptly to permit Canadian crude oil to enter this country, free of any quantitative restraints, upon agreement as to measures needed to prevent citizens of both our countries from being subjected to oil shortages, or threats of shortages. We are ready to proceed with negotiations and we look to an early conclusion.

5. TIMELY SUPPLIES OF NUCLEAR FUELS

The Nation's nuclear fuel supply is in a state of transition. Military needs are now relatively small but civilian needs are growing rapidly and will be our dominant need for nuclear fuel in the future. With the exception of uranium enrichment, the nuclear energy industry is now in private hands.

I expect that private enterprise will eventually assume the responsibility for uranium enrichment as well, but in the meantime the Government must carry out its responsibility to ensure that our enrichment capacity expands at a rate consistent with expected demands.

There is currently no shortage of enriched uranium or enriching capacity. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission has substantial stocks of enriched uranium which have already been produced for later use. However, plant expansions are required so that we can meet the growing demands for nuclear fuel in the late 1970s—both in the United States and in other nations for which this country is now the principal supplier.

The most economical means presently available for expanding our capacity in this field appears to be the modernization of existing gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Portsmouth, Ohio; and Paducah, Kentucky—through a Cascade Improvement Program. This program will take a number of years to complete and we therefore believe that it is prudent to initiate the program at this time rather than run the risk of shortages at a later date. I am therefore releasing \$16 million to start the Cascade Improvement Program in Fiscal Year 1972. The pace of the improvement program will be tailored to fit the demands for enriched uranium in the United States and in other countries.

6. USING ENERGY MORE WISELY

We need new sources of energy in this country, but we also need to use existing energy as efficiently as possible. I believe we can achieve the ends we desire—homes warm in winter and cool in summer, rapid transportation, plentiful energy for industrial production and home appliances—and still place less of a strain on our overtaxed resources.

Historically, we have converted fuels into electricity and have used other sources of energy with ever increasing efficiency. Recent data suggest, however, that this trend may be reversing—thus adding to the drain on available resources. We must get back on the road of increasing efficiency—both at the point of production and at the point of consumption, where the consumer himself can do a great deal to achieve considerable savings in his energy bills.

We believe that part of the answer lies in pricing energy on the basis of its full costs to society. One reason we use energy so lavishly today is that the price of energy does not include all of the social costs of producing it. The costs incurred in protecting the environment and the health and safety of workers, for example, are part of the real cost of producing energy—but they are not now all included in the price of the product. If they were added to that price, we could expect that some of the waste in the use of energy would be eliminated. At the same time, by expanding clean fuel supplies, we will be working to keep the overall cost of energy as low as possible.

It is also important that the individual consumer be fully aware of what his energy will cost if he buys a particular home or appliance. The efficiency of

home heating or cooling systems and of other energy intensive equipment are determined by builders and manufacturers who may be concerned more with the initial cost of the equipment than with the operating costs which will come afterward. For example, better thermal insulation in a home or office building may save the consumer large sums in the long run—and conserve energy as well—but for the builder it merely represents an added expense.

To help meet one manifestation of this problem, I am directing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to issue revised standards for insulation applied in new federally insured homes. The new Federal Housing Administration standards will require sufficient insulation to reduce the maximum permissible heat loss by about one-third for a typical 1200 square foot home—and by even more for larger homes. It is estimated that the fuel savings which will result each year from the application of these new standards will, in an average climate, equal the cost of the additional insulation required.

While the Federal Government can take some actions to conserve energy through such regulations, the consumer who seeks the most for his energy dollar in the marketplace is the one who can have the most profound influence. I am therefore asking my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs—in cooperation with industry and appropriate Government agencies—to gather and publish additional information in this field to help consumers focus on the operating costs as well as the initial cost of energy intensive equipment.

In addition, I would note that the Joint Board on Fuel Supply and Fuel Transport chaired by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness is developing energy conservation measures for industry, government, and the general public to help reduce energy use in times of particular shortage and during pollution crises.

7. POWER PLANT SITING

If we are to meet growing demands for electricity in the years ahead, we cannot ignore the need for many new power plants. These plants and their associated transmission lines must be located and built so as to avoid major damage to the environment, but they must also be completed on time so as to avoid power shortages. These demands are difficult to reconcile—and often they are not reconciled well. In my judgment the lesson of the recent power shortages and of the continuing disputes over power plant siting and transmission line routes is that the existing institutions for making decisions in this area are not adequate for the job. In my Special Message to the Congress on the Environment last February, I proposed legislation which would help to alleviate these problems through longer range planning by the utilities and through the establishment of State or regional agencies to license new bulk power facilities prior to their construction.

Hearings are now being held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives

concerning these proposals and other measures which would provide an open planning and decision-making capacity for dealing with these matters. Under the administration bill, long-range expansion plans would be presented by the utilities ten years before construction was scheduled to begin, individual alternative power plant sites would be identified five years ahead, and detailed design and location of specific plants and transmission lines would be considered two years in advance of construction. Public hearings would be held far enough ahead of construction so that they could influence the siting decision, helping to avoid environmental problems without causing undue construction delays. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this important legislative proposal. At the same time steps will be taken to ensure that Federal licenses and permits are handled as expeditiously as possible.

8. THE ROLE OF THE SULFUR OXIDES EMISSIONS CHARGE

In my environmental message last February I also proposed the establishment of a sulfur oxides emissions charge. The emissions charge would have the effect of building the cost of sulfur oxide pollution into the price of energy. It would also provide a strong economic incentive for achieving the necessary performance to meet sulfur oxide standards.

The funds generated by the emissions charge would be used by the Federal Government to expand its programs to improve environmental quality, with special emphasis on the development of adequate supplies of clean energy.

9. GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION—AN ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

But new programs alone will not be enough. We must also consider how we can make these programs do what we intend them to do. One important way of fostering effective performance is to place responsibility for energy questions in a single agency which can execute and modify policies in a comprehensive and unified manner.

The Nation has been without an integrated energy policy in the past. One reason for this situation is that energy responsibilities are fragmented among several agencies. Often authority is divided according to types and uses of energy. Coal, for example, is handled in one place, nuclear energy in another—but responsibility for considering the impact of one on the other is not assigned to any single authority. Nor is there any single agency responsible for developing new energy sources such as solar energy or new conversion systems such as the fuel cell. New concerns—such as conserving our fossil fuels for non-fuel uses—cannot receive the thorough and thoughtful attention they deserve under present arrangements.

The reason for all these deficiencies is that each existing program was set up to meet a specific problem of the past. As a result, our present structure is not equipped to handle the relationships between these problems and the emergence of new concerns.

The need to remedy these problems be-

comes more pressing every day. For example, the energy industries presently account for some 20 percent of our investment in new plant and equipment. This means that inefficiencies resulting from uncoordinated government programs can be very costly to our economy. It is also true that energy sources are becoming increasingly interchangeable. Coal can be converted to gas, for example, and even to synthetic crude oil. If the Government is to perform adequately in the energy field, then it must act through an agency which has sufficient strength and breadth of responsibility.

Accordingly, I have proposed that all of our important Federal energy resource development programs be consolidated within the new Department of Natural Resources.

The single energy authority which would thus be created would be better able to clarify, express, and execute Federal energy policy than any unit in our present structure. The establishment of this new entity would provide a focal point where energy policy in the executive branch could be harmonized and rationalized.

One of the major advantages of consolidating energy responsibilities would be the broader scope and greater balance this would give to research and development work in the energy field. The Atomic Energy Commission, for instance, has been successful in its mission of advancing civilian nuclear power, but this field is now intimately interrelated with coal, oil and gas, and Federal electric power programs with which the Atomic Energy Commission now has very little to do. We believe that the planning and funding of civilian nuclear energy activities should now be consolidated with other energy efforts in an agency charged with the mission of insuring that the total energy resources of the Nation are effectively utilized. The Atomic Energy Commission would still remain intact, in order to execute the nuclear programs and any related energy research which may be appropriate as part of the overall energy program of the Department of Natural Resources.

Until such time as this new Department comes into being, I will continue to look to the Energy Subcommittee of the Domestic Council for leadership in analyzing and coordinating overall energy policy questions for the executive branch.

CONCLUSION

The program I have set forth today provides the basic ingredients for a new effort to meet our clean energy needs in the years ahead.

The success of this effort will require the cooperation of the Congress and of the State and local governments. It will also depend on the willingness of industry to meet its responsibilities in serving customers and in making necessary capital investments to meet anticipated growth. Consumers, too, will have a key role to play as they learn to conserve energy and as they come to understand that the cost of environmental protection must, to a major extent, be reflected in consumer prices.

I am confident that the various ele-

ments of our society will be able to work together to meet our clean energy needs. And I am confident that we can therefore continue to know the blessings of both a high-energy civilization and a beautiful and healthy environment.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1971.

ENERGY SUPPLY PROBLEM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent the Congress a message which carefully explores the Nation's energy supply problems in the 1970's and offers a number of highly practical recommendations for the solution of those problems.

The problems related to our energy needs are clearly due to the sharply increasing demand for energy and the parallel demand for environmental protection which places heavy limitations on the use of many customary energy sources.

The President has placed before the Congress a program which outlines new initiatives and new commitments to help insure clean energy supplies to meet our country's foreseeable needs.

He has also indicated the new appropriations needed to put his program into effect in the areas of research and development, the elimination of pollution from energy sources now in use, expansion in the leasing of Federal lands for new oil and gas supplies, and the exploration of entirely new sources of power.

I find particularly intriguing the President's emphasis on new-generation nuclear reactors as the best hope for fulfilling our energy needs in the future.

The President's message is far-reaching, and his program is well balanced. We have before us a plan marked by vision in dealing with a most crucial problem. I would hope the Congress gives adequate study to it and acts to implement it as necessary.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically welcome today's "Energy Message" as sent up by the President.

Clearly, as Mr. Nixon has noted: "We cannot take our energy supply for granted any longer." The clouds of trouble—and, perhaps, of impending, serious crisis—have been gathering on the national horizon in this regard for several years now, and for too long have been largely ignored. And, why not? For the one thing this Nation has enjoyed in abundance—in the midst of those other evidences of the fact that this has been at least a physically blessed land—has been a seeming never-ending supply of those resources from which energy can be produced. Until lately, the possibility that we might eventually run out of essential fuels, or use up our remaining hydropower sites, for instance, was something that, like so many Scarlett O'Hara's, we could "worry about tomorrow."

But, Mr. Speaker, that "tomorrow" has—without our scarcely realizing it—moved gradually closer to being some part of "today." Those clouds of impending trouble can no longer be ignored. If they are to be dissipated—and a serious

energy crisis averted—no further time should be wasted in getting Congress and the executive branch together in agreement on a national fuels-and-energy policy.

The Presidential message received today lays the framework for achieving such an agreement—and such a policy. The President's proposals are comprehensive and far-reaching. At the same time, however, they are realistic and attainable. Together, they recognize the essential fact that, under our system, it will be private industry which will provide most of our energy needs, but Mr. Nixon has also recognized the equally essential fact that the Federal government can, and must, do a great deal more than it has been in helping private industry meet this challenge.

The Government's proper role is largely in the research field, with special emphasis from now on upon methods for producing "clean" energy of one type or another, lest we do further damage to our environment. A substantial part of this effort will be directed, of necessity, at the problems currently besetting the development of nuclear powerplants—problems that are, at one and the same time, technical in nature as well as psychological, after their own fashion, in that the American public still has understandable qualms and doubts about the safety of nuclear energy. I believe that those technical problems can, despite their complexity, be surmounted, but at the moment I am not as confident of the Atomic Energy Commission's ability to surmount what can only be described as its "public-relations" problem.

I have recently received a complimentary copy of Drs. John W. Gofman and Arthur R. Tomplin's new book entitled "Poisoned Power"—and subtitled "The Case Against Nuclear Power Plants." The book, as its authors have been doing for a couple of years, poses certain questions about the need for and safety of nuclear-generated power. These are questions that, though with less resort to sensationalism, need to be asked, and equally need to be answered in public forums by representatives of the AEC in a more forthright and open manner than previously was their attitude. I think they can—and now will be—so answered. But, whether or not those answers will be accepted, after careful and thorough cross-examination by AEC's numerous critics and doubters, depends largely, one suspects, on whether or not we here in the center of this debate are willing to spend less time on fanning the fires of controversy, and more time on an objective assessment of the economic, social, and long-range ramifications of the important environmental questions involved.

Be all that as it may—for this is a debate that will go on for some time—surely the Congress could act now by moving forward as fast as possible on at least two of the President's proposals: His bill, as now pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to establish new procedures and to more directly involve the public in the long-range planning involved in the siting of new powerplants and the routes for transmission lines; and, second, his key reorganization proposal to establish

a new Department of Natural Resources, into which would be consolidated all of our currently scattered energy development programs. Not until such a new entity is established will we have much chance, I fear, of obtaining that coherent, national fuels-and-energy policy we have so long lacked but can no longer afford to do without.

Lastly, I am especially pleased at the attention the President gave in his message to the developing need for energy conservation. For a considerable period of time—coinciding with my recent years of service on the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, where we wrestle with many of these same questions—I have been bothered by the manner in which we have gone along accepting as inevitable a doubling in the national demand for energy every decade. It has been my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that we have simply been taking the easy way out by assuming that the demand for energy had to automatically be equated with the need. The President, himself, points out one reason why we may have done this by suggesting that—and he is quite accurate in this—"we use energy so lavishly today (because) the price of energy does not include all of the social costs of producing it." Clearly, Mr. Speaker, in an age of awakening environmental concern, such a public attitude is as obsolete as any governmental policy which encourages it, and we should be grateful to the President for also having lifted this neglected policy area to a higher plane for public consideration.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks immediately following the message from the President of the United States and that all Members have an equal opportunity to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In reply to the question, the program for this week is completed as of now.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Four suspensions are scheduled for Monday, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 169, acceptance of mural design sketches for U.S. Capitol.

H.R. 8011, amendments to the Wagner-O'Day Act.

H.R. 6217, peanut allotments.

H.R. 1161, expansion of agricultural exports.

There is also scheduled for consideration H.R. 7960, the National Science Foundation Authorization, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Tuesday there will be five unanimous-consent bills from the Committee on Ways and Means, which will be incorporated in the RECORD.

The bills are as follows:

H.R. 1680, continuing suspension of duties on spun silk yarn.

H.R. 4590, dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore.

H.R. 7767, continuing suspension of duties on metal scrap.

H.R. 8312, continuing for 2 years the duty-free status of certain gifts from members of the Armed Forces in combat zones.

H.R. 8313, continuing for 2 years temporary assistance program for U.S. citizens returned from abroad.

Also scheduled for consideration on Tuesday are:

H.R. 8293, the Coffee Agreement Act extension, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 8311, the Renegotiation Act amendment, subject to a rule being granted.

Wednesday there is scheduled House Joint Resolution 617, the Micronesian Claims Act, subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday there will be considered H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act extension, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 7

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday night.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTH VIETNAM CONSISTENT WITH SAFE REMOVAL AND PRO- VISION FOR THE RETURN OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues, as have I, have received requests from constituents that we all join in signing a resolution which has been proposed by a number of our fellow Members which urges the Congress to commence hearings into the best way to complete American withdrawal from South Vietnam "consistent with their safe removal and provision for the return of American prisoners of war."

Under the circumstances, I do not see where this resolution would accomplish anything. Our negotiators in Paris have asked the North Vietnamese to set a date for prisoner exchange and they refuse to even discuss the subject.

The great fallacy in fixing a date far in advance of withdrawal is failing to take into account the effect it would have on the morale of the troops there. No man wants the dubious distinction of being the last man killed or seriously wounded in a war. If military discipline is to be preserved to permit an orderly withdrawal without bringing about disaster, discipline and morale must be maintained up until the end.

We are going through a very delicate maneuver at the present time: Militarily, diplomatically, and psychologically. We are attempting to withdraw military support in the form of combat troops while building a South Vietnamese Army of sufficient strength to depend on our own remaining forces who will be necessary for logistical purposes. At the same time, we must maintain the confidence of the South Vietnamese peasant and soldier that the withdrawal of our combat troops is a prelude to a total abandonment of the people of South Vietnam after having encouraged them to fight with resultant devastation in their own land for the past 10 years. Should the South Vietnamese become convinced that America is abandoning them to the tender mercies of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army, they could well turn in anger upon our troops even as they were approaching the beaches. This would bring about a disaster of long-range implications in both military and diplomatic terms.

While I might have personal reservations about the President's plan, I feel strongly that if it has any chance of working, that chance is dependent upon the visual support of him by the general American public and its elected leaders. To deprive the President of this visual support is to deprive his efforts of any chance of success. I do not feel you or anyone would like to see that happen.

I personally have not seen a period in our Nation's history when its course of action appears so fraught with peril and uncertainty of result. For any government official or public spokesman to begin undermining the one man charged with the responsibility of conducting the foreign affairs of our country is to compound many times the perils and uncertainties. If ever there was a time when we need to give an appearance of solidarity in support of the President who has the constitutional responsibility of

protecting the Armed Forces, whether in Vietnam or elsewhere, that time is now.

I know, without reservation, of the President's deep personal desire to reduce American involvement in Vietnam without precipitating disaster. For anyone to assume or to act as though his motives were anything less is too base to deserve serious discussion.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING— FEDERAL LEGISLATION

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has responded to the silent epidemic of lead poisoning by passing the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695. The President signed this act into law on January 13, 1971, without comment. Fortunately, a mass outpouring of letters, phone calls, and telegrams was able to convince him to disregard the recommendation of veto which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had forwarded to him.

The act authorizes three 2-year programs.

First, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to units of general local government for the purpose of developing and carrying out local programs to detect and treat lead-based paint poisoning. For fiscal year 1971, \$3,330,000 was authorized, and for fiscal year 1972, \$6,660,000.

Second, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to units of general local government for programs to identify those areas that present a high risk to the health of residents because of the presence of lead-based paints and then to develop and carry out programs to eliminate the hazards of lead poisoning. For fiscal year 1971, \$5 million was authorized, and for fiscal year 1972, \$10 million.

Third, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is to conduct a research and demonstration program to determine the nature and extent of the lead-based paint poisoning problem, and methods of removing lead-based paints from interior surfaces, porches, and exterior surfaces of residential housing with which children might come into contact. The Secretary is to report to the Congress and suggest further legislative steps within 1 year of enactment of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. For fiscal year 1971, \$1,670,000 was authorized, and for fiscal year 1972, \$3,340,000.

In addition to these program activities, the act directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prohibit the use of lead-based paint in residential structures constructed or rehabilitated by the Federal Government, or with Federal assistance.

Thus, the Congress has authorized \$30 million—\$10 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$20 million for fiscal year 1972—to

implement the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act.

Any sums authorized, but not appropriated, for fiscal year 1971, may be appropriated for fiscal year 1972. Thus, a full \$30 million is authorized for the fiscal year which begins on July 1, 1971, to fight childhood lead poisoning.

No money has been appropriated. The children are still waiting.

THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF OUR ELDERLY PEOPLE

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced four bills designed to meet the special needs of our elderly people for adequate income, good health care, decent housing, and companionship.

Reaching age 65 in this country has become, in too many cases, the beginning of the end rather than the beginning of the golden years. Retirement has become far more than a simple adjustment to a more sedate pace of living. For 20 million elderly citizens it means a new way of life, a new way of life with few of the advantages that have been the goal of their working years.

Just when he feels the need for an income adequate to travel, to relax, or just to feel secure in his home and property, the retiring worker usually suffers a precipitate drop in income. Just as he discovers that he will become increasingly dependent on public transit, he finds transportation services on the decline. Just as he requires more medical attention and prescribed medicines, he is disappointed to watch a vicious and uncontrolled explosion of medical costs coupled with a rising doubt about the quality of medical services. And, just as he feels the need for greater security, familiar surroundings and friends, he is often forced to give up his home and be placed in a nursing home.

My bills are not the whole answer. We need a broad range of programs to meet the needs of elderly people. Coupled with advances in social security, however, they are necessary steps toward solution of these problems. My bills include: One to provide full, rather than partial, income tax deductions for all medical expenses incurred by elderly people; a second to establish a Division of Housing for the Elderly headed by a new Assistant Secretary in the Department of Housing and Urban Development; a third to prohibit insurance companies from denying automobile insurance coverage on the basis of age alone; and the fourth to authorize the construction of more senior citizens community centers.

We must do more for our elderly citizens. The Federal Government, through its policies of deficit spending, has fostered an inflationary spiral that has robbed retired workers of the benefits of their pensions, insurance coverage, and life savings. Latest indicators show progress in curbing the rate of inflation, but for many of these 20 million elderly citizens, the damage has already been done.

Compassion and equity demand action on these proposals.

ELECTRICAL ENERGY AND POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to the Congress today constitutes a momentous and important event in the history of our country.

President Nixon has brought to the Nation's attention, in clear and forthright terms, two national problems of paramount importance to our Nation. These problems, although separate in the minds of those who have not studied them, are inseparably entwined. If our modern industrial society is worthy of continuance and expansion, and as our population expands and raises its standard of living, it becomes mandatory that we solve these two inseparable problems.

The machine age has multiplied our energy use by a factor of 300 to 350 over the one manpower energy use that prevails in undeveloped nations. It has made possible the highest average standard of living in the world. It has made possible a level of literacy, inventiveness, ingenuity, abundance of quality food, and health services, which have lengthened our average life expectancy by 20 years in the past half century.

But that same industrial revolution, coupled with population growth and urbanization, has polluted our environment with human and industrial waste. This pollution now threatens the viability of our society with an ever-increasing lethal danger.

The President has clearly presented the problem; that is, pollution of our environment is the primary challenge to our future. It must be met. It can be solved.

The second problem, and we must consider it inseparable from the solution of the pollution problem, is the impending crisis in the supply of electrical energy.

Without an adequate clean supply of electrical energy:

First, we cannot maintain our present level of consumer goods production;

Second, we cannot increase the quantity of consumer goods to supply the inevitable increase in population between today and the year 2000 A.D. This increase is reliably estimated to be at least 100 million human beings;

Third, last, but not least, we cannot produce the devices which will give us the deterrent military strength to prevent nuclear war, and establish by credible negotiation a universal peace.

The challenge posed by the impending energy deficit is stark and clear:

We must double our present generating capacity by 1980.

We must double the 1980 generating capacity by 1990.

We must increase the 1990 generating capacity by a minimum factor of 50 percent, or by a possible factor of 100 percent, by the year 2000.

There are sober, reasonable estimates of increased power requirements based

on the best calculations of the most credible and best informed professionals available. In my opinion these projections are as accurate as can be made.

What does this mean in terms of the national interest?

It means that the President's message is timely.

It means that it is urgent and important to our people and the people of the world.

It is important to our people because it involves the viability of our society.

First, the doubling factor every decade for the next 30 years is basic to our standard of living, now and in the future.

Second, 70 percent of our electricity is used in industrial operations which provide employment for our present workers and must continue to be used for our increasing population of workers.

Third, I list this third, perhaps it should be first.

We cannot provide the solution for pollution without this tremendous doubling of electrical energy every decade.

Why? Because without abundant, cheap, clean electricity;

We cannot clean the contaminants from our air,

We cannot clean the contaminants from our water,

We cannot treat sewage or industrial effluents,

We cannot compress solid wastes—old automobile bodies, bottles, cans, and so forth—into smaller cubical space for transportation, recycling, or disposal.

We cannot recycle recoverable metals, glass, paper, and so forth.

Where can we get this increased amount of electricity?

The answer is clear to those of us who have spent years in the study of this problem.

We must have every kilowatt of electricity that we can produce from every fuel source available. What are those primary fuel sources in order of present use and availability? In order of present use and availability they are:

First. Coal.

Second. Oil.

Third. Gas.

Fourth. Uranium.

Fifth. Hydroelectric—very limited.

The fossil fuels, coal, oil, and gas, now provide 80 percent of the source fuel for electricity and are presently the most important. Their contaminant input in the environment has been definitely computed and unfortunately they have a major impact on atmospheric pollution.

But, we are using and must continue to use more fossil fuels—and we will move closer and closer to the major point in time when these fuels are depleted. In the meantime we must have a massive research and development program to reduce their pollution impact.

For at least the next three decades and probably longer, fossil fuels must be used to provide the major supply of electrical kilowatts, for the next decade, therefore, our problem is to trap and remove fossil fuel contaminants so that our atmosphere will remain usable for humans, animals, and vegetation.

The President is therefore facing reality when he calls for more investment

in research and development in this field.

The President is also wise and realistic when he calls for research and development in the field of uranium fuel.

He has made a national commitment in the uranium fuel field to develop and build an improved type of reactor known as a liquid metal fast breeder reactor.

He has called for a demonstration fast breeder reactor which will be technologically feasible and commercially useful by the end of the decade.

I believe that the solution to our long-term electrical needs is the atomic fast breeder nuclear reactor.

In our present nuclear reactors we extract only .7 percent of the potential heat from a given amount of uranium. The breeder reactor is destined to extract 70 percent or 100 times the heat from a given amount of uranium.

I shall not describe in detail the operation of the fast breeder reactor but I will point out a few of its principal attributes. The first is that the fast breeder converts the fertile uranium—238 into fissionable plutonium which can then be recycled as new fuel in the breeder. The net result of this is that through careful design a breeder reactor will generate more fuel than it consumes.

The feasibility of the fast breeder reactor was demonstrated 20 years ago in 1951 at the national reactor testing station in Idaho. We now have operating in this country three small liquid metal fast breeder reactors; the EBR-II test reactor at Idaho; the Enrico Fermi No. 1 in Michigan; and the Sefor experimental reactor in Arkansas.

None of these was expected to be economically competitive; and, in fact, our forthcoming power demonstration breeders are not expected to be economic. We do anticipate, however, that in the period of the 1980's this country will begin introducing into our national electrical generating capacity large commercially attractive fast breeder nuclear powerplants that are competitive.

A second attribute that the liquid metal fast breeder reactor has is that it is as efficient from a steam cycle point as our modern fossil plants. Present day light water plants discharge 40 percent more waste heat than do the fossil plants. The breeder will, megawatt for megawatt, discharge about the same waste heat as a fossil fired plant.

A third attribute is that the engineers predict that the nature of the sodium-cooled nuclear breeder reactor is such that releases of radioactive material can be held to a bare minimum; in other words, below the 5 to 10 millirem per year experienced by present light water reactors.

Fourth, the valuable factor of breeding plutonium by burning uranium will assure us of a nondepletable source of energy for many centuries.

When the breeder reactor is developed, and the President has committed the Nation to its successful demonstration by 1980, we will, for the first time, be assured of an abundant supply of electrical power for many centuries.

This source of energy will be available long after our oil, coal, and gas are de-

pleted, or retired to an invaluable chemical depository, which is the most valuable use of these substances.

The President's decision is historically important.

It will, in my humble opinion, probably rank in the perspective of history as the most important presidential domestic decision of the 20th century.

Why do I make this statement?

President Eisenhower, of course, will be remembered for his great contribution as a military leader in World War II. His great domestic decision, however, was the atom's for peace program. This was during the Eisenhower-Nixon years 1952 to 1960. During those 8 years we turned the use of the atom from war to peace. We developed over a thousand peacetime uses for atomic energy. This program earned President Eisenhower a secure place in history.

President Kennedy's decision to place men on the moon and bring them back safely in 10 years was successfully accomplished, although he failed to live to see it due to his tragic assassination.

Nevertheless, his domestic decision to make a national commitment to the space program thrilled the world, brought tremendous increases in scientific technology and secured his place in an imperishable niche in the annals of our national history.

I am sincere when I say that President Nixon's decision to develop an abundant supply of electricity from a virtually inexhaustible uranium, plutonium, and thorium fuel source will secure him an honorable place in our history second to no one of his predecessors.

Today is not the time to document my statement nor do I have the time to describe in detail the promise of national benefit which is embodied in the President's decision to face the dual and inseparable challenges of environmental pollution and electrical energy deficit, which we face now—today.

Suffice it to say that in the opinion of many Members of the House and Senate, Members of both political parties—the President has acted wisely in setting a new priority for a domestic peacetime goal, the solution of pollution through an absolutely necessary increase in electrical energy.

At the same time he has assured this Nation of a viable domestic future as well as the industrial progress necessary for our national security, from the standpoint of military strength and diplomatic credibility, at the international table of negotiation for peace.

I am a Democrat, the President is a Republican. However, I believe we are both dedicated Americans.

As a U.S. Representative, it is my duty to support the best interests of the people of our Nation. I shall therefore support the President's energy acceleration program. It is a vital program for our Nation. It should be carried forward in every field with full protection of the public interest. I am confident that the congressional committees of jurisdiction over the federally owned coal, oil, and uranium-bearing lands will carry out their mandate and cooperate with the President in accelerating the production

of vitally needed fuel supplies for the public interest.

I think the President is to be commended for this important decision.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), in commending the President's decision to accelerate a variety of programs relating to the development of our energy resources, the production of electrical energy in adequate quantities, and devising adequate means to cope with pollution from all energy sources.

I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from California as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its beginning in 1946. I have great respect for the continuing study that he has made over the years concerning the development of civilian nuclear power in this country. I have worked along with him on these programs. I am personally convinced of their benefit to our Nation, and my views are very much in accord with his.

It is clear to me that this country's need for electrical energy in the foreseeable future will require the use of all available fuels, both fossil and nuclear, and that we must learn to use the electrical energy produced in the most efficient manner we can devise. After a period of intensive development, nuclear power is just beginning to make its contribution to the electrical capacity of this Nation. At present there are only 22 operating plants generating 9,131,000 kw. and representing about 3 percent of the present electrical generating capacity in this country. There are an additional 55 nuclear plants under construction equal to or larger than units now operating and another 44 plants have been ordered by utility companies. These plants are principally light water nuclear reactor plants, and their mode of operation is not one which makes efficient use of the energy content of uranium.

One of the programs to which the President today has given new impetus is the fast breeder reactor program. This is a type of reactor which utilizes fully the energy content of uranium and will provide a source of electrical energy for centuries. The light water nuclear reactor provides an interim solution to a portion of our energy needs. It builds an industry and provides experience which will be helpful in the operation and utilization of the fast breeder reactor which offers a solution to our long-term needs.

I shall not discuss all aspects of the President's message received today by the Congress; I merely wish to make a few comments on the portion relating to nuclear energy and make clear my intention to provide continued support not only to the nuclear energy program, but to the necessary programs that will permit us to do a better job of cleaning up our environment.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for the per-

sonal effort that he has put into calling to the attention of all, the importance of recognizing the interrelationship of energy production and pollution abatement and, more important, his leadership in fighting for the breeder program as an important development which can provide a source of cheap, abundant electrical power, with minimal environmental impact. Further, it permits us to conserve and utilize our valuable fossil fuel reserves for purposes other than the production of electrical energy.

I commend the gentleman from California for his long study of these problems, for championing the need for and merit of the fast breeder concept, and for his tireless effort in urging the development of a balanced program for the proper utilization of these valuable energy resources for our own benefit and for the benefit of succeeding generations yet to come.

Like the gentleman in the well, I am very happy that the President sent up the message to the Congress that he did today. Again, I thank the gentleman from California, and I pledge my support to the President in these efforts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who is now the vice-chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for his remarks. I wish to further pay tribute to the fact that the gentleman and I both went on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy some 25 years ago at the same time. The gentleman has sat by my side for all these 25 years. The gentleman has helped the program immensely as has the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER). I am very happy that both of these gentlemen are on the floor today, because these two gentlemen have had as much to do with the progress of the peacetime use of atomic energy as any two men in the Congress.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) for his remarks. Later on in my own time I will have some commendatory remarks to make, not only about the President, but about the gentleman in the well, as well. But prior to that time I think that we should at this point anticipate an argument against the President making the first breeder reactor a national objective to be achieved by the year 1980. The objection is an allegation that somehow or other we really do not need the breeder and that if we work real hard on the hydrogen fusion, we will have that by 1980, and we can skip this entire development of providing electricity to meet our requirements.

The fact of the matter is that this contention is an impossible dream. Controlled thermal nuclear reaction is the same reaction that takes place on the surface of the sun. It is a very, very complicated system to control this power. There is no one who really understands the problem who contends that this can be done before we have to have a breeder reactor to meet our requirements.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman.

The people who are holding out for this process of fusion as being the answer to our electric power problem are either unknowledgeable or are deliberately doing it for destructive purposes.

As the gentleman has just said, the heat that is involved is the heat that is produced on the surface of the sun and that heat is millions of degrees Fahrenheit. There is no metal of any other kind of physical container or element that can contain this heat. Therefore, the most credible testimony before our committee is that if a continuance of fusion could be obtained—and it has not been obtained, I might add at this time—that there would be no way of containing it with any kind of physical material that we know of.

Mr. HOSMER. Yes; that is true, as the matter of the fusion process itself, but then the heat somehow or other has to be converted into electrical energy, either direct conversion or some other conversion, that has to be accomplished, neither of which are at the present time anywhere near the realm of practicality.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. We are experiencing in this field and the President rightly mentions that along with hydromagnetodynamics and solar energy and other sources that are talked of in some circles, but I am sure he knows because his scientific advisers have advised him that we are talking of something that is far into the future and will not be accessible from a useful standpoint between now and the year 2000 and probably much longer.

Mr. HOSMER. I cannot agree with the gentleman more.

On page 17986 of yesterday's RECORD, I have some remarks relating to the pace of the development of hydrogen fusion which may be of interest to any of those whose interest has been sparked by our conversation today. Those remarks, however, do not knock down or refute other contentions in reference to hydrogen fusion; namely, that it would be clean and free of radiation. This is not the fact, as scientists will testify to.

Secondly, the economics of hydrogen fusion in relation to that of the breeder reactor, certainly are completely up in the air, and the target is a tough one because the breeder reactor makes more fuel than it consumes. Therefore, you cannot fuel your next generation of reactors free. That is pretty hard a game to better.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution today and for his many years of dedicated service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement today and for his interest in the statement that has been submitted by the President.

In furtherance a little of what the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) has said, would not the gentleman agree

that the fast breeder reactors, holding promise as they do, nevertheless cannot be developed commercially in time to meet the energy demands for the next decade?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. We will still have to continue to depend mostly on fossil fuels for the next decade. The estimate is it will be the year 2000 before different types of nuclear reactors and it will take over 55 percent of the energy needed. In the meantime we will have to depend on coal, oil, gas and hydroelectric power for the majority of the electricity that we need. So those people who fear that this is going to replace some of the existing forms of fuel have a needless fear. Our needs for electricity are going to be so great that we must use every type of resource fuel in increasing amounts in order to take care of this doubling effect which will amount to about six times the present generating capacity in the next 30 years.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for his statement because I fear that the danger is the people in our country are looking toward the development of the fast breeder reactor being the absolute answer to the energy shortage in the next few years. While I think it holds much promise, we certainly cannot allow ourselves to be diverted from these other problems and other sources of energy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. One of the things the President in his message recognizes is this fact and he says we must get at the job of taking contaminants from the air which come from fossil fuel.

As an example—a ton of coal throws about 300 pounds of contaminants into the air. The same amount of BTU's from oil will throw about 75 pounds into the air. The same amount for gas will have about 12 pounds into the air.

We must learn how to take all of these contaminants or the greatest part of them out of the air because we are going to be using more coal, more oil and more gas, if we can get it, as long as we can get it, until the supply is depleted.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) and to tell you how proud I am of the work both of you have done in this very important field having to do with nuclear energy and nuclear power. As you know, on our committee we hit the fringes of some of this and we can tell you some of the things that will take place in the future. If this country is to retain its leadership in the world, we must maintain our leadership in this technology.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman completely. He speaks with great authority, as the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. He has lived with scientists now for many years, and has studied these technological problems I guess more than any other one man in the Congress. He is responsible for the success of the space pro-

gram. It is indeed heartening to have his support.

The gentleman well knows I have supported him in his endeavors in that field, because science is interchangeable. What is discovered in one field of science is useful in another. Certainly there is a play back and forth between scientific accomplishments of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wanted to say further that within the past 30 days I have had occasion to make two trips to Europe. On each of them I was concerned with science at these places. I visited plants in Europe. I talked with European scientists.

I want to dispel the feeling many people have that we have a monopoly on science. We are great, but we have not. Scientists can be the catalyst to draw the world together, but we must maintain our leadership, no matter what the field, medicine or anything else in the field of science.

I congratulate the gentleman for his great leadership.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with interest to the remarks of the Gentleman from California. I know of his expertise in the field he is discussing. About 10 days ago, our very distinguished colleague, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, gave a major speech before the Portland City Club, in Portland, Oreg.

The growing demands for increased electrical energy are evident in every part of the country. We all witnessed with deep concern the "brownout" in New York City not too many months ago. None of us would look forward to a similar situation in our own State.

We are actually faced with double jeopardy: distress for the future of our environment coupled with a corresponding apprehension about substantial power shortages resulting from a slow-down on the building of new plants with the rising demands for more power.

In point of fact, literally every sort of generating plant is coming under attack for environmental reasons: fossil fuel, coal and oil, plants because they pollute the air and cause thermal pollution; hydroelectric projects because they mar the landscape of scenic waterways; and nuclear plants because of both thermal pollution and radiation hazards.

As ranking House member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with 25 years of service on that vital legislative panel, few are better equipped anywhere in the Nation to survey the pros and cons of the energy dilemma than CHET HOLIFIELD. Therefore, I now place in the RECORD what can only be described as a remarkable address—which received and overwhelmingly positive response from my fellow Oregonians and which ought to be read by all interested Americans:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD
ENERGY, ELECTRICITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

A driving force behind all civilizations has been the urge to better man's lot through the more efficient use of energy.

We find evidence of this driving force in pre-history.

Man learned to use fire, he developed the wedge, the wheel, the lever, and the windlass, which enabled him to multiply his own energy and that of his animals.

Due to this immutable law of progress, machines were developed. Machines at first driven by man himself or by animal and water power.

Through the development of improved metals, man became ready for his next, and largest, step—the use of fuels in the steam engine.

Fuels, man found, had several advantages over the then conventional power sources: First, the energy in wood, oil, coal, and gas was concentrated and subject to storage.

Second, these fuels were easily portable. Third, these fuels were relatively inexpensive and readily available.

The next quantum leap for mankind was the conversion of energy in the form of heat, created by fuel, into electricity.

This conversion process has become the "philosopher's stone" of energy. With this process we could transmit energy to distant locations at the speed of light.

Electrical energy could then be converted back into heat, light, or motion.

From the "philosopher's stone" of electricity, Americans have elevated their standard of living to the highest of any major nation in the world.

Our per capita Gross National Product is more than ten times that of countries having little electricity. Literacy is more than double; we have five times as many doctors, and we may expect to live 20 years longer than people in countries which have sparse electrical resources.

The slogan is literally true, that we "Live Better Through Electricity."

Our standard of living is the highest of any nation because we use the highest ratio of mechanical power versus manpower.

One man can do the work of 350 men.

In achieving this high ratio, we utilize a broad range of mechanical power spreading from simple machines to complex, automated factories.

Steel, aluminum, and even products such as pastries, are produced with only minimal human supervision.

But behind this great array of mechanical and electronic devices must stand an abundant supply of energy—primarily electrical energy.

It is necessary that almost all of this energy be derived from the sources where it is most abundant—from fossil fuels, falling water, and the atom.

It is the obtaining and utilization of this energy which presents one of the greatest domestic problems of our time.

Today, I will discuss these sources of energy and some of the problems which are inherent in their use.

Fossil fuels account for all but a few percent of all energy released on earth at this time.

These fuels are used in the internal combustion engine; and they are burned to create steam for industrial use and for the production of electricity.

Several major problem areas exist in the use of these fuels:

First, there is the problem of discovery.

Second, there is the problem of transportation.

Third, there is the problem of refining fossil fuels for use, and

Fourth, there is the impact of the by-products of these fuels upon man's environment.

Falling water is capable of providing only a very small percentage of our present energy needs, even if every river in America were dammed, creating a series of large lakes from coast to coast.

And then there is what at this time is only a very small new source of energy de-

rived from the fission of the atom. That small new source is destined to dominate the electrical energy field by the year 2000—only 30 years from now. I will discuss the fossil fuels in more detail later.

It should be clearly understood that man has always been faced with choices and trade-offs. He chose to put aside the life of a nomad in favor of breaking the sod and tilling the land.

He chose the security of living in groups, towns, and cities, while accepting the problems and inconveniences which resulted therefrom.

He chose to heat his home in winter at the expense of fewer trees, and he domesticated animals thus reducing wildlife.

All of these past choices have changed man's environment. All such future choices will change his environment. But an environmental change is not necessarily an undesirable change.

To give just one example, the TVA system consists of a series of navigable lakes, of drinking water quality, free of mosquitoes, providing flood control, recreation, electricity, and transportation.

When contrasted with the periodic floods, polluted rivers, and lack of recreation resources in the early 1930's, no one will say that the environment was not enhanced by the change.

We, therefore, should not strive to oppose all environmental change simply because it is a change. But we should, and must, minimize the harmful effects of such changes.

ENERGY NEEDS AND ENERGY RESOURCES

In this context, I will continue my discussion of our energy needs—particularly electrical energy—between today and the year 2000.

I want, also, to discuss energy resources with respect to their respective present and future uses, their potential abundance, or their potential depletability.

How much electrical energy will be needed by 1980, by 1990, and by the year 2000?

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held extensive hearings in 1969-1970 on the problems of generating electrical energy.

We have printed as a record of those hearings 3,280 pages in four separate documents such as the one I hold in my hand. (8500 copies of each.)

Our conclusions are, therefore, drawn from a comprehensive record of credible testimony from the Nation's most expert witnesses. Their testimony is supported by a tremendous accumulation of statistical data and documentation.

We concluded that we must double our present electrical generating capacity by 1980.

We concluded also that we must increase our present electrical generating capacity by a factor of about six in 30 years—by 2000 A.D.

We believe that these goals can be accomplished with minimum impact on the environment and that apparently the public is willing to pay the necessary cost.

To meet the growing demand for electric energy, the Federal Power Commission projects that the generating capacity in the fifty states will rise from 344 million kilowatts at the end of 1970, to about 670 million kilowatts in 1980, and reach approximately 1,260 million kilowatts in 1990. An idea of the magnitude of the undertaking required over the next two decades may be gained from an estimate that more than 250 new sites will be needed for thermal power plants, both fossil-fueled and nuclear, of 500 thousand kilowatt capacity and larger. This does not include possible additions to existing thermal power plants.

Let us speak of where this energy will be obtained during the next two decades, 1970 to 1990.

In 20 years, nuclear plants will represent

about 40% of the country's electrical supply; while about 45% will be fossil fueled electric plants; and about 12% will be hydroelectric.

These nationwide projections are based on regional summaries which have been prepared as a part of the effort associated with the issuance of the 1970 Federal Power Commission National Power Survey.

We are planning and building new capacity at an unprecedented rate. But the rate is too slow.

We are facing, in certain regions, brown-outs and possibly a tragic blackout such as occurred on the Northeastern Seaboard in 1965.

Chairman Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission stated, at hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on August 3, 1970:

"The current situation is such that little leeway remains for additional delays if the country is to avoid critical future shortages in meeting anticipated real power needs."

In a "Statement on the Fuel Situation for the Winter of 1970-71," Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Presidential Council of Economic Advisers, and General George A. Lincoln, Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, said:

"We have continued to study the energy supply situation and find that as winter approaches the nation faces a potential shortage in the supplies of natural gas, residual fuel oil and bituminous coal. The potential shortage appears to be more serious in some regions of the country than in others, but no section is completely immune from concern."

This coming summer looks tight throughout many sections of the country.

Authoritative statements and reports have again and again stressed that the urgent near term need for electric power requires that delays in providing that power be held to an absolute minimum.

Also, reports looking to the implementation of improved institutional arrangements on siting of power plants have recommended that procedures be developed for expediting the process consistent with protection of the environment.

Thus, in the Report "Electric Power and the Environment" published by the Energy Policy Staff of the President's Office of Science and Technology, in August 1970, in which all of the Federal Agencies responsible for environmental and power programs participated, the basic findings stated:

"New public agencies and review procedures must take into account the positive necessity for expediting the decision-making process and avoiding undue delays in order to provide adequate electric power on reasonable schedules while protecting the environment."

Having established the urgent need for our people for additional electricity, now let us consider the abundance or depletability of the various fuels used in making energy—oil, gas and coal.

In the case of coal, we are told that we have enough coal to last about 300-400 years. However, by burning it we would be wasting a very valuable storehouse of chemicals that has been formed over a period of hundreds of millions of years. Many scientists believe that burning coal as a fuel is using it at its lowest potential value. They term it more wasteful than the clearing and burning of valuable woods from our primeval forests.

In any event, the depletion of our irreplaceable coal supply can be calculated—but the value of the storehouse of chemical values destroyed if it is burned cannot be estimated.

The supply of petroleum oil is far shorter in long-range supply than coal and it, too, is an immensely valuable storehouse of petrochemicals.

The supply of natural gas is much less in terms of energy resources than coal or oil. Shortage of this clean, mobile fuel is common today in most parts of the world.

Fossil fuels have had sharp advances in price in the past several years. Some recent purchases were made at double the price of two to three years ago. Prices may continue to double every few years on into the future.

Another problem we have in the use of fossil fuels is their inherent contribution to the pollution of our environment. As an example, a ton of coal with a 2.5% sulfur content burned in a power plant results in the emission of about 300 pounds of sulfur oxide, nitrogen oxide, particulate ash, etc., through the stack. Air cleaning equipment, if used, can reduce this to about 100 pounds but better removal techniques are needed. Hundreds of millions of tons of coal are burned each year.

Burning oil also contributes heavily to atmospheric pollution. In producing the equivalent heat of one ton of coal, oil with a 1.6% sulfur content will throw off an average of about 75 pounds of various types of contaminants.

Gas fuel is the least contaminating of the fossil fuels, but even here we find approximately 12 pounds of air contaminants for an equivalent amount of heat. But as we all know, natural gas fuel is tragically short in most areas of the U.S. Additional pipelines cannot be filled without greater gas sources.

One other cause-effect factor of environmental concern is that the use of all three fossil fuels results in the creation of hot water. The correct term should probably be "thermal addition" to the receiving river, lake or ocean.

However, some say that any thermal addition is "thermal pollution." But call it what you will. If it can be shown to be excessive thermal addition, then we can and must cool the water to tolerable acceptance.

This is not a technical problem. We know how to cool water with cooling ponds, towers, and heat exchangers, and have been doing so for years. The cost is bearable and, in my opinion, wherever thermal addition can be proven to be an unacceptable factor, it can and will be eliminated.

The same philosophy is applicable to stack contaminants such as sulfur dioxide. This presents no unsolvable technical problem. Various new devices are undergoing development tests and will be used when a reliable technique has been demonstrated. The price of purity in either air or water can be borne by the users of electricity and, in my opinion, will be borne. The costs should be tolerable.

We will not for today's purpose discuss pollution or ecological detrimental effects of hydroelectric plants for two reasons:

(a) The amount of hydroelectric power from present and potential sources is quite small in relation to present and future needs of electric energy.

(b) The detrimental ecological effect is far less than for fossil fuel plants.

NUCLEAR FUEL

I have left to the last the consideration of nuclear fuel in (1) relation to its depletable as an energy source, and (2) its environmental effect.

Our present known supply of uranium can be estimated.

We cannot, however, predict the quantity of new discoveries nearly as accurately as we can the fossil fuels—although an element of uncertainty prevails in both undiscovered fossil fuels and undiscovered uranium ores.

The one fact that stands out is the certainty of depletion, and consequently the certainty of increasing costs of all types of fuel and eventual shortage.

In regard to uranium ores, we estimate that our present known reserves of reasonable cost ores will last 30-40 years. This estimate is based on the present technology and efficiency of the light water reactors.

It is based on our present utilization of fissionable material as it occurs in natural uranium. The portion of the material we use for nuclear fuel (uranium-235) is only seven-tenths of one percent of a given amount of the uranium content of the mined ore. The total nonfissionable uranium that is unused (uranium-238) is, therefore, 99.3 percent of the given amount.

At present natural gas supplies 32 percent of the nation's energy requirements, but current estimates of domestic natural gas resources indicate that there is only enough to supply 24 percent of the total energy needs between now and the year 2000. The situation is somewhat better in liquid fuels, but not much. At present liquid fuels supply 43 percent of the nation's energy requirement. Current estimates of domestic reserves indicate that there is enough to supply 48 percent of the nation's energy total needs between now and the year 2000. Taking gaseous and liquid fuels together, they supply 75 percent of current energy demand can supply only 72 percent of the demand between now and the year 2000 and at that time known and estimated reserves would be completely exhausted. Thus, our growing demand for energy indicates that we will be critically short of domestic supplies of liquid fuels and natural gas by the end of this century. Coal is in more abundant supply, but increasing costs due to environmental considerations and increased difficulty of mining will undoubtedly limit the economic use of these fuel resources.

In the case of nuclear fuel—uranium—there is the following to be considered: If we build only light water reactors which utilize only the uranium-235 content of this resource, we will run out of that resource in a few decades. As someone has said before, "It is like feeding the seed corn to the hogs." If we use uranium in this inefficient manner, we encounter the same danger of depletion as we do in the fossil fuels. The raw materials become more expensive per ton as we go to poorer quality reserves. This is especially true of coal and uranium. I would add that if we never progress beyond light water reactors in our nuclear power plant program, then perhaps we should not have spent the \$2 billion we did in developing them. But as I shall state later, we are on the verge of constructing a new type of nuclear reactor which will, we believe, multiply our extraction of heat from a given amount of uranium manifold and this approach promises to solve our need for an unlimited energy supply for many many centuries. It is obvious that dependence upon fossil fuels or uranium used only in light water reactors will not solve the long-range energy needs of this nation.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

Before I talk about a feasible long-term solution for our energy needs, I would like to cover in some detail the environmental effects which result from the operation of nuclear power plants. The aspects to be considered are:

What gases are released to the atmosphere?
What particulate matter is released to the atmosphere?

What quantities of waste heat are discharged to the atmosphere or cooling water?

What radioactive materials are released to the atmosphere or to the cooling water?

For comparison purposes, I have included as an attachment to my prepared remarks an appendix to a talk by AEC Commissioner Ramey, which provides a description of the effluents from fossil fueled plants. Briefly these included discharge of noxious gases, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide particulate matter, and waste heat to the air and waste heat to the water. In addition, some radioactive material in the form of radium-226 and radium-228 is discharged into the air, by fossil fueled plants—but I do not intend to make my case on that issue.

THERMAL EFFECTS FROM NUCLEAR PLANTS

Newspaper articles notwithstanding, neither our fossil plants nor our nuclear plants are causing our lakes, rivers or oceans to boil. The pure physics of operating a steam turbine requires that some waste heat be rejected from the plant. It is not possible by such means to convert all of the heat generated into electricity. This would be an efficiency of 100 percent. In fossil plants 10 percent of the heat generated goes up the stack. In a nuclear plant, no waste heat is rejected through the stack. In both cases some waste heat is rejected to the cooling water. More heat is rejected in the case of the light water nuclear plant because it operates at a somewhat lower efficiency than our modern fossil plants. In fact, about 40 percent more heat is rejected to the water in these nuclear plants than for the fossil plants. This "thermal addition" is principally a question of the volume of water heated to the same degree in temperature. The heating effect per unit of volume passed through the condenser can be the same for both plants—the difference is that a greater volume of water or flow rate is required in the case of the nuclear plant.

As any engineer will tell you, the same types of cooling devices—wet or dry towers, cooling ponds, discharge channels—can be used with equal effectiveness in either fossil or nuclear plants to cool the water to whatever discharge temperature you choose. It will cost money, but it is apparent that the public is willing to pay the cost. We may by our design overcompensate to insure that the ecology in the vicinity of the plant does not suffer. In our present climate of environmental concern, we will probably overprotect rather than risk any possible ecological damage. As we learn more about whether these effects have significance, we may well elect to be less conservative in this respect in the future designs of both types of plants.

RADIATION FROM NUCLEAR PLANTS

The subject of radiation from nuclear power plants is probably less understood by the lay public than any other environmental consideration of either fossil or nuclear plants. Members of the public have been misled—I do not blame them. Some technically qualified persons and a number of unqualified persons have, during the past two years, needlessly alarmed the public over the possible dangers of very low-level routine discharges of radioactivity from nuclear power plants.

First and foremost, let me assure you that we can readily design into these plants the capability to restrict releases of radioactivity to whatever level you may wish to specify. As I have already said, we can do the same for thermal additions—no magic is required, only straightforward engineering design and dollars.

Consider the present radiation guides prescribed by the Federal Radiation Council and endorsed by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and the International Commission on Radiological Protection. These are—annual exposures of 500 millirem to individuals and 170 millirem to the general population. We are talking about amounts which are one-sixth to one-half of a roentgen exposure per year. That is far less than you receive on a fluoroscopic gastro-intestinal (G.I.) examination.

Bear in mind these guides are not established by the Atomic Energy Commission. They are simply used by the Commission as ceiling limits for nuclear facility operations—based on NCRP recommendations.

It is comforting to note that the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) has restudied both the earlier scientific data and the so-called "new" data cited by recent nuclear critics. The NCRP in January of this year concluded that there was no scientific basis for change in the fundamental radiation protection

criteria published by that committee in 1959 (500 mr and 170 mr annual allowable doses for exposure of the general public).

Those of us in the legislative branch who have followed the development of the nuclear industry and the applicable radiation standards throughout the years have encouraged a philosophy expressed by the advisory committees, NCRP and ICRP, that radiation exposures should be kept as low as practicable. Simply because the standards would allow 500 millirem per year to an individual is no basis for needlessly exposing persons to that limit. On the contrary, the doses can and should be kept well below that limit.

For those of you who may be unfamiliar with the terms I have used, let me say that a "millirem" is not a million rem. It is one one-thousandth of a rem. Without dwelling upon how the biophysicist defines the rem—it is simply his standard unit of measurement—let me recite the exposures to which we all voluntarily subject ourselves in our day-to-day lives with no special concern and no evidence of untoward effect.

Chest X-ray.

Whole mouth X-ray (dental).

Fluoroscopic exam.

Salesman in jewelry store selling radium dial watches.

200 millirem per X-ray.

5,000 millirem (5 rem).

5,000 millirem per minute of examination.

90 millirem extra exposure per year.

All of the above exposures are *in addition* to the normal "background" radiation which results from:

Cosmic radiation and other natural sources;

100 millirem per year (near sea level in U.S.);

150 millirem per year (in higher altitudes such as Denver, Colorado).

Recently we conducted a radiation survey of the U.S. Capitol to see what levels were being emitted from the granite and other stone there. It was discovered, for example, that the entrance to the Rayburn Building, where my office is located, has a radiation level about 237 millirem per year *above* naturally occurring background. The entrance to the New Senate Office Building is 324 millirem per year *above* background.

When Mrs. Green and I journeyed out here by jet at 35,000 feet in altitude, we each accumulated 3 millirem from cosmic radiation—we will get another 3 millirem on the return trip. If Mrs. Green and I each make twelve round trips a year back to our district from Washington, we will each accumulate 72 millirem per year from that activity.

And as a politician before my time used to say, "Let's look at the record." What annual dose should one expect from living immediately adjacent to a nuclear power plant? The record shows the dose to be about 5 to 10 millirem per year or 1 to 2 percent of the allowable 500 millirem prescribed by the radiation protection guides. Thus you can see that the potential radiation exposure to those living in the vicinity of nuclear power plants is, for all intents and purposes, negligible when compared to the other radiation exposures imposed by the natural background of radiation, coupled with the exposures that they willingly undertake in connection with medical and dental practices. As an aside, the 5 to 10 millirem is a hypothetical dose which no one ever receives from a nuclear reactor. To actually receive the dose, a person must sit on the fence near the reactor 24 hours a day for 365 days a year.

Some of our opponents have been quick to point out that in the case of medical exposures one has a clearly definable risk-benefit situation. This is true, but I would hasten to add that the operation of nuclear power plants for the purpose of generating electricity is a risk-benefit situation. The risk, as I have pointed out, is extremely

small, if indeed there is any at all, and the benefit to be derived is a very large one and this is apparent when one considers the great public need for electrical energy. The use of electrical energy, the cleanest energy known, actually prevents massive pollution from any known fuel source.

I am confident that the nuclear industry will continue to improve the engineering design of reactor facilities in order to minimize even further present release of radioactivity. We on the Joint Committee have a responsibility as representatives of the Congress to oversee the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission and the nuclear industry in general. We all have families, including children and grandchildren, and we are not so cruel as to allow unnecessary radiation exposure to the population of this country in order to impose a nuclear power industry upon an unwilling nation. For those who understand the biological effects of radiation and have studied our need for electrical energy, it is abundantly apparent that the minuscule radiation exposure resulting from the operation of the nuclear industry does not present a biological risk of any consequence. The peaceful atom can satisfy our pressing need for a new form of energy which will benefit mankind in his fight against a multitude of pollution factors.

THE FAST BREEDER REACTOR

Now I would like to return to the problems of energy resources and the solution to our long-term electrical needs. The solution to this problem lies in the successful development of an atomic fast breeder nuclear reactor. I have already mentioned that the light water reactors do not utilize the energy content of uranium in an effective manner. This is because only the uranium-235 atom is used to generate heat. I shall not describe in detail the operation of the fast breeder reactor but I will point out a few of its principal attributes. The *first* is that the fast breeder converts the fertile uranium-238 into fissionable plutonium which can then be recycled as new fuel in the breeder. The net result of this is that through careful design a breeder reactor will generate more fuel than it consumes. This permits not only refueling of the reactor in the first instance but also provides fuel supply for additional reactors to be fueled as they are built and added to the electrical grid.

The feasibility of the fast breeder reactor was demonstrated 20 years ago in 1951 at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho. We now have operating in this country three small liquid metal fast breeder reactors: the EBR-II Test Reactor at Idaho; the Enrico Fermi #1 in Michigan; and the SEFOR experimental reactor in Arkansas. None of these was expected to be economically competitive; and, in fact, our forthcoming power demonstration breeders are not expected to be economic. We do anticipate, however, that in the period of the 1980's this country will begin introducing into our national electrical generating capacity large commercially attractive fast breeder nuclear power plants that are competitive.

A *second* attribute that the liquid metal fast breeder reactor has is that it is as efficient from a steam cycle point of view as our modern fossil plants. I had mentioned earlier that the light water plants discharge 40 percent more waste heat than do the fossil plants. The breeder will, megawatt for megawatt, discharge about the same waste heat as a fossil fired plant.

A *third* attribute is that the engineers predict that the nature of the sodium-cooled nuclear breeder reactor is such that releases of radioactive material can be held to a bare minimum; in other words, below the 5-10 millirem per year which I have already cited as present practice for light water reactors.

THE FAST BREEDER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Last year the Congress authorized a total package of \$80 million as the Federal Government's financial participation in the first power demonstration project for the fast breeder. This consisted of \$50 million in cash, \$20 million in services, and \$10 million in waiver of fuel use charges. It is to be a cooperative venture with industry. This is an approach that we have used before in the development of the light water reactor. The breeder demonstration plant is expected to be in the range of 300-500 megawatts electric and will require 6 or 7 years to build. There is a disparity between the total amount of money estimated as needed for such a plant and the sum of the amounts the Federal Government and private industry have indicated they are prepared to put into the first project.

The gap needs to be closed. Based on the data the Joint Committee obtained earlier this year in testimony from Commission witnesses, it appears that the Government will need to put in about 100 million in addition to the presently authorized \$80 million to get the project started. I fully realize that the industry part of the team still must contribute a large sum but our needs for energy justify and require this effort. There should be no stalemate or negotiating hang-up relative to the "... about \$100 million" I have mentioned. The arrangements are yet to be worked out. The precise number is amenable to determination adequately for authorization required purposes. A study of the cost estimate data the AEC has prepared and presented at our authorization hearings supports these figures.

In my view what is needed is the announcement by the Administration of a national commitment to pursue the development of the fast breeder reactor as a high priority program directly relating to our Nation's needs for energy for the future. It is recognized by some, but should be known and appreciated by all, that abundant electrical energy is necessary if we are to clean up our environment. We need electricity to operate pumps for sewage treatment plants, to clean our atmospheric contaminants, to provide filtration of air supplies to our homes, stores and office buildings, to recycle wastes, and to compact scrap so that it will occupy only a minimum space volume. We will be stymied in our attempts to produce a clean environment if the ranting and raving by a few people is permitted to prevent the construction and operation of electrical power plants.

I am not opposed to proper environmental consideration of these problems. I am an environmentalist myself, but all of these factors must be considered in a balanced manner in order to assure the overall needs of our people are not ignored, in order to placate small, though vocal, special interest groups.

I hope you will take these facts home with you and remember them well.

Pollution in our modern environment cannot be reduced or eliminated without using a tremendous amount of energy—electrical energy.

Additional electrical energy must be generated by additional electrical generating plants.

Additional generating plants must burn fuel with an absolute minimum contribution of pollution to our environment. This requirement can be met by all types of plants—fossil or nuclear.

Nuclear fuel is our best hope for a clean non-depletable fuel for the long-range future.

I believe it will prove to be less of a pollutant than fossil fuels.

Nuclear fuel burning plants are cleaner today than fossil fuel burning plants.

In the next three decades, we will be forced by fossil fuel depletion and a continued rise

in price to turn to nuclear generating power plants.

By the year 2000 A.D., the six fold increase of needed kilowatts will be dependent on nuclear fuels by a 55 percent factor of our total generated kilowatts. We have already demonstrated that we can control the atom, now let us use it for the benefit of mankind.

APPENDIX I.—ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

In the operation of nuclear power plants there are two types of releases to the environment that must be carefully controlled to minimize potential undesirable effects on the environment and to protect public health and safety. These are, first, the release during normal reactor operation of small quantities of radioactivity under well-controlled and carefully monitored conditions and second, the release of substantial quantities of heat at low temperature.

Radioactivity releases

The AEC regulations on radiation protection which govern the release of the small quantities of radioactivity in air and water effluents from power reactors are based principally on the radiation protection guides recommended by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) (whose functions are now being performed by the Environmental Protection Agency) and approved by the President for guidance of all Federal agencies. The recommendations of the FRC are developed with the assistance of appropriate Federal agencies, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. The recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection are also carefully considered. The guidance on radiation protection issued by the FRC, NCRP and ICRP is mutually compatible.

In addition to their own expertise, the members of these groups seek the advice of other highly qualified scientists and researchers with specialized knowledge of the many factors that determine the effects of radioactivity on man. The results of the extensive experimental programs on the behavior and effect of radioactive materials in the environment and in living tissue are also carefully considered in developing the FRC guides.

The Commission's policy as established in its regulations is to limit release of radioactivity from each nuclear facility so as to provide reasonable assurance that exposures of the general public to ionizing radiation from the cumulative effects of all nuclear facilities and other sources do not exceed radiation protection guides recommended by the Federal Radiation Council and approved by the President.

For the purpose of controlling releases of radioactivity from several nuclear facilities in an area, AEC regulations provide for imposing both concentration limits and quantity limits to assure that the total radioactivity released to the environment from all sources does not result in intakes of radioactivity in air, water, and food by humans in excess of FRC guides. Only a small number of power reactors are now in operation and the quantities of radioactivity released have been so small that as a practical matter, it has not been necessary to impose quantity limits to limit cumulative total quantities from all reactors. We expect releases from power reactors will continue to be low. Nevertheless, looking to the future we are continuing to carefully examine our regulatory requirements to assure that releases to the environment from any nuclear facility in a geographical area continue to be adequately controlled and that exposure to the public remains well within radiation protection guides.

Surveillance programs at nuclear power plants now operating indicate that the releases of radioactivity from these plants have generally been small percentages of limits

imposed under AEC regulations. Based on results of monitoring programs in geographical areas adjacent to operating power reactor sites, it is estimated that exposures to individuals living near the site boundaries of a typical operating power reactor in 1968 were about one percent of the FRC radiation protection guides, that is, about 0.005 rem per year. The rem is the unit used as a measure of exposure to any nuclear radiation. A millirem (mrem) is a unit one thousand times smaller than a rem.

To put an annual exposure rate of 0.005 rem per year into perspective in day-to-day terms, it can be compared to variations in background radiation levels from place to place. Exposures to persons in the United States from natural background radiation range from 0.08–0.2 rem/year whole body exposure. In some areas of India and Brazil the natural levels of radiation are more than ten times higher. If a person living in Baltimore moves to Pittsburgh, his average annual exposure rate from natural background cosmic radiation alone would be increased by approximately .005 rem per year. Table I below gives further perspective on this matter.

In summary, based on present knowledge and operating experience the low levels of radioactivity released from nuclear power reactors are not expected to have a perceptible adverse effect on the environment or public health and safety.

RADIATION, EXPOSURES (Comparative information)

Annual whole body exposures from natural background radiation

(Cosmic radiation; radioactivity in rocks, soil, building materials; radioactivity in body)

United States—70–200 millirem (.07–.2 rem).

Special Areas and Average

Brazil

Volcanic areas—1600 millirem (1.6 rem).
Monozite Sand Areas—500 millirem (.5 rem).

India

Monozite Sand Areas—1300 millirem (1.3 rem).

Federal Radiation Council (FRC Guides)— Annual whole body exposure

Occupational Exposure—5000 millirem (5 rem).

Individual in Population—500 millirem (.5 rem).

Suitable Sample Population Group—170 millirem (.17 rem).

Medical exposures to localized portion of body
Average chest X-ray—20–500 millirem (.02–.5 rem).

Range for fluoroscopic examination of gastro-intestinal tract—5000–400,000 millirem (5–400 rem).

First detectable clinical effects (acute whole body exposures)

25,000–100,000 millirem (25–100 rem).

Cosmic radiation exposure to whole body during round trip flight—Washington, D.C. to West Coast at 35,000 feet
3–5 millirem (.003–.005 rem).

Annual whole body exposure from typical operating power reactor to persons living near site boundary

Persons living near site boundary—5 millirem (.005 rem).

Average to persons living within 4 miles—less than 1 millirem (.001 rem).

Definitions

rem radiation dose unit.
millirem—1/1000 of a rem.

APPENDIX II.—AIR POLLUTION FROM THE COMBUSTION OF COAL, OIL, NATURAL GAS

Air pollution, a source of major national concern, is a consequence of many factors—population growth, technology development, increased urbanization, and rising energy de-

mands. The need to curb such pollution was deemed so urgent that it was singled out as a matter of very high priority in the First Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality, August 1970.

While the majority of these pollutants come from automobiles and other internal combustion engines, substantial amounts result from fossil-fueled power plants. The principal pollutants from fossil-fired power plants are: fly-ash, smoke and soot, and the gaseous oxides of sulfur, carbon, and nitrogen. These pollutants have the potential of impairing public health, creating annoyance, and causing significant property damage.

Sulfur oxides are the most troublesome pollutants of the atmosphere from fossil-fired plants at the present time. Sulfur dioxide may convert to sulfuric acid mist, which can cause extensive damage to humans, vegetation, and property. A modern coal-fired plant with a capacity of 1000 Mwe could discharge through the stack about 250 tons of sulfur dioxide per day when operating at full capacity.

Nitrogen oxides produced by coal-fired plants, when inhaled by man, can combine with the water in his body to form nitric acid. This acid damages cell tissues, particularly in the lung. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has put nitrogen oxide among the first five pollutants for which it is developing air quality control criteria. It has been estimated that a 1000 megawatt coal-fired plant dumps 80 tons of nitrogen oxides into the atmosphere every day.

Carbon dioxide is being added to the atmosphere at the rate of six billion tons a year by the burning of coal, oil, and natural gas. It has been estimated that by the year 2000, the carbon dioxide content could increase by 25 percent, resulting in a "greenhouse effect" which could modify the heat balance of the atmosphere sufficiently to cause marked changes in climate.

Carbon monoxide is also being added to the atmosphere by combustion of fossil fuels. It combines with hemoglobin in the red blood corpuscles and thus interferes with their normal functions of supplying oxygen to the body tissues. The amount of carbon monoxide produced annually by power plants, while small in comparison to that from cars, is about one million tons.

There may also be unknown risks—genetic damage, life shortening, cancer—from environmental contamination with non-radioactive materials and organic products from fossil plants.

A discussion of the organization and methods used in efforts to control air pollution can be found in Chapter IV of the report "Considerations Affecting Steam Plant Site Selection."

ADDENDUM

Definitions

Roentgen.—An exposure dose of X-or gamma radiation such that the associated corpuscular emission per 0.001293 grams of air produces, in air, ions carrying 1 electrostatic unit of quantity of electricity of either sign.

Roentgen Equivalent Man (rem).—The rem is the unit used to express human biological doses as a result of exposure to one or many types of ionizing radiation.

Relative Biological Effectiveness (RBE).—The RBE is a factor which is used to compare the biological effectiveness of absorbed radiation doses (i.e., rads) due to different types of ionizing radiation. More specifically, it is the ratio of an absorbed dose of X-rays or gamma rays to the absorbed dose of a certain particulate radiation required to produce an identical biological effect in a particular experimental organism or tissue.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members de-

siring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE NATION'S ENERGY PROBLEMS

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the commendation of President Nixon for his comprehensive exposition of questions and answers to this Nation's energy problems as contained in his message to Congress on this subject today. Our colleague from California (Mr. Holifield) has quite correctly labeled the message as a momentous and important event in the history of our country.

It has long been apparent that piecemeal approaches to the energy problem, source by source, grow increasingly inadequate as our times become more complicated and our needs for energy, by whatever scale you measure them, increase at compounded rates. The President has offered us the opportunity to unify our energy efforts in a meaningful way that promises to weld public and private activities together on a development schedule tailored to avoid energy gaps.

Inasmuch as the message lays heavy stress on a single structure within the proposed new Department of Natural Resources as the logical common repository for all important energy resource development program, perhaps a similar unification within the Congress of jurisdiction over these related areas also might be logical. That, however, is a thought for the future even though I broached the idea of an energy agency, to which it would be applicable, in remarks at the nuclear safety program, information meeting at Oak Ridge National Laboratory on February 17, 1969.

Before highlighting the areas of the message dealing specifically with nuclear matters, geothermal developments and research I think it both fitting and proper to note here words of commendation for the gentleman from California (Mr. Holifield). Many of the ideas in today's message are ideas either born in his fertile mind during the many years he has addressed these problems or nurtured by him from early life to maturity. I personally know of his several conversations with the President on these matters and the thoughts conveyed by him in many major speeches on this subject. I am confident that his inputs were major factors in giving the message the excellence which it displays. I would further commend the gentleman from California (Mr. Holifield) for laying aside personal and partisan considerations in the development of what has been here presented today. His wise and unselfish devotion to duty in supporting and forwarding the best interests of the people of our Nation reflects true statesman-

ship. Indeed, as I said on another occasion, if ever a second coming impends and three new wise men have to be selected, CHET HOLIFIELD is sure to be one of them.

Personally I was particularly pleased by the release announced in the message of the \$16 million previously impounded at the Office of Budget and Management, which may now be used to begin the cascade improvement program in the gaseous diffusion complex at Oak Ridge, Portsmouth, and Paducah. This will bring about increased production of enriched uranium, a vital fuel for our nuclear power reactors upon which all the free world depends. By doing so the date by which the supply of this ingredient will be overrun by demand will be delayed. The delay will afford us the vital time needed to plan, finance and construct new enrichment capacity without running any risk of an enriched uranium nuclear fuel gap which otherwise might seriously interfere with electrical energy supplies during the early years of the decade of the 1980's.

This move also should serve to remove the impasse caused by congressional dissatisfaction with the freeze of this \$16 million. A related proposal may be implemented to begin sharing some of our uranium enrichment knowhow both with fellow Americans and with allies overseas who logically want to take some fair part in the supply of additional enrichment capacity and assume some fair burden in the financing thereof. All this does not mean that the Nixon administration is about to raffle off the enrichment complex or disembouchure treasure house of military secrets. Contrarily, it is a recognition that time has made the matter of supplying nuclear fuel predominately a civilian matter whereas in the early years it was almost exclusively a military one. As a civilian matter it necessarily has to be dealt with somewhat differently than in the past.

Frankly, what I foresee is that the Government will continue owning and operating and expanding the diffusion plants for the foreseeable future. Then, as centrifuge technologies are developed for the enrichment of uranium, the new centrifuge capacity might possibly be the subject of free enterprise development. And, insofar as foreign countries are concerned, I believe that the United States will easily retain its fair share of the world market for enrichment services while a healthy enrichment industry, subject to appropriate international safeguards, develops to meet additional needs. As a matter of fact, I see no means by which the United States could finance the total free world requirements for enriching capacity. Nor do I see any advantage in attempting so to do. As a nation we have never found monopoly to be a very satisfactory economic tool.

Of course, the message properly recognizes the great need for development of a satisfactory breeder economy. The message correctly schedules achievement of this as a national goal by 1980 with the liquid metal fast breeder reactor as the chosen vehicle for the purpose. An added \$27 million is included this year to boost the program and the Government share of overall development costs

has been boosted by \$50 million, for a total of \$130 million in cash and kind. This is a more realistic estimate of the magnitude of the Government's rightful share of the enterprise.

Further, the mention of continued funding for alternate fast breeder approaches to that of liquid metal, namely, gas-cooled, light water cooled, and the molten salt concept, is a proper backstop and insure of demonstrating a breeder reactor by 1980, even though conceivably it might be of a type different than that now principally proposed.

After the breeder will come fusion power, controlled thermonuclear reactions which tame the power of the H-bomb for clean and peaceful use. The message realistically recognizes that the developmental problems here are of tremendous magnitude that therefore, fusion power is no substitute for the fast breeder in the sequential development of U.S. electrical energy capacity. The addition of \$2.1 million for fiscal year 1972 for this program will help insure that it comes to fruition as a practical and economic electricity producer sometime soon after the turn of the century when it will be needed.

If you are picking up a pattern here from what I have said it is because that pattern was established by the message. In it two quite nonpartisan concerns on the President's part are apparent. One is for adequate energy and the second, and equally important in his mind, is for clean energy. These are the same thoughts he has expressed to me on prior occasions and again, only this morning during a telephone call in which he indicated his appreciation both to the gentleman from California (Mr. Holifield) and myself for parallel bipartisan approaches to the subject.

I think it significant that the message included in its general call for clean energy that also, in specific connection with nuclear energy, health, safety, and environmental considerations be regarded as essential parts of this same generic category. As a matter of fact even existing light water reactors came in for an added \$3 million for safety related efforts, just to make certain the bases there are covered here, too.

Two other nuclear related subjects appropriately were in the message, power-plant siting and plowshare nuclear stimulation of natural gas production. Their inclusion assures deserved high priority attention to the possibilities of both for easing or avoiding energy shortages.

In closing, I would like to mention my real pleasure at inclusion in the message of a promise to begin the leasing of geothermal lands by this fall. Many of us worked long and hard to obtain legislation permitting the development of this resource. The President is to be commended for clearing away the redtape which heretofore has been somewhat delaying the start of a leasing program for development and production.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Again, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman for

his many, many thousands of hours of study and work and attendance at hearings over the past 16 or 18 years. He has rendered a valuable service from his side of the aisle. The program we have now in this country on atomic energy could not have been obtained without the bipartisan support of all of the Members on his side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle. He, as ranking Member, has certainly set an example which his colleagues have followed, and I have tried to do the same thing on my side of the aisle.

Mr. HOSMER. Let me say to the gentleman that it has been a real thrill at all times to work on such an important facet of our Nation's requirements. It has been a delight to work with such intelligent and diligent and enjoyable colleagues and, therefore, twice productive.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho. Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman in the well not only for the expertise and leadership he has given in his capacity on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but also in his membership on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs where he has dealt with other energy matters outside the atomic energy field.

I join with him and with the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) in expressing our concerns about this entire problem and the very great debt of gratitude that the Nation should properly owe and recognize and express to the President of the United States in this very significant message which ought to be a landmark of this administration and certainly ought to be one of the most newsworthy events of the year. I hope people will note the recent reversal of the energy demand ratio to the GNP as being an exacerbation of the very real energy demands and crisis over the next several years.

I hope also that in our concern, and a very proper concern it is, over the environment and our impact upon it in the production of energy, that we do not lose sight of the fact that it requires energy to deal with environmental problems. We cannot deny the production of energy in order to solve environmental problems.

I am reminded of some of the measures now pending before the Congress to simply prohibit strip mining in all of its forms and some recent proposals which would bring about a flat prohibition against strip mining on public lands as being the kind of blind response to environmental concern that would make the problem worse rather than better. But, we should deal with the problem in an intelligent manner.

Let us solve the problem by not denying its existence.

Mr. Speaker, I think this concern, expressed as it is in so very many ways, is also being expressed by the fact that the Research Committee operated under the Republican Conference has recently established a task force on energy and resources which I have the honor to chair and on which the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is a very prominent and important member.

We hope in all of these ways to underscore the public need for understand-

ing and concern about the various inter-related problems of energy demands as well as our environmental problems and express the hope for a better future for this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I not only thank the gentleman from Idaho for his kind remarks, but also wish to call attention to the satisfaction which his constituents must feel when they hear him discuss so ably and so eloquently problems of such importance to the Nation and their government. Their confidence and satisfaction must be that insofar as they are concerned these matters are being very well and very capably handled by the gentleman.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

Joseph Smith Duncan gave America its first addressograph machine in 1892. The first model consisted of a hexagonal wood block upon which was glued rubber type torn from rubber stamps. The block revolved, advancing a new name and address to the printing point and inking the type simultaneously at each operation. This model was never marketed. The model "Baby 'O'" was put into production on July 26, 1893, in one small back room in the old Caxton Building on Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

CARGO PREFERENCE GIVES FARMERS, LABOR "50 PERCENT OF NOTHING"—FINDLEY PREDICTS UNIONS WILL ACT REASONABLY IF RESTRICTION IS LIFTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, in October of 1963, the late President Kennedy offered to sell large quantities of American wheat to the Soviet Union. As a condition of the sale, he made it a requirement that 50 percent of the grain be transported in American ships.

The decision was a natural one for him to make. American farmers, the world's most efficient producers of agricultural products, had outdone themselves in preceding years. Domestic wheat surpluses were continually mounting and storage costs were high. It was in our interest to get rid of the wheat, just as it was in the Soviet's interest to buy it. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, publicly urged that the United States send grain to Communist countries, stating that "hunger knows no politics."

From a political standpoint, the decision to send 50 percent of the grain in American bottoms was also natural. Pres-

ident Kennedy had won election over Vice President Nixon by the narrowest margin in history. The support of organized labor had been crucial. Labor's traditional support for the Democratic ticket would be just as important in the presidential election to be held 1 year later. The President would not wish to antagonize or offend those upon whom his hopes for reelection so clearly depended.

Thus, when the longshoremen and other maritime unions demanded that cargo preference regulations be applied to grain sales to Communist governments, President Kennedy obliged.

Eight years later, it is apparent that a grievous error was committed, and that both the American workingman and the American farmer today carry the burden of that error. Far from creating jobs in the maritime shipping industry, the cargo preference requirements destroys jobs.

In fact, the cargo preference restriction on grain to Communist countries has never worked since its inception. Because of high union wages on U.S. ships, even the wheat sale to the Soviet Union arranged by President Kennedy required an enormous U.S. subsidy amounting to almost \$2 million. The subsidy was in the form of a substantial discount on Durum wheat, and the purpose was to offset the high shipping costs which resulted from sending 50 percent in U.S. bottoms.

Since that deal was concluded, no similar subsidy has been sold in Eastern European and Soviet markets.

American grain farmers, who depend upon foreign purchases for almost half of their wheat sales, have lost valuable new markets to Canada and other wheat producing areas. This has meant fewer dollars to farmers for the purchase of union-made tractors, planters, plows, harvesters, trucks, and other union-made items. It has meant fewer dollars for union-staffed trucks and rail shipping and handling of the grain. And it has not secured for maritime labor the income for which they had hoped. As a result of cargo preference, working men and farmers alike have suffered mightily.

For example, although our country exports more wheat than any other nation in the world, we supply only about 1 percent of Eastern Europe's wheat requirement. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, supplies those same countries with 16 percent of their wheat. Throughout the decade of the 1960's, we sent only about 5 percent of our exportable wheat to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Through various restrictions, such as cargo preference, we preclude ourselves from competing in one-quarter of the world grain market. That costs farmers and businessmen valuable sales and longshoremen and shiphands jobs.

The reason for this deplorable situation is simple.

It costs only \$8.50 to ship 1 ton of grain from the United States to ports on the Black Sea if a ship of foreign registry carries it. To ship that same ton of grain in a U.S. vessel costs \$22.25—almost three times as much.

The requirement that 50 percent of

U.S. grain shipped to Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union go in American bottoms actually means that no U.S. grain gets shipped.

In effect, the 50-percent requirement means 50 percent of nothing—50 percent of nothing for labor, 50 percent of nothing for farmers, 50 percent of nothing for businessmen, and 50 percent of nothing to help balance our foreign payments.

Now is the time to drop cargo preference restrictions in the interests of both agriculture and labor. President Nixon will announce on Thursday, June 10, the list of commodities to be placed under general license to the Peoples Republic of China. I hope that he will include the widest category of agricultural products on that list, and among them grains.

Thursday would be the most appropriate time for the President to announce that he is also lifting the cargo preference restriction. While the 50-percent requirement is on the books, no grain will move to China irrespective of whether general or specific licensing is required.

Farmers deserve an opportunity to compete in all foreign markets. Cargo preference effectively prohibits them from doing so.

American shipping interests, maritime crews and longshoremen, and other union workers also deserve an opportunity to earn a decent living. As Mr. Meany succinctly put it:

Seamen, as well as wheat farmers must eat.

Eight years of cargo preference have not helped them.

Clearly, a new approach must be taken, and I believe that organized labor is ready to explore new alternatives. Mr. Meany has openly called for a "continuing review of governmental policy concerning cargo preference, flag quotas, and maritime policy generally." He has stated that a "constructive alternative" is needed. The present system benefits neither agriculture nor labor. Mr. Meany only argues that "the abandonment of the legitimate interests of the American merchant marine and of the public interest in the merchant marine is neither justified nor necessary to accomplish this objective."

Certainly, the United States cannot afford to lose all its merchant fleet. The public interest Mr. Meany speaks of requires a strong fleet for the sake of our national security. Yet, just as clearly, an alternative to the present system must be found.

I urge President Nixon to announce, at the time he lifts the cargo preference restrictions on grain shipments to Communist countries, that he is immediately reconvening the Maritime Advisory Committee and ordering them to report immediately and directly to him its recommendations to solve the problem of freight rate differentials. If he does so, I believe that organized labor will react reasonably.

The Committee is composed of representatives from labor, business, and government. It enjoys the complete confidence of the unions, and they can be sure that their legitimate interests will be protected.

Further, there are alternative solutions which are acceptable to organized labor. Mr. Meany has stated:

If the freight rate differential is, in fact, the only barrier to (expand grain trade), there are various ways in which the problem can be approached which would respect the legitimate interests of all parties and would not entail the betrayal of one vital segment of our economy by another.

One suggestion which the Committee should consider is the desirability of providing a direct Government subsidy for the wage differential in the U.S. merchant fleet.

As Mr. Meany points out, labor has supported subsidies to assure wheat price maintenance through the government loan mechanism, and labor has also supported the taxpayer-financed direct wheat export subsidy program when it was in effect.

As Mr. Meany suggests, other alternatives are also available. Cargo preference is clearly a failure. A better solution to the problem is needed.

Farmers want a better solution. Labor wants a better solution. Our foreign policy requires a better solution. Our balance-of-payments problem cries for solution.

It is time to act. The moment is upon us, and we must not put off the difficult decision.

NATIONAL PEACE CORPS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as one who introduced the resolution to designate May 30 to June 5, 1971, as National Peace Corps Week, I want to take this opportunity to salute the Peace Corps on its 10th anniversary. Over 45,000 volunteers have served in some 60 countries over the last decade, promoting international friendship and understanding while helping the developing countries meet their needs for trained manpower. Our Nation is deeply indebted to these courageous and dedicated volunteers who have selflessly served their country and other countries in the cause of peace and development.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially appropriate that during this same week that we are honoring the Peace Corps, the Congress has given its final stamp of approval to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971 which would create a new Action agency, combining the Peace Corps with our domestic volunteer programs. It is an indication to me that we are willing and eager to build upon the successful volunteer programs of the past decade to meet the new challenges of the present decade. It is an indication to me that the voluntary spirit in America is not only alive and well, but growing. It is that voluntary spirit which has made us a great nation; and it is that voluntary spirit which will keep us a great nation.

The Peace Corps has perhaps been the most successful embodiment of that spirit for it has demonstrated to the world that the voluntary way in America is not confined to our own shores but tran-

sends national boundaries as true humanitarianism should.

MILITARY PRIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pride that I share with colleagues a poem written by a young constituent, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Davis, Jr., of Wilmington, N.C., who is now serving his country in Vietnam. When many of our youth are demonstrating against the national interest and military service, it is inspiring to hear from one who challenges others to be proud of their country and its freedoms. The poem follows:

ONLY THINKING

Two months ago, I left my home state
For a war torn land full of death and hate.
But before the Navy, when from college I left,

My decision to join had influence some more,
My classmates had come to wish me their best.

And I felt great pride in the uniform I wore.
Training and stateside duty passed,
And my orders for Nam came down at last.
The day I left home, my family cried.
But, under the tears, their eyes burned with pride.

Though me, from my family, my duty tore,
I had never felt prouder of the uniform I wore.

I've seen children who from hunger cry,
I've faced "Charlie," and I've watched him die.

I've heard a friend, who's blood spilled bright,
Say, against freedom his pride was not slight,
"I was helping stop communism from upping
the score,"

And I never felt prouder of the uniform I wore.

The news from home said "The students
want more,
And the demands not met bring on campus
war".

They ridicule America with their show of
might.

While it's for, not against, my country I
fight,

They hate, ridicule, scorn me and more
Because of my pride in the uniform I wore.

Duty is a word they never learned,
And freedom is a privilege they never earned.
When by President speaks they scream lie.
But, on his decision, if need be, I'll die

And hope by my death that I have done my
share

Because I am still proud of the uniform I
wear.

I am an American and proud of my right
Of having for freedom been able to fight.
You on the campus, you who say you're not
treated equal,

Should see what communist aggression can
do to a people.

Though you burn my flag and scream I'm
unfair,

You can't stop my pride in the uniform I
wear.

I think of the men who die here each day
So you students can continue to live your
own way.

What thanks do they get for the sacrifice
they've made?

You burn their flag and you spit upon their
grave.

But if they were still alive, their combined
voices would roar

Of the pride that they felt for the uniform
they wore.

Loyal Americans, don't look at this trash,

Who burn down their schools and with local police clash,
 And judge all young Americans by their un-loyal way
 Because, there are thousands of us who would like to say,
 That we love our country and of its future we care
 And we are all proud as hell of the uniform we wear.

DIRECTION THAT THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS SHOULD BE TAKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the attention of the House, what, in my judgment, are two very significant articles in the New York Times pointing to the direction that the strategic arms limitation talks should be taking.

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, who is the dean of the U.S. arms control professionals, recommends increased emphasis on defense and a corresponding reduction in the relative effort devoted to strategic offensive forces. His analysis raises fundamental questions about the canons of our conventional strategic wisdom: the concept of "mutual assured destruction" to which phase Dr. Brennan aptly assigns the acronym MAD.

While I do not pretend to endorse all of Dr. Brennan's positions, I believe it is time for Members of this body who have expressed concern about the safety of civilians endangered by air or artillery strikes or those Members who are justifiably concerned over a reordering of national priorities away from excessive military spending, to analyze and come to terms with the direction in which our own strategic philosophy programs are taking us.

In my judgment this can mean nothing else but a mutual and enforceable decrease in offensive strategic nuclear systems, and positive action to strengthen rights of civilians to be protected from aerial warfare.

The article follows:

STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES I (By Donald G. Brennan)

American strategic nuclear policy has been dominated in recent years by an idea called "assured destruction." This concept is that the dominant task of the U.S. strategic forces is to be able to mount a nuclear attack that would reliably destroy a substantial fraction of the Soviet society, even after a major Soviet strike on American forces. Recent public statements of the Nixon Administration have emphasized a doctrine called "strategic sufficiency." Although published formulations of this doctrine are ambiguous, it is clear that something like the concept of "assured destruction" still dominates American strategic policy, even if the terminology itself is no longer used in official statements.

This domination extends to strategic arms-control matters. It is widely argued that the most peaceful, stable, secure, cheap, and generally desirable arrangement is one in which we and the Soviets maintain a "mutual assured destruction" posture, in which no serious effort is made by either side to limit the civilian damage that could be inflicted by the other. Most of the opposition

in the West to substantial systems of missile defense for cities and some of the opposition to the Safeguard ABM system derives from the alleged benefits of such a posture. This is pertinent to the forthcoming Soviet-American negotiations on offensive and defensive forces announced by President Nixon last Thursday.

I believe that the concept of mutual assured destruction provides one of the few instances in which the obvious acronym for something yields at once the appropriate description for it; that is, a Mutual Assured Destruction posture as a goal is, almost literally, mad, MAD.

If the forces of technology and international politics provided absolutely no alternative, one might reluctantly accept a MAD posture. But to think of it as desirable—for instance, as a clearly preferred goal of our arms-control negotiations, as many current proposals automatically assume—is bizarre. This can be made very clear by considering the simplest and most effective means of realizing it.

At present, we and the Soviets achieve a MAD posture by means of long-range missiles and bombers armed with thermonuclear weapons. There are, however, many problems associated with these forces; missiles and bombers may be attacked before they are launched, they may fail to perform properly, or they may fail to penetrate enemy defenses. Concern about such vulnerabilities in our posture helps drive the arms race. These forces are also expensive; the U.S. alone spends about \$8 billion a year on them.

Now, if it were genuinely desirable to have a MAD posture, we could achieve it far more effectively, reliably and cheaply than at present. As Leo Szilard remarked ten years ago, we and the Soviets could have an arms-control agreement to mine each other's cities. We could install very large thermonuclear weapons with secure firing arrangements in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and so on, while the Soviets could install similar weapons and arrangements in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and so on. It is technically feasible to make such a system very secure, and the vulnerabilities mentioned above could be eliminated, which would reduce arms-race pressures. While such a system would have its own technical problems, analysis indicates they would be far simpler to solve than those of the present system. It would also be much cheaper than the current system; it could save billions.

Yet almost everyone will judge it starkly absurd, even after consideration. And, since a mined-city system is clearly the best way of realizing a MAD posture, it follows that a MAD posture as a goal is itself fundamentally absurd—it is, indeed, mad.

This reduction-to-absurdity argument is useful for sharply drawing attention to the fact that something must be wrong with MAD as a way of life. However, one can discuss the problems of MAD directly. There are at least three interrelated problems.

The first is that, in spite of our best efforts, a major nuclear war could happen. An institutionalized MAD posture is a way of insuring, now and forever, that the outcome of such a war would be a nearly unlimited disaster for everybody. While technology and politics may conspire for a time to leave us temporarily in such a posture, we should not welcome it—we should rather be looking for ways out of it. And they can be found.

The second fundamental difficulty is, in essence, political: The body politic of the United States did not create a Department of Defense for the purpose of deliberately making us all hostages to enemy weapons. The Government is supposed, according to the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense," and plainly most Americans would revolt at the idea that a mined-city system is a sensible way to do this. They would be quite right. The Defense Depart-

ment should be more concerned with assuring live Americans than dead Russians.

The third fundamental difficulty is moral. We should not deliberately create a system in which millions of innocent civilians would, by intention, be exterminated in a failure of the system is not that reliable. If we accept a MAD posture as an interim solution, we should be seeking ways out of it, not ways to enshrine it.

Tomorrow I shall discuss alternative directions for strategic policy and arms control.

STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES: II

(By Donald G. Brennan)

Yesterday I explained that many people regard a posture of Mutual Assured Destruction—MAD—as a desirable objective of our arms-control policy. I also explained that a mined-city system was obviously the most efficient way of achieving a MAD posture, and, since the mined-city system was clearly absurd, it followed that a MAD posture itself must be absurd.

Why, then, do some Americans advocate a MAD posture? The advocates involved are, in the main, technical or technically oriented people accustomed to theoretical models, and the arguments involve appeals to "stability" of various kinds and reference to other sophisticated jargon—jargon that I understand very well, having helped to articulate it a decade and more ago. For instance, one argument sometimes heard is that this posture will best protect against nuclear war altogether, but this proposition is very dubious indeed.

While these advocates are undoubtedly sincere, and many of them are even intelligent, I believe they have been bemused by theoretical models of strategic interactions, models which seem sophisticated and intellectually appealing but which are in fact much oversimplified descriptions of reality. Indeed, some few technical people, who have at least had the integrity to follow the logic of such analysis to its conclusion, have been so bemused by these models that they have seriously advocated the actual deployment of a mined-city system.

Well, if an institutionalized MAD posture is not desirable as a permanent way of life, and is not, what alternative is available? The answer is to provide increasing emphasis on defense, and corresponding reduction in the relative effort devoted to strategic offensive forces.

There is much controversy about just how effective defense (such as ABM) can be made against current offensive forces, or against further enlarged offensive forces. I cannot discuss this controversy here. However, there is very little controversy over the fact that defense can be made quite effective if the opposing offense is held down or actually reduced, while allowed defense is built up. This is precisely the direction that negotiations in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks should be taking, but, so far as I can see have not yet been taking. The forthcoming negotiation on offensive and defensive forces will provide both Governments with a good opportunity to pursue this possibility.

Even if it were held that currently achievable defense is too ineffective to be useful against even a suitably reduced offensive threat (a position that few informed persons would believe), it makes little sense to preclude the possibility of a more effective defense being found in the future. Most of the current approaches to these matters would do so.

It might be possible to achieve similar effects simply by sharply reducing offensive forces, without any defense, if it were not for two factors: (a) there are other countries in the world besides the United States and the Soviet Union, and (b) perfect inspection of sharply reduced offensive forces probably

cannot be achieved, and defense can provide protection against clandestine weapons.

The most desirable postures providing increased defensive emphasis would be those achievable through negotiations with the Soviets. If such negotiations should fail, other alternatives, though less desirable, are available. I believe a sensible unilateral American strategic program would be governed by the following three rules:

The Budget Rule. We should spend about as much money on strategic offensive and defensive forces combined as the Soviets do, neither greatly more, which might stimulate arms-race effects, nor greatly less, which would leave us in a position of increasing risk.

I shall, for obvious reasons, call this the Brass Rule. In terms of possible strategic nuclear wars, we should be able to do about as badly unto the Soviets as they can do unto us. This makes it unlikely that the Soviets could "dictate" terms to the United States in a crisis. Note that this formulation—in contrast to the McNamara formulation of "assured destruction"—leaves open the possibility of reducing our threat to the Soviets, if their threat to us can be reduced by whatever means.

The Defense Rule. Of the money provided by the Budget Rule, spend as much on defense as is compatible with the Brass Rule. For the foreseeable future, this would require major continued expenditures on offense.

We should not be busily engaged in forging a permanent Sword of Damocles, to hang forever over our heads, by our own design and efforts. It is too likely to fail. We should rather devote our best efforts to escaping from this MAD posture. The alternatives are available.

PROBLEMS BESET NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in my investigation over the past year of the Atomic Energy Commission's proposal to establish an atomic-waste dump in Kansas, it has become obvious that the men of AEC, despite their vaunted expertise in all matters scientific, are humans with the same frailties and proclivity for mistakes that mark the rest of us.

One would think that because of their grave responsibilities, because they deal with things that imperil all life on earth, they would exhibit a degree of care that exceeds the ordinary. The record does not seem to bear this out. On the contrary, while the Commission is undoubtedly peopled with men of outstanding ability and perhaps even near-genius, its very lack of concern for the ordinary, the mundane, the simple, results in occasional outlandish results.

A good example is illustrated by a newspaper article that appeared in the front page of the Washington Post of May 26, 1971. The piece, by the very capable science writer Thomas O'Toole, recounts that apparent defective designs in nuclear-fuel power reactors will delay the construction and/or operation of at least five major nuclear powerplants. As many as 51 other such plants the article says, face construction and operation delays as a result of recent tests showing up serious problems.

The AEC, of course, believes that the

problem is probably not in basic design and points out that the test failures were only in laboratory-sized models. However it admits it is very much concerned if the emergency cool-down system does not work. The concern is great enough to order a halt in operation of three plants almost ready to produce electricity and to construction of two others. AEC believes the delays may last from 1 to 3 months, but no one knows for sure. The five plants currently involved represent an investment of more than \$1 billion and the impact of prolonged loss of power production from the three will exacerbate the already critical power situation the Nation faces this summer.

In my judgment, this article points up again the fact that in AEC's haste to develop peaceful use of the atom and push private utilities into vast and terribly expensive construction programs—which of course the power users must pay for—it just does not do its homework.

An integral part of the atomic-power production is the resultant highly dangerous waste that must be cared for until it is no longer lethal to living things—a period ranging from 50,000 to 500,000 years depending on the type of waste. AEC spent billions developing a method of producing electricity from the atom but did not give a great deal of thought to disposing of the wastes safely. Now, facing vast quantities of this hot and poisonous material, it wants to dump it into abandoned salt mines without having carefully and fully researched the necessary facts to determine how safely this can be done.

Since other Members of this body already have, and more will in the future, experience critical environmental, ecological, and health and safety problems arising from AEC operations, I include the newspaper article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1971]

A-PLANTS FACE DELAYS AFTER FAILURE IN TESTS

(By Thomas O'Toole)

At least five and as many as 56 atomic power plants being built in the United States face construction and operation delays as the result of tests showing possibly defective designs in their nuclear-fueled reactors.

The five plants alone represent an investment of more than \$1 billion and an electric power output of more than four million kilowatts, enough to light up a city the size of Chicago. Long delays in these plants could trigger power crises in Florida, New York and Michigan, where they are being built.

Far more serious is the impact long delays might have on 51 more plants being built or about to be built; these account for more than 42 million kilowatts of planned power and an investment of over \$10 billion in more than 20 states. Lengthy delays in their construction could trigger a nationwide power shortage.

The delays were caused by six straight failures of laboratory-sized atomic reactors to cool themselves down in emergencies called "loss of coolant" failures. Each time, the emergency procedure for cooling down the hot nuclear cores backfired in tests, causing the simulated reactors to close themselves down.

"These tests were not fair models of real reactors," one Atomic Energy Commission official said. "Nevertheless, we have to be concerned by the failures and the outside possi-

bility that we might have a fundamental problem in design."

The chances of basic design problems are slim, AEC officials said. But if the emergency coolant designs don't work it would affect the nuclear plants being built and the 16 plants already in operation.

If the designs prove defective, plants operating today might have to be closed while the designs were being corrected.

"We have told five utilities they can expect licensing delays on five nuclear power plants," an official of the AEC's regulatory staff said yesterday.

"These five were chosen because they were all at a juncture where some action had to be taken. They had to be told they could not meet their deadlines."

The five utilities are Consolidated Edison Co. and Long Island Lighting Co. in New York, Florida Power & Light Co., and Detroit Edison Co. and Consumers Power Co. in Michigan. The Con Ed, Florida P&L and Consumers Power plants are ready to begin producing electricity; the other two are about to begin construction.

The length of the operation and construction delays is anybody's guess. One AEC official said the five utilities can expect delays of at least one month and probably three months.

The tests that turned up the loss-of-coolant failures were what engineers call "blowdown" tests. They were conducted on semi-scale reactor mockups at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho Falls, Idaho.

In the tests, engineers pretended that a water-cooled reactor under pressure had suddenly lost its cooling water at the same time that it suffered a "blowdown," which is a rupture in the piping that carries the coolant through the reactor.

The tests showed that when emergency water was flooded in through the piping to cool down the core, it did not get to the core because pressurized steam built up and wouldn't let it in.

"The tests seemed to indicate," one source said, "that there is a possibility the steam pressure within the vessel could prevent the core cooling water from entering the vessel. It appeared as if the core cooling water was being forced out of a break in the recirculation loop."

Engineers noted that the test results don't prove a design defect, since the tests were carried out on a model vastly different from a full-scale reactor. Only one prime coolant loop is used in the model, whereas four are used on real reactors.

Nonetheless, the test results were viewed as serious in the most conservative AEC circles.

"If you get a loss of coolant and then a loss of emergency coolant in a real accident," one official said, "your reactor core would overheat and probably melt under temperatures in excess of 5,000 degrees.

"The core would probably crumble," he went on, "and although you've got 10 or 12 feet of reinforced concrete under the core it might melt through all that. There would be steam explosions and there is a possibility of the reactor bursting. Nobody knows for sure what would happen."

REPRESENTATIVE RONCALIO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO MAKE ILLEGAL THE MANUFACTURE, SALE, PURCHASE, USE AND POSSESSION OF ALL THALLIUM COMPOUNDS AS A PESTICIDE

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to make ille-

gal the manufacture, sale, purchase, use and possession of all Thallium compounds as a pesticide or as an instrument of animal control.

During the month of May, 48 eagles were found dead in my State of Wyoming. Upon investigation of these deaths, it appears most of the eagles fell victim to the reckless use of one of the most lethal wildlife poisons known to man, Thallium sulfate.

Thallium sulfate is a non-specific, highly stable and persistent, cumulative toxin that not only killed countless eagles but also indeterminate numbers of other wildlife. Under existing statutory and regulatory directives, it is impossible to determine the number of persons using this poison, their identity, the concentration in which it is distributed, the localities of its placement, the duration of exposure to wildlife, or the total effect upon not only predators, but all forms of animal life, including man.

The situation described above points to the lack of control and the neglect of our public responsibility in regulating the various poisoning programs in my State of Wyoming and throughout the Nation.

The bill I introduce today is just one step in bringing these programs under strict control. I hope the House of Representatives will act with favor on this measure so as to bring a halt to such a national disgrace as Wyoming has suffered in the last month, and to prevent further irreparable damage to our already fast-fading national wildlife.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILBUR D. MILLS BEFORE JOINT SESSION OF LOUISIANA STATE LEGISLATURE

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Day recess, Louisiana was honored to have the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and great American patriot, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, address the joint session of the Louisiana Legislature, in Baton Rouge, La.

It was a signal honor for me personally for WILBUR to come to our beloved State, he being a close and dear friend from the neighboring State of Arkansas and the chairman of the committee on which I have the pleasure of serving.

The address was stirring and indeed timely, and I would like for all our colleagues to have the benefit of these words of wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I include the address of Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS before the joint session of the Louisiana State Legislature in Baton Rouge, La., May 31, 1971, following my remarks:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILBUR D. MILLS

It is a singularly gratifying honor for me to be invited to appear before this distinguished legislative body today. I come with full appreciation of the significant fact that Louisiana has been the matrix for the western half of this Nation—the mother of the many States carved out of the vast territory between the Mississippi River and the Rocky

Mountains, including my own State of Arkansas.

The history of Louisiana and the Louisiana Purchase constitutes, therefore, a large measure of the history of the United States. Just as New York was the gateway and melting pot of the east, so Louisiana has welcomed, received and sustained people representing the varied cultures and influences of the Old World. Louisiana, however, more than any other part of the United States, has had the genius to blend and preserve these diverse ethnic contributions into a tradition of harmony, hospitality and that unique charm for which your State is known everywhere. Louisiana has successfully accomplished a rare and graceful union of heritage preservation and maximization of progress with a vitality and spirit second to no other State in the Union.

We Arkansans are proud of our close association with Louisiana, dating from centuries before the Louisiana Purchase right up to the present time. The same Spanish explorers and French pioneers who in very early days plied the "Father of Waters" in Louisiana also explored and settled along the mighty river's tributaries in Arkansas. These early French settlers left marks that are visible today not only in geographical names on the map of our State but in the customs and mores of our people. The port of New Orleans has, from the time of the Crescent City's founding, been exceedingly important to Arkansas, because it has been, and still is, our principal "window to the sea".

During the War Between the States, citizens of Arkansas and Louisiana joined shoulder to shoulder at Port Hudson, Vicksburg and other battles both within and without this State.

After the war, it was once again to the port of New Orleans that Arkansas looked to provide the outlet to world markets for her cotton and other agricultural products that would afford opportunity for recovery and restoration of her devastated economy.

In the ensuing years, we in Arkansas and you in Louisiana cooperated and worked together to tame the Mississippi River and to have instituted the far-flung system of flood control measures that have transformed this longest of all rivers into a consistently obedient servant rather than the unpredictably destructive and rebellious enemy of years gone by.

Today, with the completion of the Arkansas River Navigation Project, we stand on the threshold of an era that will see even greater enhancement of the close relationship that exists between Louisiana and Arkansas and, indeed, all the States of the Mississippi Valley. Because of Louisiana's strategic location at the point where this fertile valley, the richest and most productive in world history, meets the sea, we look to you and your waterways and ports once again to show us the way.

That Louisiana has been showing the way for the mid-South, the Mississippi Valley and the entire Nation, as well, is manifested in the great contributions your State has made and is making to the progress and strength of the United States. We know very well that statistics show that in foreign commerce, New Orleans, is second only to New York among the ports of this country in the value of foreign trade handled and that it is the Nation's leading grain port. We recognize that Louisiana is a leading State in the discovery, production, refinement and distribution of essential natural resources so vital to the Nation's economy and defense. Your leadership is well known also in the production of forest products, fish and seafood, furs, soybeans, rice, livestock and all manner of food and fiber. Your State's phenomenal industrial growth since World War II is symbolized by the appellation of the riparian area from this point

southward to below New Orleans as the "American Ruhr". Your artistic and cultural contributions are without peer among the States of the Union.

Your leadership is particularly evident and pronounced in government. Louisiana has consistently produced distinguished statesmen and dedicated public servants at all levels of government—Federal, State and local. It has been said that man for man your current delegation to the Congress, which has aggregate seniority of almost 170 years of service, is the most powerful there. On the House side, the Majority Leader is Hale Boggs, and on the Senate side, the President pro tempore and Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is Allen Ellender. The Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services is Ed Hébert and the Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate is Russell Long. Otto Passman is high on the list of Members of the House Committee on Appropriations. Joe Waggonner is a valued Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee which I have the honor to chair. Speedy Long, Ed Edwards, John Rarick and Pat Caffery are also establishing themselves as important Members of the Committees they serve and are adhering to the tradition of Louisiana legislators, which have always been among the most able, effective and articulate delegations in the Congress.

Today, I want to speak to you about important aspects of our Federal system—that is, Federal-State-local relationships in the frame of particular areas and in the light of issues currently before the public. The Committee on Ways and Means since the beginning of this Congress has been comprehensively reviewing intergovernmental relationships in the public welfare system. On last Wednesday, the Committee filed its report on H.R. 1, the Social Security and welfare amendments, with the House of Representatives, and soon we shall be voting on this bill on the House floor.

H.R. 1 represents the most far-reaching and complete revision of the Nation's welfare system since its inception, and nobody denies that this system has been badly needful of revision. After long and assiduous study and month after month of public hearings and executive sessions, the Committee became convinced that the only feasible and sensible approach to the welfare problem is federalization of the family and adult assistance programs, establishment of uniform requirements and provision for an appropriate nationwide income floor. With respect to families, this Federal floor would be set at \$2,400 for a family of four. The new program would be federally administered.

Federalization in this particular area, that is, public welfare payments, is the proper course to follow to achieve greater fairness and equity, desirable uniformity and better control, economy and enforcement of the program. Instead of the widely varying pot-pourri of existing programs in the fifty States, we want to create a system of welfare that will be consistently fair both to the taxpaying public which supports it and its beneficiaries. We want a system of welfare which places primary emphasis on ultimate severance of a family from the program and re-entry into the working world. We want a program that restores people to employment, self-reliance and self-respect. We want a program that will stem the alarming tide of spiraling costs and chronic instances of family dependence on welfare generation after generation.

The Committee is convinced that H.R. 1 is a tremendously significant move in this direction. It will establish a new system of incentives and requirements for work and training. Families in which at least one person is employable would be enrolled in what is called the "Opportunities For Families" program, which would be administered not

by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but by the Department of Labor. Only those families without employable persons would be enrolled in the Family Assistance Plan, the part that would be administered by HEW.

All adult family assistance recipients except those specifically exempted by the bill, would be required to register for work or training. The exemptions from the registration requirements have been held to a minimum.

H.R. 1, therefore, places the spotlight of attention on the terminal end of welfare while simultaneously tightening the prerequisites for initial entry on the rolls. The only feasible means of accomplishing these objectives is through federalizing of the program. The beneficial financial results to the States of federalization are quite substantial, aggregating some \$1.5-billion of State savings in the first year of operation. Louisiana, for example, can expect to save more than \$65-million in fiscal year 1973 over what it would be spending under present law.

This, in my judgment, is a proper way to improve the Federal-State partnership and to provide savings to the States. We must continue to seek specific areas on a case by case basis and determine in a logical, rational, objective manner whether a particular program would lend itself to full Federal responsibility, whether a specific program should be left to the States, or whether it is one in which cooperative, tandem effort can best achieve desired, well defined goals. It was this case by case approach that led many years ago to assumption of Federal responsibility for flood control in the Mississippi Valley and provided literal salvation for the States at the lower end of the Valley, namely, Louisiana, Mississippi and Arkansas. It is the proven and tested way of providing relief to the States and at the same time maintaining sound and effective programs.

To be contrasted with this case by case, function by function approach, which I am convinced will strengthen Federal-State relationships, is the blunderbuss, cure-all-ills, general revenue sharing proposal currently being ballyhooed across the country. That is the Alice in Wonderland belief that somehow by a wave of a wand or sleight of hand, the Administration can channel nonexistent Federal largesse into the States' treasuries. I remain adamantly opposed to this measure, although beginning day after tomorrow, in the spirit of fairness and to afford the matter its full day in court, we commence extensive public hearings on the Administration's proposal in the Committee on Ways and Means.

One good reason I am opposed to general revenue sharing is the obvious one that the Federal Government would not be sharing revenues but simply borrowed money. If you don't believe it, look at the projected Federal deficit for the current fiscal year and next year. According to estimates in the latest report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, the Federal funds budget for this year will be in the red by \$26.5-billion, and the estimate for fiscal year 1972 is an even greater deficit of \$28.6-billion. That represents an aggregate of \$55.1-billion in two years, the largest back to back deficit since World War II. In March of this year, the Congress had to adjust the national debt limit upward to \$430-billion to accommodate these anticipated deficits. Very frankly, however, I doubt that limitation will carry us to the end of the next fiscal year as it is intended to do.

How anyone can suggest general revenue sharing, with a straight face, in full view of Federal deficits of that magnitude and the chronic string of deficits over the past forty years is beyond me.

Not only that—the general revenue sharing proposal of the Administration would operate capriciously in the manner in which

the so-called Federal revenues would be distributed to the States and local governments. Take, for example, the formula that would distribute funds to the local governments. It is based primarily on the respective amounts of taxes collected by each governmental unit. It is true that each State and its local governments would have the option to adopt alternative methods of sharing the funds—but it is questionable whether these alternative formulas would produce very different results from the tax collection basis. What I want to stress is that the amount of taxes collected by a particular local government is not a good measure of its need for assistance. This gives the greatest amount of aid to local governments which can raise substantial tax revenue because they have wealthy residents or a large industrial or commercial tax base.

The capricious results of revenue sharing are particularly evident in your own State of Louisiana. Baton Rouge with a population of 166,000 would get \$2.9-million under revenue sharing, while Shreveport, with a larger population of 182,000 people, would receive only \$1.7-million in revenue sharing funds. On the other hand, there would be cases of cities of approximately the same size receiving differing amounts. For example, Alexandria would receive about \$202,000 in revenue sharing funds as compared with \$260,000 for Bossier City even though each has a population of about 41,500.

And I want to remind you that figures of this nature, which are hard to justify, are not confined to cities in Louisiana. Passaic, New Jersey, for example, would get \$888,000 in revenue sharing funds, while the City of Monroe in your State would get only \$662,000 despite the fact that the two cities are about the same size. And Charleston, West Virginia, whose population of 71,500 is less than that of Lake Charles in your State, would get \$1.2-million in revenue sharing compared with the \$754,000 that Lake Charles would receive.

These are merely a few illustrative examples which show clearly how haphazard and misdirected the aid under revenue sharing would be. I am confident many other examples will be brought out in the course of the Committee's hearings on this subject.

Another grave concern I have about general revenue sharing is its dangerous potential for erasing those vestiges of States rights that still remain in our Federal system of government in this country. We in the South know too well that when the Federal Government wants to give out money there is always danger of entrapment. What I am apprehensive of is the time that would surely come in the future after Federal revenue dollars are being mainlined into State treasuries and States become dependent on—yes, addicted to—these dollars. What is there to keep a subsequent Congress from suddenly telling the States that they are rather backward—that there are some things the Federal Government would like for you to do with respect to the way you run your judiciary, conduct your legislature, with respect to the operation of your local governments, with respect to any program you want to name? You will have to do these things in order for us to justify continuing to give you Federal dollars to spend.

The very name by which the proposal is popularly or unpopularly called, "no-strings-attached general revenue sharing," is synonymous with pie in the sky and discordant and at variance with practical realities. Astute State and local representatives and officials at the mention of such a proposal, should be wary of its sugar-coated promises.

This is certainly not to say that State and local governments do not have financial problems, and my record over the past three decades in the Congress and for almost that long on the Committee on Ways and Means shows that I have been sensitive and respon-

sive to these needs. Not only must we be sensitive to them, however, we must strive to find sensible means of meeting them. The welfare bill is just one instance of such sensible means. There are other specific areas currently being considered in the 92nd Congress. As a Member of that Congress, I pledge to you my best effort in this essential endeavor. I am convinced that we can find solutions to our respective and joint financial problems without weakening or destroying the basic fabric of local, State and Federal governments—each strong in its own sphere of responsibility—which has served the Nation so well for so long.

CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS AND 29 COSPONSORS PROPOSE INDIAN EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that Indians have a unique claim to Federal support of their children's education, through treaties and congressionally authorized programs, our educational system has failed, at all levels, to respond to the specific needs of Indian people in the United States. This failure is borne out by oft repeated statistics. The school dropout rate for Indians is twice the national average. Indians, on the average, complete only 8.4 years of schooling, compared with 10.6 for the Nation as a whole. More than any other group, Indian children believe themselves to be of "below average" intelligence.

Hard on the heels of these depressing realities of Indian education follow unemployment figures at 39 percent of the Indian population and a poverty level income of \$2,000 for half of all Indian households.

Cooperating with Harvard University, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund in its report "An Even Chance" scores administrators on the misuse of Federal moneys earmarked for the special educational needs of Indian children. Moneys authorized with specific congressional intent to serve Indian children, are intermingled with general State funds purchasing services for the statewide educational system. The report verifies this fact. "Those dollars pay for teachers' aides who serve all the children, not just educationally deprived Indian children. They buy equipment for every child, not just the eligible Indian children. They provide kindergarten classes for all children, not just the eligible children. They buy mobile classrooms which become permanent facilities for all students.

Lack of Indian involvement is a major reason for the misuse of Federal money and deficiencies in Indian education. Almost all the studies of Indian education agree on this point. Federal Indian boarding schools, with little Indian input, have been referred to in less than glowing terms in describing the education and treatment of the children attending those institutions. In contrast, we find enthusiasm and a bright outlook among the students at those few schools where Indians have been involved in program development and policymaking.

Rough Rock, Rocky Boy, and the Navajo Community College are schools where Indians are involved.

Indian involvement in Indian education is at the heart of the Indian Education Act of 1971, which I am introducing today with 29 other Members of the House.

The bill provides for a presidentially appointed 15-member National Board of Indian Education. At least 10 of the board members must be Indian. The board would be housed in the Office of Education for budget purposes only. In all other respects, the board would be an independent national school board making policy for and directing Indian education.

Federal education activity relating to Indians would be centralized in and coordinated by the national board. It would have oversight jurisdiction over ESEA, Impact Aid, Public Law 815, and other education program moneys for which Indians are eligible. The board would insure that proper consideration is given Indians, both those on reservations and those in urban centers, in the expenditure of funds appropriated under these acts.

The national board would have jurisdiction over an authorization of new developmental money, \$20 million the first year and \$30 million in each of the 4 succeeding years. This money would be earmarked for innovative programs to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. Some of this innovative program money could be placed under the control of local Indian tribes and other local Indian organizations which would contract with local school boards for special Indian education programs.

The bill also provides additional money for Indian adult education. The adult program is aimed at lowering the current 39-percent unemployment rate among Indians; nonliterate individuals could learn the three R's and vocational courses would be made available. I also look for the program to raise the sights of those Indian parents who are not educationally oriented. A change in parental attitude, upon realizing the value of education, will go far in encouraging their youngsters to stay in school.

According to specific treaty provisions and as U.S. citizens, Indians have a right to quality education. This means that their special needs must be met. I am confident that the Indian Education Act of 1971 will better meet those needs, right many past wrongs and provide new hope for Indian people across the United States.

BEATRICE MINE IS DANGEROUS

(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, on Sunday, May 31, 1970, a miner who had 20 years of mining experience was killed instantly by a roof fall. This miner left a widow and four dependent children.

The Bureau of Mines' fatality report concerning this accident concludes:

CAUSE OF ACCIDENT

The direct cause of this accident was the failure of management to have the roof secured in a more permanent manner at the completion of or shortly after the completion of the miner "run". (Italic supplied.)

That fatality occurred at the Beatrice Pocahontas Co., mine of the Island Creek Coal Co., in Buchanan County, Va. Island Creek, with its many mines, ranks third in the Nation in coal production.

This is one of 16 deaths that occurred at Island Creek Mines in 1970. There have been six deaths at that company's mines from January 1 to May 29, 1971, including one at the Beatrice mine.

I am not surprised that the Bureau of Mines found this death to be caused by "the failure of management." The safety record of the Beatrice mine is very poor. From November 1970 through May 4, 1971, there have been no less than 21 imminent danger closure orders issued causing all or part of the Beatrice mine to be idled while the danger is abated.

The text of those orders follow my comments.

The Bureau, in testimony on May 10, 1971, before the House Education and Labor Committee on the Hyden disaster, said that national average for imminent dangers for 1 year is less than one per mine. Beatrice far exceeds the national average.

These hazardous conditions at this mine caused the United Mine Workers of America to request, on January 26, 1971, that the Bureau of Mines station an inspector at this large mine on each production shift.

The UMWA letter and related correspondence are at the end of my comments.

During consideration of the 1969 law, the UMWA urged that Congress require, under certain conditions, that an inspector be stationed at each mine. Congress rejected that concept and required spot inspections weekly instead—and I agree with the conclusion that spot inspections are a better means of insuring compliance with safety provisions than the concept of a full-time inspector at a dangerous mine.

The Bureau also rejected a similar UMWA request of January 26. Instead, the Bureau required daily spot inspections. These are continuing even today. Even with these daily inspections, 10 imminent danger closure orders were issued through May 4.

Since May 4, 1971, Bureau inspectors have issued five more imminent danger closure orders on May 1, 13, 18, 25, and 27, 1971.

The text of these orders follow my comments.

The Beatrice mine is unsafe. Management is to blame, despite the protestations of an executive, John York, of Island Creek Coal Co. made last week from the company's Cleveland offices. Mr. York, who is stated to be a vice president of employee relations of Island Creek, a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum Corp., was quoted as saying he "did not know anything about these 21 closure orders."

On May 21, 1971, I asked the Secretary of the Interior to institute proceedings to close the mine until it can be safely op-

erated. Two weeks and two more imminent danger closure orders have passed since then. The passive Department has yet to reply, much less ask to save miners.

Pertinent material follows:

PART I. IMMINENT DANGER CLOSURE ORDERS AND SOME OTHER VIOLATIONS, NOVEMBER 17, 1970 THROUGH MAY 4, 1971

Coal mine inspection report, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Co., Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Va., November 17-19, 30, December 1-3, 7-10 and 14, 1970, by Ronald L. Keaton, Federal coal mine inspector

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on an inspection made pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 742).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Beatrice Mine, located off U.S. Route 460 at Keen Mountain, Virginia, is opened by three development shafts and one additional for ventilation purposes. The mine is being developed in the low-volatile bituminous Pocahontas No. 3 coalbed.

A total of 470 men (51 on the surface and 419 underground) was employed on three coal-producing shifts daily, 5 and 6 days a week. The average daily production of 5,600 tons of coal was loaded mechanically. The life of the mine was estimated to be 35 years.

FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1969

Notices and Orders

1. Violation—Section 303(f).

Weekly examinations for hazardous conditions were not properly made nor recorded. No. 7 development panel, 1 north (No. 2 unit). A Notice of Violation No. 1 was issued November 17, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on November 18, 1970. This violation was abated during the inspection November 18, 1970.

2. Violation—Section 305(k)

The belt control cable was not supported on insulators beginning at the mouth of No. 8 development panel off 1 north (No. 3 unit) and extending for a distance of 150 feet in No. 3 entry. A Notice of Violation No. 2 was issued November 30, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 1, 1970. This violation was abated during the inspection December 1, 1970.

3. Violation—Section 305(m)

The power cable to the rock-dust machine was not protected with a fuse. A Notice of Violation No. 1 was issued December 1, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 2, 1970. The violation was abated during the inspection December 2, 1970.

4. Violation—Section 310(d) (1)

Supplies were unloaded and stored under the trolley wire, which was not guarded, for a distance of 40 feet near the end of the track in No. 6 development panel off 1st north. A Notice of Violation No. 1 was issued December 2, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 7, 1970. The violation was abated during the inspection December 10, 1970.

5. Violation—Section 314(b)

Two mine cars and the rail trucks were pushed along the track from the mouth of 6th west off 1 north to No. 5 unit, a distance of 5,000 feet. A Notice of Violation No. 1 was issued December 8, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 9, 1970. The violation was abated during the inspection December 9, 1970.

6. Violation—Section 317(f) (1)

Deep, standing water was present in the emergency escapeway 1,100 feet outby the stall machine in No. 6 development panel off

1 north (No. 2 plow). A Notice of Violation No. 2 was issued December 2, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 7, 1970. The violation was abated during the inspection December 10, 1970.

7. Violation—Section 317(f) (4)

The intake escapeway in No. 8 development panel off 1 north (No. 3 unit), developed after the operative date of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, was not separated from the belt and trolley haulage entries. A Notice of Violation No. 1 was issued November 30, 1970, on Form 104(b) requiring that this violation be abated by 8:00 a.m. on December 4, 1970. The time was extended to January 29, 1971.

1. Imminent Danger—Station 104(a)

Inadequately supported, loose roof was present over the rock-dust supply track beginning at the telephone and extending out-by for a distance of 40 feet.

Order No. 1 was issued at 8:30 a.m. on December 1, 1970, on Form 104(a) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated December 1, 1970.

2. Violation—Section 304(a).—
Imminent Danger

Accumulations of loose coal and coal dust were present through the last line of crosscuts between Nos. 1-4 entries, No. 8 development panel off 1 north, No. 3 unit.

Order No. 1 was issued at 9:30 a.m. on November 30, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1), requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 30, 1970.

3. Violation—Section 304(a).—
Imminent Danger

Loose coal and coal dust accumulations were present in the shuttle car roadways beginning at the belt feeder and extending inby for 120 feet and through the last line of crosscuts between Nos. 1-4 entries, 8 west off 2 north (No. 5 unit).

Order No. 1 was issued on November 18, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 18, 1970.

4. Violation—Section 304(a).—
Imminent Danger

Loose coal and coal dust was present in the last crosscuts between Nos. 1, 2, and 3 entries in No. 8 unit of No. 12 development panel off 1 south.

Order No. 1 was issued at 9:30 a.m., on December 3, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated December 3, 1970.

5. Violation—Section 304(a).—
Imminent Danger

Loose coal and coal dust accumulations were present in No. 2 entry beginning at the conveyor belt tailpiece and extending inby for a distance of 300 feet; also, in the last two crosscuts between Nos. 1 and 2 entries. (1 south parallel entries, No. 1 unit)

Order No. 1 was issued on December 8, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated on December 8, 1970.

6. Violation—Section 304(d)

The rock-dust applications were inadequate in Nos. 1-4 entries and the connecting crosscuts, No. 7 development panel, 1 north (No. 2 unit) beginning at the belt feeder and extending inby for a distance of 300 feet.

Order No. 1 was issued on November 17, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 17, 1970.

7. Violation—Section 304(d).—Imminent
Danger

The rock-dust applications were inadequate beginning at the belt feeder and extending inby for 120 feet and through the last line of crosscuts between Nos. 1-4 entries, 8 west off 2 north (No. 5 units).

Order No. 2 was issued on November 18, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 18, 1970.

8. Violation—Section 304(d).—Imminent
Danger

The rock-dust applications were inadequate through the last line of crosscuts between Nos. 1-4 entries, No. 8 development panel off 1 north, No. 3 unit.

Order No. 2 was issued at 9:30 a.m. on November 30, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 30, 1970.

9. Violation—Section 304(d).—Imminent
Danger

The rock-dust applications were inadequate in the last crosscuts between Nos. 1, 2, and 3 entries in No. 8 unit off No. 12 development panel off 1 south.

Order No. 2 was issued at 9:30 a.m. on December 3, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated December 3, 1970.

10. Violation—Section 304(d).—Imminent
Danger

The rock-dust applications were inadequate in No. 2 entry beginning at the conveyor belt tailpiece and extending inby for a distance of 300 feet; also, in the last two crosscuts between Nos. 1 and 2 entries, 1st south parallel entries, No. 1 unit.

Order No. 2 was issued at 4:00 p.m. on December 8, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated December 8, 1970.

11. Violation—Section 305(c).—Imminent
Danger

The packing glands were loose on the continuous miner methane monitor and the cover contained an opening in excess of 0.004 inch. No. 7 development panel, 1 north (No. 2 unit).

Order No. 2 was issued on November 17, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d) be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated on November 17, 1970.

12. Violation—Section 305(c).—Imminent
Danger

The receiving-end headlight on the right-drive shuttle car contained an opening in excess of 0.008 inch, 8 west off 2 north (No. 5 unit).

Order No. 3 was issued on November 18, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated November 18, 1970.

13. Violation—Section 305(c).—Imminent
Danger

The control panel cover on the shuttle car contained several openings in excess of 0.004

inch and the pump motor power cable conduit was broken. No. 6 development panel off 1 north, No. 2 plow section.

Order No. 1 was issued at 8:30 p.m. on December 2, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated on December 2, 1970.

14. Violation—Section 305(c).—Imminent
Danger

The discharge-end headlight on the right-drive shuttle car in No. 8 unit off No. 12 development panel off 1 south, contained an opening in excess of 0.008 inch and two of the control circuit fuses were bridged with wire; also, the continuous miner control switch cover contained an opening in excess of 0.008 inch.

Order No. 3 was issued at 9:30 a.m. on December 3, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated on December 3, 1970.

15. Violation—Section 305(c).—Imminent
Danger

The standard shuttle car loading-end headlight contained an opening in excess of 0.008 inch. No. 9 development panel off 1 north, No. 4 unit.

Order No. 1 was issued at 5:30 a.m. December 7, 1970, on Form 104(c) (1) requiring that all persons, except persons referred to in Section 104(d), be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the affected area. The Order was terminated December 7, 1970.

RONALD L. KEATON,
Federal Coal Mine Inspector.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. # 44-00238-0, A, Spot Inspection.

No. 1 T.A.C.

Norton, Virginia 24273.

Telephone No. 679-0230, January 4, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on January 4, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: Methane in the amount of 3.5 percent was detected by means of a mechanical detector in the air current being used to sweep the pillared area between Nos. 1-5 development panels in the No. 1 north main entry (return air course) at the mouth of No. 4 entry, No. 1 development panel.

In accordance with Sec. 104(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173), you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Entire mine.

Served to George Dunham, Superintendent, at the mine office on January 4, 1971, at approximately 1:30 p.m.

TITUS A. COX.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

Spot Inspection, I.D. 44-00238, No. 1 H.D.L. Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone 679-0230, January 12, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on January 12, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: The rock dust applications were inadequate in Nos. 3 and 4 entries, beginning at survey station 8385 and extending inby for a distance of 100 feet, also, the connecting crosscuts between these entries No. 7 development off first north (No. 2 unit).

Served to Cecil Null, Mine Foreman, on No. 2 unit at 4:30 p.m. on January 12, 1971.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 2 unit.

HOWARD D. LOONEY.

Note: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

NORTON, VA.,
January 12, 1971.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY DISTRICT C
Memorandum

To: J. S. Malesky, District Manager
From: Howard D. Looney, Federal Coal Mine Inspector

Subject: Spot Inspection, Beatrice Mine (No. 2 unit), Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia on January 12, 1971

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on an inspection made pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 742).

FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY
ACT OF 1969

Order

1. Order No. 1 was issued on January 12, 1971, at 4:30 p.m. on Form 104(a). The Order was terminated on January 12, 1971, at 6:15 p.m.

HOWARD D. LOONEY,
Federal Coal Mine Inspector.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. No. 44-00238-0, Spot Inspection, No. 1 R.L.K.

Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, January 13, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on January 13, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: Methane in the

amount of 6.00 per centum was detected by a permissible methane detector in the air current used to ventilate the pillared area in 1 north mains. The points of detection were at the main door in No. 2 entry, 150 feet outby the pillar line in No. 2 development panel and in the last open crosscut between Nos. 2 and 3 entries.

In accordance with Sec. 104(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Entire mine. Served to Carnie Browning, Safety Engineer, at the mine office on January 13, 1971, at approximately 1:15 p.m.

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. #44-00238-0, A Spot Inspection, No. 1 R. L. K.

Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, January 15, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on January 15, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: Methane in amounts ranging from 7.0 to 9.0 per centum was detected with a permissible methane detector in the travelable area between the barrier pillar and gob area between Nos. 2 and 3 development bleeder connectors off 1 north mains.

Served to George Dunham, Superintendent, at the mine office on January 15, 1971, at approximately 3:15 p.m.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Entire mine.

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

1. D. #44-00238-0, A Spot Inspection, No. 1 R.L.K.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, February 4, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on February 4, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reason-

ably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: Methane in amounts of 2.0 to 6.0 per centum was detected by a permissible methane detector in Nos. 1 and 2 entries, No. 2 development panel off 4 west (No. 1 plow section tall entries). The affected area was from the plow tailpiece to and including the left portion of No. 1 bleeder entry.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(a) of the Federal Coal Mine and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 2 development panel off 4 west (No. 1 plow section).

Served to Bobby Yates, Section Foreman, on No. 1 plow section on February 4, 1971, at approximately 9:00 a.m.

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. 44-00238-0A, 9:00 a.m., No. 1 G.B.F. Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, February 12, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior upon making an inspection of this mine on February 12, 1971, finds, in accordance with Sec. 104.(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-179) a violation of the mandatory health or safety standards set forth in Sec. 75.400 of the Act or Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Condition or practice: Loose coal, oil and grease were permitted to accumulate on the continuous mining machine on No. 8 unit, No. 12 development 1 south.

Issued to Carnie Browning on the surface at approximately 1:30 p.m. on February 12, 1971.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, the undersigned finds that the above-described violation is similar to the violation set forth in Order of Withdrawal No. 1 issued December 8, 1970; that in accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (1) of the Act the foregoing violation is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause and effect of a mine health or safety hazard, and finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply with such mandatory standard; that no inspection of this mine has been made, which has disclosed no similar violation, since the Order of Withdrawal No. 1 dated December 8, 1970.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from, and to be prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above described violation has been abated.

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 8 unit, No. 12 development 1 south.

GENE B. FULLER.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. # 44-00238-0, A, 11:20 a.m. No. 1 Q.B.F.

Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, February 23, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior upon making an inspection of this mine on February 23, 1971, finds, in accordance with Sec. 104(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173) a violation of the mandatory health or safety standards set forth in Sec. 75.301 of the Act or Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Condition or practice: Only 2,500 cubic feet of air a minute was reaching the working face of the right crosscut off No. 1 entry on No. 7 Unit.

Served to Carnie Browning on No. 7 Unit at approximately 12:30 p.m. on February 23, 1971.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, the undersigned finds that the above-described violation is similar to the violation set forth in Order of Withdrawal No. 1 issued December 8, 1970, that in accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (1) of the Act the foregoing violation is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause and effect of a mine health or safety hazard, and finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply with such mandatory standard; that no inspection of this mine has been made, which has disclosed no similar violation, since the Order of Withdrawal No. 1 dated December 8, 1970.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from, and to be prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above described violation has been stated:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 7 Unit (cross entries between 2 North and 3 North).

GENE B. FULLER.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, March 2, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior upon making an inspection of this mine on March 2, 1971 finds, in accordance with Sec. 104(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173) a violation of the mandatory health or safety standards set forth in Sec. 75.905 of the Act or Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Condition or practice: The continuous mining machine on No. 8 Development off 1 North (No. 3 Unit) was not maintained in permissible condition due to the threads stripped from the packing gland nut on the defuser motor, nor was packing provided in this gland.

Served to Ted R. Self on No. 3 Unit at approximately 12:15 p.m. on March 2, 1971.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, the undersigned finds that the above-described violation is similar to the violation set forth in Order of Withdrawal No. 1 issued

December 8, 1971; that in accordance with Sec. 104(c) (1) of the Act the foregoing violation is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause and effect of a mine health or safety hazard, and finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply with such mandatory standard; that no inspection of this mine has been made, which has disclosed no similar violation, since the Order of Withdrawal No. 1 dated December 8, 1970.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c) (2) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from, and to be prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above described violation has been abated:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 3 Unit No. 8 development off 1 north.

GENE B. FULLER.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. No. 44-00238-0, 4:00 p.m., No. 1 G.B.F. Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, March 17, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on March 17, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: The following conditions were present on the No. 2 plow section:

1. Coal float dust was permitted to accumulate on top of the rock-dusted surfaces of the No. 4 entry (immediate return) for a distance of 600 feet out by the plow tail-piece.
2. The conduit between the No. 2 pump motor and the control box to the stall machine was damaged.
3. The high voltage cable and the transformer used to provide power to the plow was located within 50 feet of the pillar line.
4. The first line of jacks were tilted to the extent that the roof was inadequately supported in the area of the plow head.

In accordance with Sec. 104(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173), you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 6 development off 1 North (No. 2 plow section).

Served to Jack Hackney, Assistant Night Foreman, on No. 6 development No. 2 plow section at approximately 6:30 p.m. on March 17, 1971.

GENE B. FULLER.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

No. 1 R.L.K. Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, April 13, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on April 12, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition or practice: The methane content was in excess of 2.0 per centum in No's. 1 and 2 bleeder entries, No. 1 plow section, No. 3 development off 4 West. Tests made with permissible methane detectors 25 feet in by points where the air currents joined another split of air indicated between 2.32 per centum and 2.42 per centum.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 194.2 of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists.

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Served to George Danham, Superintendent, at the mine office on April 13, 1971 at approximately 11:45 a.m.

Served orally to Carnie Browning, Safety Engineer, underground at approximately 10:45 a.m., April 13, 1971.

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of the Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. No. 44-00238, No. 1 R.L.K. Norton, Virginia, 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, April 14, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior upon making an inspection of this mine on April 14, 1971, finds, in accordance with Sec. 104(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173) a violation of the mandatory health or safety standards set forth in Sec. 75.301 of the Act or Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Condition or practice: Only 2,400 cubic feet of air a minute was reaching the face of the crosscut being driven from No. 4 entry to No. 5 entry, cross entries off 3rd. North (No. 7 unit).

Written on the surface but served orally to Carnie Browning, Safety Engineer, on No. 7 unit at approximately 10:00 a.m.

In accordance with Sec. 104(c) (2) of the Act, the undersigned finds that the above-described violation is similar to the violation set forth in Order of Withdrawal No. 2 issued December 8, 1970; that in accordance with Sec. 104(c) (1) of the Act the foregoing violation is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause and effect of a mine health or safety hazard, and finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply with such mandatory standard; that no inspection of this mine has been made, which has disclosed no similar violation, since the Order of Withdrawal No. 1 dated December 8, 1970.

In accordance with Sec. 104(c) (2) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from, and to be prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above described violation has been abated:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Cross entries off 3rd. North (No. 7 unit).

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

I.D. No. 44-00238, No. 1 R.L.K.
Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, April 26, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior upon making an inspection of this mine on April 26, 1971, finds, in accordance with Sec. 104.(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-173) a violation of the mandatory health or safety standards act forth in Sec. 75.505 of the Act or Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Condition or Practice: The insulation was worn and damaged in several places on the left-drive shuttle car cable reel in 8 West section (No. 5 unit).

Written on the surface but served orally to Carnie Browning, Safety Engineer, on 8 West section (No. 5 unit) at approximately 10:15 a.m.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c)(2) of the Act, the undersigned finds that the above-described violation is similar to the violation set forth in Order of Withdrawal No. 1, issued December 8, 1970, that in accordance with Sec. 104.(c)(1) of the Act the foregoing violation is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause and effect of a mine health or safety hazard, and finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply with such mandatory standard; that no inspection of this mine has been made, which has disclosed no similar violation, since the Order of Withdrawal No. 1 dated December 8, 1970.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(c)(2) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act to be withdrawn from, and to be prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above described violation has been abated:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: Left-drive shuttle car, 8 West section (No. 5 unit).

RONALD L. KEATON.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL

Spot Inspection, G.L.S. No. 1 B.L.K.
Norton, Virginia 24273, Telephone No. 679-0230, May 4, 1971.

To the operator of the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior, upon making an inspection of this mine on February 4, 1971, finds the existence of the following described conditions or practice which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm before such condition or practice can be abated.

Condition of practice: 1. Loose coal and coal dust accumulations were present along the belt conveyor in No. 4 development panel off 4 West (No. 6 unit), beginning at the

tailpiece and extending outby for a distance of 1,600 feet.

2. The rock dust applications were clearly inadequate in the above described location and in No's. 3 and 4 entries and the connecting crosscut beginning at survey station 8299 and extending outby for a distance of 100 feet.

3. The mine examiner did not place the time of examination with his date and initials at the places he examined along the belt conveyor.

In accordance with Sec. 104.(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, (P.L. 91-173) you are hereby ordered to cause all persons, except persons referred to in Sec. 104.(d) of the Act, to be withdrawn from and prohibited from entering the following area until an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior has determined that the above-described imminent danger no longer exists:

Area from which persons must be withdrawn and prohibited from entering: No. 4 development panel off 4 West (No. 6 unit).

Written on the surface but served orally to Carnie Browning, Safety Engineer, on No. 6 unit on May 4, 1971, at approximately 11:00 a.m.

RONALD L. KEATON,
GRATHO L. STILTNER.

NOTE: Review of this Order pursuant to Sec. 105.(a) of the Act may be made upon application to the Board of Mine Operations Appeals.

PART II. IMMINENT DANGER CLOSURES SINCE MAY 4, 1971

MR. DONALD P. SCHLICK,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety:

Elton D. Rea, Federal coal mine inspector, issued 104(A) closure order 12:30 p.m., 5/13/71, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

1. Due to excessive float coal dust, the rock dust applications were inadequate along the conveyor belt from No. 9 development panel to No. 10 development panel and extending inby the No. 10 development panel belt drive for a distance of 200 feet. (These development panels are off 1 North Mains)

Affected Area—Nos. 9 and 10 development panels off 1 North. Agreement operation, 419 underground employees, 5,600 tons per day. Luther Preston, superintendent, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Closure order: issued 12:30 p.m., 5/13/71 by Elton D. Rea terminated 3:30 p.m., 5/13/71.

In the last paragraph the form No. 15 104(A).

G. L. MEARS,
Subdistrict Manager.

MR. DONALD P. SCHLICK,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety:

Elton D. Rea, Federal coal mine inspector, issued 104(A) closure order 10:30 A.M., 5/11/71, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

Inadequately supported loose roof was present over the shuttle car haulage road in the crosscut between Nos. 1-8 entries at survey station No. 9071 on No. 8 development panel off 1 North Mains, also, the continuous miner on the same section had a loose packing gland. The diffuser hot and the diffuser tubing was split.

Area affected—No. 8 development panel off 1 North Mains, agreement operation, 419 underground employees, 5,600 tons per day. Luther Preston, Superintendent, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Closure order (form 104(A)) issued 10:30 A.M., 5/11/71, by Elton D. Rea terminated 12:30 P.M., 5/11/71.

G. L. MEARS,
Subdistrict Manager.

MR. DONALD P. SCHLICK,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety:

Gene B. Fuller, Federal coal mine inspector, issued 104(A) closure order, 10:00 A.M., 5/18/71 during spot inspection, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

1. Coal float dust was permitted to accumulate on top of the rock dusted surfaces of the No. 4 entry, No. 10 development off 1 North beginning at the No. 4 unit conveyor belt drive and extending inby for a distance of 700 feet.

Affected area—No. 4 unit, No. 10 development off 1 North. Agreement operation 19 underground employees, 4,500 tons per day. Luther Preston, Superintendent, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Closure order (form 104(A)) issued 10:00 A.M., 5/18/71 by Gene B. Fuller terminated 11:00 A.M., 5/18/71.

G. L. MEARS,
Subdistrict Manager.

MR. DONALD P. SCHLICK,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety:

Elton D. Rea, Federal coal mine inspector, issued 104(A) closure order 9:30 A.M., 5/25/71, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

1. Inadequately supported loose roof present in No. 8 in entry, Nos. 6. Development panel off 4 north mains (No. 8 plow unit) for distance of 200 feet in by survey station 6915.

Affected area—No. 8 entry. No. 6 development panel off 1 north.

Main (No. 8 plow unit), for a distance of 300 feet in by survey station No. 6915.

Affected area—No. 8 entry No. 6 development panel off 1 north main (No. 8 plow unit). Agreement operation, 419 underground.

Employees. 4,600 tons per day. Luther Preston, superintendent, Keen Mountain, Virginia 84624.

G. L. MEARS,
District Manager.

MR. DONALD P. SCHLICK,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety:

Elton D. Rea, Federal coal mine inspector, issued 104(a) closure order 10:45 a.m., 5/27/71, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

Due to float coal dust applications were inadequate for a distance of 15800 feet away Survey Station No. 8307 in the tall entry of No. 1 plow section, No. 2 development panel off 4 West mains.

Affected area—No. 2 development off 4 West mains (No. 1 plow section). Agreement operation, 419 underground employees, 4,600 tons per day. Luther Preston, superintendent, Keen Mountain, Virginia 24624.

Closure order (form 104(a)) issued 10:45 a.m., 5/27/71, by Elton D. Rea terminated 11:45 a.m., 5/27/72.

G. L. MEARS,
Subdistrict Manager.

PART III—UMWA CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1971.

MR. JAMES WESTFIELD,
Associate Director—Coal Mine Safety, Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WESTFIELD: We are concerned with the methane condition at the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Coal Company, Keen Mountain, Virginia. You, of course, know that this is one of the deepest and gassiest coal mines on the North American Continent.

During recent months, I have made two trips to this mine on this question, and, on

the last occasion, I went underground and was on one of the plow sections. Within the past several weeks, Charley Tarasuk, Assistant to the Safety Director, has also been at this mine.

Several withdrawal orders have been issued at this mine within the past few weeks due to a buildup of methane. We are fortunate that we have at this mine an active and competent safety committee.

I am requesting in the interest of the safety of the men at this mine that you station a federal mine inspector at this mine each and every day that it is in operation. Will you please advise me.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. EVANS,
Director, Safety Division.

FEBRUARY 4, 1971.

Mr. LEWIS E. EVANS,
Director, Safety Division,
United Mine Workers of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVANS: This will respond to your letter of January 26 in which you requested that a Federal inspector be assigned to the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, each day the mine operates.

Our inspectors have been maintaining a close watch over the conditions about which you are concerned through the spot inspections conducted every five days. In fact, recently the frequency of inspections at this mine is greater than once every five days; however, for the next five-week period we have assigned an inspector to visit the mine daily during the periods coal is being produced. At the end of the designated period we will determine whether the need yet exists.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. CRAWFORD,
Acting Assistant Director,
Coal Mine Health and Safety.

MEMORANDUM

FEBRUARY 2, 1971.

To: J. S. Malesky, District Manager, Norton, Va.

From: Assistant Director—Coal Mine Health and Safety.

Subject: Spot inspection schedule, Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, Keen Mountain, Buchanan County, Virginia.

Confirming our telephone conversation of January 29 please assign an inspector to the subject mine on a daily basis, when coal is produced, until further notice. His schedule should have adequate flexibility to enable him to ascertain the conditions on each of the coal-producing shifts.

JOHN W. CRAWFORD,
Acting Assistant Director, Coal Mine
Health and Safety.

MARCH 8, 1971.

Mr. LEWIS E. EVANS,
Director, Safety Division,
United Mine Workers of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVANS: In further response to your request of January 26 concerning the Beatrice Mine, Beatrice Pocahontas Company, we have evaluated the results of the assignment of an inspector at the mine daily during the past five weeks.

Based upon this evaluation, we have continued the assignment for another period of time in the future.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES WESTFIELD,
Assistant Director, Coal Mine Health and
Safety.

PART IV—MY LETTER TO SECRETARY MARTIN
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1971.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MORTON: The memories of Farmington, West Virginia, where 78 miners were killed in 1968, and Hyden, Kentucky, where 38 miners were killed in 1970, move me to ask you to take immediate steps to institute proceedings under section 104(h) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 leading to the closure of the Beatrice Mine in Buchanan County, Virginia. The mine is owned by the Beatrice Pocahontas Company, a division of the Island Creek Coal Company. It employs 470 men on three shifts.

Twenty-one imminent danger closure orders have been issued by Bureau of Mine inspectors at this mine on the following dates:

1. November 17, 1970 (2).
2. November 18, 1970 (3).
3. November 30, 1970 (2).
4. December 1, 1970.
5. December 2, 1970.
6. December 3, 1970 (3).
7. December 7, 1970.
8. December 8, 1970 (2).
9. January 4, 1971.
10. January 12, 1971.
11. January 13, 1971.
12. January 15, 1971.
13. February 4, 1971.
14. February 12, 1971.
15. February 23, 1971 (2).
16. March 2, 1971.
17. March 17, 1971.
18. April 13, 1971.
19. April 14, 1971.
20. April 26, 1971.
21. May 4, 1971.

Most of the violations resulting in imminent danger orders were caused either by inadequate rock dusting or excessive accumulations of methane. Methane in excess of 5 percentum was found on January 13, (6 percent); 15 (7.0 to 9.0); and February 4, (2.0 to 6.0). The explosive range is between 5 and 15 percentum.

Data collected in November and December, 1970, show that the mine spews out more than 3 million cubic feet of methane in any 24 hour period. The mining system is the long-wall mining of 1300 feet across the face.

The hazardous conditions at this mine have become so serious that Mr. Lewis E. Evans of the United Mine Workers on January 26, 1971, was compelled to ask the Bureau to "station a Federal mine inspector at this mine" on a daily basis. Mr. Evans said this mine "is one of the deepest and gasliest coal mines on the North American Continent."

On February 4, 1971, the Bureau's Acting Assistant Director—Coal Mine Health and Safety—said that "for the next five week period we have assigned an inspector to visit the mine daily" when coal is produced. On March 8, 1971, Mr. Evans was advised that, based upon the Bureau's evaluation of the results of the daily inspections, "we have continued the assignment for another period of time in the future."

This is an intolerable situation. Quite obviously, these 470 miners are working in extremely hazardous conditions. One mistake could be fatal to many.

The mere fact that a Federal inspector visits this mine daily is not enough. Such visits have not improved the safety record at the mine. You will note that, during this period of daily inspections, imminent danger orders have been issued on 10 different occasions.

Moreover, the Bureau has an insufficient number of inspectors to carry out the duties imposed upon it by the law. Daily visits by an inspector at this mine must result in a diminution of inspections or scope of inspections at other mines in the area. This is a disservice to other miners.

I understand that the Bureau has assessed civil penalties against the company totaling \$6,025 for 53 violations from August to November, 1970. This is less than one-eighth the total assessed against the Finley Coal Company for its violations.

The company has protested these assessments. Apparently, no assessments have yet been made for these 21 closures, 6 of which were unwarrantable failure closures.

This is an unsafe mine.

The Interior Department has more than adequate authority to take immediate steps to close the mine until it can be made safe. This authority should be used without delay.

The Finley Coal Company mine at Hyden is closed today. We should not wait for a disaster at the Beatrice mine to occur before we close it.

The loss of an average daily production of 5,600 tons of coal at this mine is a small price to pay to protect the lives of 470 men.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

PART V—MR. YORK CLAIMS HE DOES NOT
KNOW ABOUT CLOSURES

[From the Washington Star, May 31, 1971]

"MAJOR" MINE EXPLOSION AT OAKWOOD
PREDICTED

TAZEWELL, VA.—Because of what he calls "explosive quantities" of methane gas in the 1,350-foot Beatrice coal mine at Oakwood, Va., a frequent critic of the coal industry and the United Mine Workers has predicted the mine "will blow up, making the Farmington disaster look like a tea party."

Dr. I. E. Buff, yesterday told a memorial service for miners killed in mine accidents that there would be a "major explosion" within a year at the Beatrice mine, which he said was closed three times in January because of methane buildup.

The cave-in at the Farmington, W. Va., mine Nov. 20, 1968, killed 89 miners.

Buff said statements by Rep. Ken. Hechler, D-W. Va., that conditions at the Beatrice mine were "extremely hazardous" were true.

Hechler last week asked the U.S. Bureau of Mines to "take immediate action to close the Beatrice mine until it can be made clearly safe for the 470 miners now employed at the mine."

Hechler cited 21 imminent danger closure orders in the last six months at the shaft.

Meanwhile, an official of the Island Creek Coal Co., operator of the mine, said that Hechler's statements were just to attract publicity.

"Mr. Hechler is constantly looking for sensationalism, whether it is in the press, TV or otherwise," said John York, vice president of employee relations for Island Creek, a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum Corp.

York said Hechler is not a mine inspector and is not qualified to know what "hazards" are. He added that the Bureau of Mines has inspectors at the Beatrice mine "every day of the week."

York said he didn't know anything about the closure orders to which Hechler referred.

DENTAL AND MEDICAL SCHOOLS
NEED FUNDS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House soon will be considering important legislation dealing with health manpower—the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, H.R. 8629, which was reported out of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on Wednesday, June 2. This legislation is a critical component of the Nation's efforts to create a better and a more meaningful life for all Americans—a life less burdened by disease and suffering.

The reason the forthcoming legislation is so crucial is that health manpower necessary to achieving the goal of better and more meaningful lives is in short supply.

We know, for example, that the United States now faces a shortage of some 50,000 physicians, a shortage of 57,000 dentists, a shortage of nearly 150,000 nurses, and a shortage of more than 250,000 allied health personnel.

Yet the academic medical and dental centers that educate and train health professionals are facing financial crises which prevent them from fulfilling their essential role in providing this manpower.

I firmly believe that national policy in support of medical and dental education should be based on two concepts—that medical and dental education are functions of national importance, and that the medical and dental institutions involved are a national resource.

Only through viewing medical and dental schools as a national resource and providing Federal support for their basic operations at substantial levels and in a continuing form can this structure of vital institutions and their indispensable functions be sustained.

An example of the dire financial situation facing our Nation's medical and dental schools is provided by the prestigious Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons and School of Dental and Oral Surgery, both located in the district which I represent. At Columbia University, financial distress has led to the loss of key faculty members and to program changes in a number of important areas. For example, two physicians were lost from a plan for improving health care delivery and teaching. Vacancies have gone unfilled in the fields of pharmacology, gastroenterology, neurobiology, and pediatrics.

Furthermore, Columbia's financial situation has become so severe that it has been unable to appoint full-time chiefs in a number of departments.

In addition, lack of funds has prevented the renovation and modernization of classrooms for teaching medical students. This has resulted in double sessions with the dental school and has forced cancellation of medical school plans to increase the student body. The school cannot consider expanding class size because of the classroom inadequacy.

Provisions in the forthcoming health manpower legislation for construction

assistance and for operating support can provide useful approaches for meeting the financial needs of Columbia and of all the Nation's medical and dental schools.

The legislation should be the opportunity for a giant step forward toward recognizing our medical and dental schools as a national resource. It can be the beginning of a laudable national effort to provide the schools with a fundamental base of support at a substantial level and in a continuing form.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ASPINALL, from June 7, 1971, noon, until 3:30 p.m., June 8, 1971, on account of official business.

To Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, for Friday, June 4, on account of official business.

To Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, 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. RUTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 60 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. SKUBITZ for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. LENNON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS during his colloquy with Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

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

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. GUDE in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. DENNIS.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

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

Mr. RYAN in six instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in three instances.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in three instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. FISHER in six instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 7, 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.

801. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

802. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the economic advantages of using American ingredients to satisfy milk requirements in Western Europe, Departments of Defense and Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

803. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that problems of the Deep Submergence Rescue Vehicle program show a need for improvement in management control, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

804. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report

on premature production of the antisubmarine warfare directional low-frequency analysis and recording system, Department of the Navy; 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. BETTS:

H.R. 8927. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be issued for a term of 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8928. A bill to repeal section 5532 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reductions in the retired or retirement pay of retired officers of regular components of the uniformed services who are employed in civilian offices or positions in the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8929. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8930. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself, Mr. ESCH, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 8931. A bill to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 8932. A bill to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8933. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. HILLIS, and Mr. POWELL):

H.R. 8934. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to improve the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8935. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for construction grants un-

der section 8 of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 8936. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to make payments under that act reflect the efforts of the States for school purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 8937. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to provide for administration of programs of Indian education by a National Board of Indian Education in the U.S. Office of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. FETTIS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TIERNAN and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 8938. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to provide for administration of programs of Indian education by a National Board of Indian Education in the U.S. Office of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 8939. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of detention camps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 8940. 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. 8941. 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. 8942. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to extend black lung benefits of orphans whose fathers die of pneumoconiosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8943. A bill to extend for an additional year the existing program for payment of black lung benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 8944. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. REES, Mr. RED of New York, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 8945. A bill making an appropriation to continue or resume funding of certain nutrition projects under title IV of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey):

H.R. 8946. A bill to amend the provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 which relate to black lung benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PREYER of North Carolina:

H.R. 8947. A bill to suspend until the

close of March 31, 1972, the duty on corn and maize; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 8948. A bill to make illegal the manufacture, sale, purchase, use and possession of thallium compounds as pesticides or as an instrument of animal control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8949. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit foreign assistance from being provided to foreign countries which do not act to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 8950. A bill to provide for comprehensive management of the Nation's forest lands through the application of sound forest practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. WYATT,

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 8951. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for maximum entrance and retention ages, training, and early retirement for air traffic controllers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.J. Res. 684. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. MORSE):

H. Con. Res. 329. Concurrent resolution requesting that the United Nations appoint a commission to report on elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 330. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution relative to the United States entering into a mutual defense pact with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

204. By Mr. ZION: The Indiana General Assembly, requesting the President to provide a space capsule at Spring Mill State Park; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

205. By the SPEAKER: Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to providing technical assistance and grants in-aid for mosquito control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, Mr. BOLAND introduced a bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald F. Lariviere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.