

ness, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, and that the period for the transaction of routine morning business not exceed 45 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under the orders previously entered, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will soon recess until 11:15 a.m. tomorrow.

Upon the approval of the Journal, if there is no objection, and laying before the Senate of the pending business and following the recognition of the majority leader and the minority leader, under the order entered on January 29, the able Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized for not to exceed 45 minutes, for the purpose of making a statement and conducting a colloquy.

Following the statement by Mr. PROXMIRE, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with

statements therein limited to 3 minutes, and the period will be limited to not to exceed 45 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it is my understanding that Senator PROXMIRE intends to engage in a colloquy with other Senators. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) to postpone until the next legislative day the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9, a resolution to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to the limitation of debate.

RECESS TO 11:15 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11:15 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1971, at 11:15 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2 (legislative day of January 26), 1971:

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

Thomas F. Schweigert, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, vice Alfred E. France, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John K. Grisso, of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of 4 years vice Joseph O. Rogers, Jr., resigning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 2, 1971

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

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts.—Colossians 3: 15.

God of the morning and the evening, make us conscious of Thy presence as we live through the hours of this day. Strengthened with might by Thy spirit in the inner man may we be sustained by "a faith that shines more brightly and clear, when tempests rage without: That when in danger knows no fear, in darkness feels no doubt."

Into Thy keeping we commit ourselves, our loved ones, and our country, praying that through these troubled times we may live courageously and confidently, always working for the day when peace will come, justice will be done, and men will learn to live together freely and faithfully.

"God of justice, save the people
From the clash of race and creed,
From the strife of class and faction:
Make our Nation free indeed.
Keep her faith in simple manhood
Strong as when her life began,
Till it find its full fruition
In the brotherhood of man."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

municated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

FEBRUARY 2, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Sincerely yours,

HALE BOGGS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, in glaring disregard of the administration's own commitment to an expansionary policy, it is shocking to learn that the administration is recommending a paltry 6-percent increase in social security benefits retroactive to January 1, 1971. The proposal would limit the retirement income test to \$2,000 and would limit the increase in minimum benefits to the 6-percent across-the-board increase.

The administration contends that the cost of living has increased only 5.5 percent since the last benefit increase took effect. The Government's estimate of the cost-of-living increase in 1970 is almost 100 percent out of line for the elderly poor. The Consumer Price Index is calculated on the living expenses of a young family unit of four in good health. In the case of social security beneficiaries who live in family units of one or two

in poor health, the cost of housing, health services, drugs, food, and transportation have risen over 15 percent in the last year. On the basis of these real increases in living costs, a 6-percent increase in social security benefits is unrealistic and a cruel blow to the elderly.

APOLLO 14 DOING WELL

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able to inform the House that everything is going well with Apollo 14. I had a telephone call from Mr. George Low, Administrator of NASA this morning from Houston, and he tells me that everything is underway, and he is quite satisfied with it.

I know the Members are all glad to hear this.

FASCELL URGES EARLY ACTION ON SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there are today more than 26 million Americans awaiting action by the Congress on social security legislation. The dramatic increase in the cost of living has exceeded their ability to make ends meet, and they are once again caught in the lair of fixed income at a time of rapidly inflating prices.

There can be no piece of legislation for this 92d Congress more important than the early passage of a social security bill with a substantial increase in benefits retroactive to January 1 of this year.

Combating inflation and stabilizing the

economy are the important long-range objectives of our legislative activity, but we must act to protect the citizens who depend on the Congress to keep their income realistically in line with the cost of living.

I know we did our best to provide this relief in the last session. It was unfortunate that the social security bill became enmeshed in the legislative logjam at the end of the 91st Congress.

But that should give us more reason to proceed expeditiously with the consideration of a social security bill in the early days of this session. Every day we delay, the inflated cost of living takes our senior citizens farther away from the security for which they worked all their lives and which their Government promised them.

We can close that gap by quick action on this legislation.

"SPECTRUM" OFFERS EFFECTIVE DRUG REHABILITATION

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of our colleagues to a drug rehabilitation program operating successfully in south Florida. In this era of drug abuse and misinformation, the evidence of a sensible, working rehabilitative attack on addiction is refreshing and offers hope for the future.

The name of the program is Spectrum, an accredited agency of the National Institute of Mental Health operating under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. It is recognized and approved by both the office of the Surgeon General and the State of Florida for the treatment of selected drug addicts.

South Florida, like so many areas across the United States, has experienced a serious drug problem in recent years. Dade County alone has had a 297-percent increase in death by overdose of narcotics in the last 2½ years. About half of the victims were between the ages of 15 and 24.

The Spectrum program offers what its name implies: a comprehensive range of services geared to the needs of the individual and based on the philosophy that the drug addict's main problem lies in the conditions which led him to drug dependency.

While it is an open-ended concept and constantly in search of new approaches in therapy, Spectrum offers three basic programs:

First, under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, Spectrum operates as an official agency of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. As such, it offers addicts services for commitment, hospitalization, detoxification, psychiatric therapy, counseling, and support.

Second, for those who cannot enter in-resident treatment, for whatever reasons, Spectrum offers counseling, employment assistance, and referral to other local agencies involved in helping the addict maintain a drug-free existence.

Finally, there are three Spectrum houses operating in Dade and Broward Counties, offering around-the-clock involvement and care for addicted persons. These highly supervised therapeutic communities are staffed by rehabilitated ex-addicts. The emphasis here is on group therapy, motivation building, re-orientation, and then community re-entry with gainful employment.

This process is long, difficult, and expensive. But when the product is a healthy and whole human being salvaged from an addict's shell, the investment is certainly worth the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this Christian Community Service Agency in my district. I believe it represents a model for similar programs across our Nation, and I commend the example of Spectrum to all those interested in effective alternatives to the massive drug problem confronting us today. Surely every one of us is a member of that interest group.

BILL TO PRESERVE THE ATLANTIC SALMON OF NORTH AMERICAN ORIGIN

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to preserve Atlantic salmon of North American origin. I am proud to announce that 36 of my colleagues have joined me today in cosponsoring this bill, and that they share my concern for the problem America faces in conserving this species of fish.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no means other than voluntary agreement to compel one nation to protect fish that originate in the waters of another nation. The case of Atlantic salmon is an example.

Danish fishing interests have discovered that Atlantic salmon congregate off Greenland and as a result of their taking large stocks of these American fish, our Atlantic streams are suffering from diminished supply.

This bill is an effort to encourage Denmark and other nations to protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin either on the high seas or in their own coastal fishing zones. It provides for the Secretary of Commerce to notify the Secretary of the Treasury where our American stocks of fish are endangered by overfishing by foreign fishermen, whereupon the Secretary of the Treasury would ban fish products of such nation from being imported into the United States.

This obviously is a harsh measure, but whenever any such nation finds its exports to the United States threatened they can negotiate a conservation treaty which is in their own interest, and likewise in the interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to have this wide support of my colleagues for this bill, and I am assured by my committee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan, we can receive early hearings in this matter which is of great concern to both commercial and sports fishermen of America.

A list of cosponsors follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Hon. Hastings Keith of Massachusetts.
 Hon. Silvio O. Conte of Massachusetts.
 Hon. Wendell Wyatt of Oregon.
 Hon. George A. Goodling of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., of California.
 Hon. Don H. Clausen of California.
 Hon. Chalmers P. Wylie of Ohio.
 Hon. William D. Hathaway of Maine.
 Hon. William L. Scott of Virginia.
 Hon. Charles W. Sandman, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Hon. Carleton J. King of New York.
 Hon. John H. Dent of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Paul G. Rogers of Florida.
 Hon. Otis G. Pike of New York.
 Hon. Alexander Pirnie of New York.
 Hon. Burt L. Talcott of California.
 Hon. Harold T. Johnson of California.
 Hon. Alton Lennon of North Carolina.
 Hon. Craig Hosmer of California.
 Hon. Ben B. Blackburn of Georgia.
 Hon. Robert H. Steele of Connecticut.
 Hon. R. Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Frank Horton of New York.
 Hon. Frank M. Clark of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Floyd V. Hicks of Washington.
 Hon. Fletcher Thompson of Georgia.
 Hon. Seymour Halpern of New York.
 Hon. Lawrence G. Williams of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Thomas M. Rees of California.
 Hon. Norman F. Lent of New York.
 Hon. Lawrence J. Hogan of Maryland.
 Hon. George P. Miller of California.
 Hon. James A. Burke of Massachusetts.
 Hon. Louise Day Hicks of Massachusetts.
 Hon. Mario Biaggi of New York.
 Hon. Lloyd Meeds of Washington.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. Charles Willson Peale embodied the spirit of American individualism. He was a universal man of the 18th century and his genius ran from a painter of George Washington, to a silversmith, inventor, sculptor, mechanic, millwright, soldier, and founder of America's first public art gallery and first museum of natural history. He embodied the vigor and boundless energy of a young America.

EIGHT MONTHS WITHOUT AN LEAA ADMINISTRATOR

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1970, the resignation of Mr. Charles Rogovin as Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration became effective. At that time, and now, I lament the departure of Mr. Rogovin as head of this most important Federal agency, which, in my opinion, represents the great hope and potentially the most effective weapon in this Nation's war on crime. My disappointment at Mr. Rogovin's resignation was based not only on the loss to the Federal Government

of a man of his exceptional talents, but also because as a new agency charged with such an important mission. I felt that LEAA could not afford to be beset by the problems and logjams which in part were the cause of Mr. Rogovin's departure. Fortunately, Mr. Rogovin's has remained in the criminal justice field as president of the Police Foundation in Washington, D.C. and the Congress has responded to the infirmities in LEAA's structure by modifying the "troika" and giving the Administrator "all administrative powers."

Incredibly, however, 8 months have elapsed since Mr. Rogovin's resignation without the appointment of a replacement for the position of Administrator of LEAA. For almost an equal length of time the position of Director of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has gone unfilled since the resignation of Mr. Henry Ruth, another highly respected exponent of an enlightened approach to criminal justice problems.

In the interim, among other developments, Congress has increased the authorized funding level of LEAA for fiscal year 1973 to an amount 27 times larger than the budget of LEAA in fiscal year 1969—\$1.75 billion in fiscal year 1973 as compared with \$63 million in fiscal year 1969—the law enforcement plans of 55 State planning agencies, upon which block grants are made, were received by LEAA; millions of dollars in block, discretionary, and research grants and contracts were issued; and the employment rolls within the leaderless agency continue to grow. What the lack of an Administrator does to the standing and esteem of LEAA in the eyes of the general public and State and local law enforcement agencies cannot be readily calculated.

What is clear, however, is that the continued absence of direction for LEAA can only lead to a further erosion of morale within the agency, a fostering of a poor example to State planning agencies, and a lack of national policy guidelines. This is especially evident in LEAA's audit division where a woefully undermanned staff is attempting to supervise the expenditure of millions of dollars on literally hundreds of projects in every State of the Union.

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, in the exercise of its oversight responsibilities, intend to maintain a very close supervision of the operations of LEAA. As chairman of this subcommittee I can state that the staff of LEAA has been extremely cooperative and helpful to the subcommittee in its work. Almost without exception I have found LEAA's personnel to be highly motivated, dedicated, and industrious. But as with any good army they need an able general. The Nation's crime problem demands effective leadership by LEAA. I urge the President to fill the position of Administrator of LEAA at the earliest possible moment.

THANKSGIVING DAY

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, certain days will always remain vivid in the memories of those who lived through them. For years afterward they will be able to recall the details of what transpired on the national scene, along with what happened to them personally on the same day.

Such a day was November 22, 1963, when John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, was assassinated by a Marxist. How well we all recall the tragedy of that day, as we sat before our television sets and watched the news unfold.

It is an unfortunate coincidence that in 1973, 2 years from now, the anniversary of John F. Kennedy's death will coincide with Thanksgiving, the day on which we express our gratitude to the Almighty for the blessings we have received during the previous year. The law provides that "The fourth Thursday of November in each year after the year 1941 shall be known as Thanksgiving Day."

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, would provide that "The last Thursday of November in each year after the year 1972 shall be known as Thanksgiving Day." Under the terms of my bill, Thanksgiving Day could never be earlier than November 24, thus avoiding the possibility of a conflict with the anniversary of John F. Kennedy's death.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MARSHALS CITIZEN POWER AGAINST CRIME

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 91st Congress in the area of criminal justice legislation stands unequaled. The Congress took giant steps toward solution of some of the most complex crime problems facing us today. While there are some unfinished legislative tasks, notably with regard to the Wagering Tax amendments, we can look with pride at the enactments of the previous Congress. Three stand out as milestones:

Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Public Law 91-452: As the most comprehensive legislative attack ever made on organized crime this act, among its twelve titles, provides sorely needed evidence-gathering tools against organized crime, attacks the growing rate of infiltration of legitimate business by organized crime, and tackles the primary source of revenue of organized crime—illegal gambling.

Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, Public Law 91-513: This act attacks the Nation's drug problem on three basic fronts—enforcement, education, and rehabilitation. It provides promise that the deadly depredation of our human resources by drugs will also be stemmed and reversed.

Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970, Public Law 91-644: As a series of amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 this act sharply

increases the funding level of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which in turn increases Federal law enforcement assistance to State and local governments. It also focuses attention on the Nation's correctional institutions and places a higher premium on training, education, and research. Specifically, the act places emphasis on training in the organized crime area by authorizing LEAA "to establish and support a training program for prosecuting attorneys from State and local offices engaged in the prosecution of organized crime."

While this legislation improves our chances of reversing the rise in crime and eliminating fear that crime and its consequences bring, ultimate success can only be achieved by an active partnership of Government and the private sector. Indicative of this is the active and effective role which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce played in urging the enactment of the above acts.

In the past few years the national chamber has provided exceedingly effective leadership in galvanizing public support for governmental efforts against crime and educating the public on the manifestations of crime and its causes. Its excellent "Deskbook on Organized Crime," published in 1969, stands as one of the best layman's reference works in that field. On a number of recent occasions the chamber has devoted its radio and television programs to discussion of the citizens' role in the crime fight.

Recently, the national chamber published another reference work on crime, equal in impact and quality to the deskbook. Titled "Marshaling Citizen Power Against Crime," the booklet is an excellent overview of the problems confronting police, the courts, and the corrections system. It should be required reading for all seeking solutions to these problems.

Following are the problem identification checklists regarding those three areas of law enforcement which are contained in the new chamber booklet, "Marshaling Citizen Power Against Crime," by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION CHECKLISTS THE POLICE—PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION CHECKLIST

Administration and operation

A. Organization, Management, and Policies

1. Have official policies pertaining to all areas of police responsibility been adopted and documented?
2. Have procedures for implementing police policies been documented and made available to those responsible for carrying them out?
3. Is the job structure of the department differentiated so that there are appropriate entry levels for those with different backgrounds and educational attainment?
4. Are there so many specialties with independent command structures that there is difficulty in bringing the full resources of the department to bear on a problem?
5. Do personnel assume responsibility commensurate with their rank?
6. Is the number of command personnel excessive?
7. Is the span of control too broad?
8. Is authority commensurate with responsibility?
9. Are there too many precincts?
10. When a juvenile is apprehended by an officer, what are the subsequent steps in the process? Detention? Release in care of parents? Arrested? Served with summons? Re-

ferred to juvenile court? Referred to a community agency?

11. Is report preparation by field personnel streamlined? Are records centralized or are they fragmented among the precincts?

12. Is there an organization chart of the department? Does it correspond to the way the department actually operates?

13. Are responsibilities and their assignment clearcut?

14. Would the department benefit from a legal advisor?

15. What is the policy governing use of firearms?

16. What management or administrative skills does the department most need?

17. Is the chief given sufficient decision-making latitude?

B. Coordination and Consolidation of Services and Facilities

1. What pooling or coordination of police resources exists within the region?

2. Could record keeping, recruitment, purchasing, detention facilities, criminal intelligence be consolidated or better coordinated among the departments in the area?

3. Can intercommunity cooperation result in a shared-by-all criminal laboratory, training facility, more efficient communication network?

4. What is the relationship of municipal to county and state police? Are there conflicts, duplications?

5. Is there a regionwide computer-based police information network the department should plug into? Should the department avail itself of the FBI's computerized National Crime Information Center, which supplies information on wanted persons, stolen vehicles, and stolen property?

C. Crime Prevention and Control

1. Is adequate credit given to the crime prevention efforts of patrolmen?

2. Are patrolmen responsible for all aspects of law enforcement—from traffic to vice?

3. Is the number of men assigned to a shift in proportion to the amount of crime and calls for service that can be expected to occur during the shift?

4. Of all reported crimes, how many are cleared by arrests or summons? How can the clearance rate be improved?

5. Are there contingency plans for emergencies, such as riots, natural disasters, etc.?

6. Has the matter of organized crime been investigated in depth?

7. To what extent would faster response time deter crime or increase arrests?

8. How might the department participate in community planning regarding crime prevention measures, security codes, etc.?

D. Corruption

1. Should the department have an internal investigation unit to probe breaches of police integrity and to determine the validity of civilian complaints?

2. Are ethical standards enforced to minimize corruption?

3. Are citizens pressured into purchasing Christmas club or policeman's ball tickets?

4. Do businessmen offer free meals or other goods and services to police in return for relaxed enforcement of certain laws such as double parking?

E. Community Relations

1. In what way does the department believe citizen involvement can be most helpful?

2. Is there a police-community relations program? In addition to a special unit for this purpose, are all personnel aware of their role?

3. Is police-community relations nothing more than superficial public relations?

4. Do segments of the community exhibit animosity toward police?

5. Are the rights of citizens respected before, during, and after arrest?

6. Are certain activities of patrolmen adversely affecting what should be the neutral political image of police?

7. Are juveniles included within the scope of the community-relations program?

8. What is the policy for processing a civilian complaint?

F. Research and Statistics

1. Are sufficient data available to indicate how patrol officers should be distributed according to the actual need for their presence?

2. Are criminal statistics maintained and analyzed?

3. Are all crimes that are reported to police reflected in official statistics?

4. What type of crime is considered most serious in the city?

5. Are statistics available regarding types of offenses, their volume, their place and time of occurrence, the victim and offender (youths, adult, man, woman), the motive?

G. Personnel Utilization and Performance

1. Is civilian manpower used whenever feasible?

2. Are police utilized for trivial duties?

3. Is the force up to authorized strength?

4. How many more men are needed? Why? How would they be used?

5. How many men ride in a patrol car? Are foot patrolmen assigned singly or in pairs to a given beat?

6. Do officers use police cars while off duty?

7. Should foot patrol receive more emphasis, given its community-relations and criminal intelligence advantages over motor patrol?

8. Has the state developed minimum standards for police performance?

9. Do patrol cars operate through the night?

Manpower and management

A. Recruitment

1. Are recruitment standards sufficiently and realistic?

2. Has an effort been made to recruit college graduates? High school graduates? Ghetto dwellers?

3. Can a qualified patrolman or detective from another city be hired by the department?

B. Training

1. Is adequate training given to recruits?

2. Are there periodic sessions of in-service training?

3. Are educational improvement and training given appropriate emphasis by promotion policy?

4. Are there officers specially trained to handle juvenile problems?

C. Salaries and Promotion

1. Are salaries competitive?

2. Are salaries tied to those of other municipal agencies?

Equipment and facilities

A. Equipment

1. Are more patrol cars or scooters required?

2. Is communication equipment badly needed? Other types of equipment?

General

1. What does the department consider as its biggest problem?

2. Is high personnel turnover a problem?

3. Does the department need citizen support for its proposed budget?

4. What court-related problems are faced by police? What corrections problems?

5. What offenses do police officials consider in need of "decriminalization"?

6. What new legislation would assist police?

7. What seems to be the major complaints of patrolmen? Of administrative personnel? Of command officers?

THE COURTS—PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

CHECKLIST

A. Case backlog and delay

1. What is the case backlog in the lower criminal courts? In the felony courts?

2. How long is the delay between arrest and sentencing? Between arrest and trial?

3. How long must police wait in court before testifying?

4. To what extent are continuances granted and for what reasons?

5. Do poor case-scheduling procedures contribute to delay?

6. How closely does the judicial process conform to the model timetable for felony cases developed by the President's Commission?

7. How many alleged offenders are in pre-trial detention facilities?

8. On the average, how long are defendants confined while awaiting trial?

9. To what extent are courts dealing with cases that could be better handled outside the criminal justice system?

B. Sentences and dismissal or reduction of charges

1. To what extent are charges dismissed or reduced? Why?

2. What percentage of cases are disposed of through a plea of guilty? How many of those pleas are negotiated?

3. What are the most common sentences for a given offense?

4. To what extent are sentences of imprisonment avoided because of substandard correctional facilities?

5. Are legislature-mandated sentences consistent with one another—are sentences relating to serious crimes less severe than those pertaining to less serious offenses?

6. Are there sentencing disparities among judges?

7. Are judges informed about sentence alternatives? Do they receive presentence reports?

8. Is appropriate use made of probation?

9. What is the relationship between the economic and ethnic status of defendants charged with similar offenses and their sentences?

C. The prosecutor and defense counsel

1. Is the prosecutor's position a full-time job or is he permitted to work on the side?

2. Are salary and other working conditions adequate to attract high caliber individuals to seek the office of prosecutor?

3. Does the prosecutor have enough assistants in relation to the workload?

4. Does the prosecutor attend prosecutor training institutes?

5. How efficient is the system in the provision of legal services to the poor? Is it overlooked, understaffed?

6. To what extent does the local bar discipline unscrupulous counsel?

7. What method is used to provide defense service to the poor—assign counsel, public defender, combination?

8. What is the provision of the defense services—donations, taxes, both? How much does this cost? Are more funds required?

D. Court organization, management and procedures

1. Does the court have a court administrator? To what degree are judges involved in day-to-day administrative matters?

2. Is there a multiplicity of trial courts without coherent and centralized management?

3. Is each judge accountable to someone for his performance and conduct?

4. How could the criminal courts in the state benefit from unification?

5. Is there a justice-of-the-peace system?

6. Is probation administered by the courts, by corrections, or by both?

7. How long are judicial vacations? Are they staggered?

8. How effectively does the court coordinate the appearances of all parties to a case?
9. Has judicial independence been extended to matters of administration, with the result that each judge is his own boss?
10. Are fines collected within reasonable periods?
11. Are calendar calls staggered?
12. Are the most serious cases adjudicated first?
13. Are court procedures about to be computerized without prior analysis of the worth or effectiveness of those procedures?
14. Is there a mechanism assuring equalized caseloads?
15. Are omnibus motions and pretrial discovery part of criminal court procedure?
16. Are the ABA standards relating to criminal appeals and post-convictions remedies being seriously studied by the court?
17. What are the most important management or administrative deficiencies?
18. Is there a plan available for the administration of justice under emergency conditions?
19. To what extent do police and corrections create problems for the court?
20. Are there now enough judges, facilities, and support personnel to handle the current workload if management and administrative techniques were upgraded?

E. Personnel selection, utilization, and performance

1. What are the daily hours of judges?
2. How are judges selected for appointment? How is their performance reviewed?
3. Is there a practical procedure by which judges can be removed from the bench?
4. Are judicial vacancies filled quickly?
5. To what extent is the judicial process suffering from failure of personnel on the one hand and from failures of procedure and policy on the other?
6. Are law school students being appropriately utilized?
7. On what basis are applicants selected to fill court vacancies?
8. What are the minimum qualifications for judges and prosecutors?
9. Are there training opportunities for judges and prosecutors—both before and after election or appointment?
10. Do court personnel receive adequate training?
11. What do court personnel consider as their most important problem?
12. In what ways do court personnel feel that citizen involvement can be most beneficial?

F. Facilities and equipment

1. Have court facilities and procedures kept pace with factors affecting the court's workload, such as increased police effectiveness, rising population, new laws, etc.?
2. Are treatment of and facilities for jurors and witnesses adequate?
3. Are court facilities conducive to justice?
4. What can businessmen do to help alleviate the lack of court facilities?
5. What correctional facilities are available to the lower courts? To the felony courts?
6. Are adequate statistics maintained by the court to facilitate problem identification and solution?

G. Juvenile Court

1. Is there a juvenile court system? How well qualified are the judges?
2. Are youths subject to formal juvenile court action for offenses that would not be considered criminal for adults?
3. Are juvenile court judges exclusively or excessively preoccupied with rehabilitation, with too little concern about public protection?
4. Is there adequate due process in the juvenile court?

H. Bail

1. Is bail applied too stringently or extensively?

2. What is the quality of bondsmen?
3. Have alternatives to bail been explored?
4. Is bail really a cloak with which to cover preventive detention instead of dealing with the latter on its merits?
5. To what extent are dangerous offenders released on bail and those charged with lesser offenses detained because they could not raise sufficient money?
6. Are "credit bonds" outlawed?
7. Is the number of bonds that a bondsman is permitted to supply related to the assets backing up the bonds?
8. Do bondsmen pay forfeitures promptly?

CORRECTIONS—PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION CHECKLIST

A. Correctional facilities, their utilization and effectiveness

1. Is there an adequate range of correctional facilities or services to which offenders may be sentenced?
2. Are correctional alternatives studied from a cost/benefit standpoint?
3. How many of those now in maximum security institutions really need that type of confinement?
4. Are statistically valid evaluations made of the effectiveness of various correctional methods, and are the criteria realistic in terms of public expectations?
5. What are the conditions in correctional institutions, particularly in short-term facilities? What about sanitation, the rights of prisoners, overcrowding, appropriate segregation of types of offenders, etc.?
6. What correctional options are available for misdemeanants, who represent 96.5 percent of those arraigned for nontraffic offenses? Particularly, are probation services available, and if so, are they sufficient to meet caseload problems and levels?
7. Do correctional facilities and services plan to avail themselves of the accreditation procedure of the American Correctional Association?
8. What is the recidivist rate of those released from each correctional facility in the region? How does each facility define recidivism? Are there built-in "success" factors which compromise the validity of the data?
9. Have referral and commitment practices been thoroughly evaluated to minimize the use of detention and confinement?
10. Do the physical facilities make adequate provision for correctional programs, and if not, are plans under way to modify or replace them?

B. Organization, management, and policies

1. Is the goal of these facilities and services rehabilitation and reintegration as well as public protection?
2. Is the correctional system unreasonably fragmented? Is there a need for better pooling or coordination of services, facilities, and management?
3. Are correctional methods tailored to the offender? If he is without a skill, is he trained until he develops one? If he is undereducated, are educational programs available? If he is an alcoholic or is mentally retarded, are appropriate medical and social services available?
4. What managerial or administrative skills do correctional administrators require the most? Do the correctional administrators really have the capacity for leadership and innovation?
5. Are administrators taking appropriate note of the union movement among correctional employees?
6. Are administrators making provision for the use of female employees, minority group members, ex-offenders and paraprofessionals?
7. Is there statewide coordination of corrections?
8. Are the administrators taking full advantage of the many different Federal funding and technical assistance programs which are now being made available through several Departments of the government?

9. Are the administrators familiar with the contents and recommendations of the many studies and surveys in corrections that have been made in recent years—among others, the President's Commission Report on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, the President's policy directive on corrections dated November 13, 1969, the report "A Time To Act" of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, and the 1970 report of the White House Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation.

10. Do the administrators have the information resources and systems which enable them to make intelligent decisions and do intelligent planning?

C. Overcrowding and other penal conditions

1. To what extent is corrections overburdened with those awaiting trial? Are they separated from prisoners serving their sentences? Are juveniles separated from adults?
2. Is there an excessive use of sentences to confinement?
3. How does the average inmate population of correctional institutions compare with the capacity for which they were originally designed?
4. Do the cells hold in excess of the number of prisoners for which they were designed?
5. Have any riots or disturbances occurred during the last three years of each facility?
6. Do the facilities have emergency fire and disorders prevention and control plans?
7. Is there sufficient provision made, both in physical provisions and by regulation, for family visiting?
8. Are custodial provisions, both physical and by practice, overly stringent? Or insufficiently secure?
9. Are the physical conditions of the facilities, and associated practices, so bad that as in several other localities an inmate lawsuit may be successful in obtaining a court judgment that they represent cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Constitution?
10. Are the rights of prisoners, as reflected in many recent court decisions, fully observed?

D. Probation and parole

1. Does the state, or the county, or the locality even have a probation system?
2. Where probation and parole do exist, do they have sufficient manpower and resources to provide any really meaningful rehabilitative treatment?
3. Are the type and extent of supervision geared to the individual needs of probationers and parolees?
4. Do the judges make adequate and intelligent use of probation, and do the parole boards use realistic criteria in making decisions for the release of prisoners?
5. Are parole and probation revocations arbitrary?
6. Are parolees and probationees informed in writing of conditions to which they must adhere?
7. Are probation and parole offices aware of the community resources available to the treatment of their clients, and do they make sufficient use of these?
8. Do the probation and parole officers have access to funds for the purchase of services—educational, training, employment placement, guidance, medical and psychological, etc.—for their clients?
9. Do the probation and parole officers really supervise their clients, or do they depend on a monthly checklist or letter?
10. Would an increased use of probation and parole, consistent with the public safety, reduce or eliminate the need for further institutional construction?

E. Personnel selection, training and performance

1. To what extent are correctional appointments influenced by political considerations?

2. Do the correctional agencies observe nationally recognized standards for the education and training of personnel?

3. Are administrators required to acquire management skills?

4. What is the turnover rate among corrections personnel?

5. Are personnel pay standards adequate?

6. Are the personnel encouraged to take advantage of state and Federal grant and loan programs for their education?

7. Do the correctional agencies have qualified and especially trained personnel to develop and conduct in-service training programs?

8. Are the personnel encouraged, and their expenses underwritten, to permit them to maintain active associations with national and regional professional organizations?

9. Are the personnel encouraged, or are they actively discouraged, from developing attitudes receptive to innovations in the correctional treatment of offenders?

10. Are the suggestions of employees for the improvement of programs and policies given full consideration and recognition?

F. Community-based corrections

1. Are the many potentially supportive medical, guidance, educational, employment, and other resources of the community sufficiently developed and coordinated with the correctional process?

2. Is the public uninformed or misinformed about the promise of community-based corrections—in terms of costs and benefits?

3. Has sufficient attention been directed toward applying community-based corrections to adults as well as to youths?

4. Are there really any community-based programs—work release, halfway houses, group homes, court diversion projects, manpower programs, etc.?

5. Are any reasonable standards observed in the operation of community-based programs, or are they really much better than the jails and institutions for which they are used to substitute?

6. Are the community-based programs equipped with sufficient supportive services—service purchase funds, counseling, training, etc.?

7. Have the correctional administrators applied for grants from any of the many Federal funding sources for various types of community-based programs?

8. Is there realistic follow-up and evaluation of community-based programs to ascertain if they are really more effective in the rehabilitation of offenders?

9. Do the police, prosecutors, and courts actively support the development of community-based programs?

10. Is the selection of offenders for placement in community-based programs too stringent and intended only to make them look good, or is selection primarily in terms of offenders needing this type of program, consistent with the public safety?

G. Recruitment and salaries

1. How many more correctional personnel are needed—and for what jobs?

2. Is there an excessive number of security personnel in comparison to so-called treatment personnel?

3. Are ex-offenders and paraprofessionals hired as full-time correctional employees?

4. Are salary levels and working conditions sufficiently high to attract fully qualified personnel?

5. Are recruitment requirements too arbitrary? Could recruitment practices be strengthened?

6. Is lateral entry permitted into the system?

7. Are new personnel who demonstrate their unfitness for correctional work weeded out?

8. Do promotion policies reflect records of performance or political or other considerations?

9. Are employees occasionally exchanged on a temporary basis with other correctional systems?

10. To what extent do the personnel standards reflect the recommendations of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training?

H. General

1. In the opinion of correctional officials, what are the most important problems they face?

2. How might citizen involvement best help them, and do they encourage citizen involvement?

3. Are correctional problems created or intensified by the police and courts to any extent?

4. What are the budgetary needs of correctional facilities and services, and is anything being done to meet them?

5. What legislation is required to help bring about a more effective correctional system?

6. What is being done to avoid an excessive dependence upon and use of institutions?

7. Are there efforts being made to treat certain types of inmates—alcoholics, addicts, social misfits, etc.—outside the correctional system?

8. Is the power structure of the community aware of the problems of corrections, and are these problems being given sufficient priority?

9. Are the respective jurisdictions receptive to pooling facilities and programs for the care and treatment of offenders where geographically feasible?

10. Are outside experts sought where necessary in developing solutions to correctional problems?

I. The ex-offender and jobs

1. Are employers willing to hire ex-offenders for meaningful jobs?

2. Is there an effective liaison between correctional institutions and potential employers of ex-offenders?

3. Are institutional training programs geared to the actual employment requirements and skills needed by the community?

4. Do the institutions have work-release programs, permitting the community employment of prisoners during the latter part of their terms?

5. Do the institutions take advantage of the manpower training program grants offered by the Department of Labor?

6. Are supporting services offered to ex-offenders when they return to communities and begin employment?

7. Do the state laws or municipal ordinances have to be changed to permit the licensing of ex-offenders for certain occupations, as for example barbering?

8. Are the correctional agencies making use of the bonding program for ex-offenders administered by the U.S. Employment Service?

9. Where programs for the employment placement of offenders exist, do they place them in meaningful jobs, or to occupations in restaurants, dry cleaning establishments, car washes, etc., where they are unlikely to remain?

10. Are funds and resources made available to probation departments for the training and employment of their clients by the private sector?

J. Volunteers

1. Is any use made of corrections volunteers?

2. How many volunteers are now being used in probation, parole, and institutions? Are more required?

3. Are there any standards being observed in the selection, training and supervision of volunteers?

4. What are the kinds of services for which volunteers are found to be most useful?

5. Are ex-offenders and minority group members included in the volunteer rolls?

6. Are the correctional agencies taking advantage of the several Federal funding sources for the initiation of volunteer programs?

7. Where volunteer programs are being started, is outside technical assistance sought to make sure that the prospects of success are enhanced?

8. Are volunteers being used to substitute for, or to supplement, the services of professional workers?

9. Are the volunteers being used on a one-to-one basis, or are they assigned excessive numbers of offenders with which to work?

10. Are those volunteers weeded out whose services do not prove productive or whose motivation may be suspect?

AIR SAFETY

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

Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Administration in the Department of Transportation is responsible for air safety throughout the national airspace system. The excellent safety record for scheduled air carrier operations is a good index of the fine job being done by the FAA, the airlines, the air traffic controllers and all others involved in aviation safety. After compiling an outstanding record in 1969, the airlines in 1970 had the safest year in the history of U.S. commercial aviation. There were no fatalities in scheduled domestic airline operations and only two fatalities in international operations. This is a great record of service to the American public.

I also am pleased to note that the safety record for general aviation showed significant improvement in 1970. The number of fatal accidents, dropped from 692 in 1968 to 621 in 1970, and the number of fatalities declined from 1,399 to 1,270 during the same time period.

We know very well that safety is not a matter of happenstance or luck. It is the result of dedication, imagination, initiative and just plain hard work on the part of Government and the aviation community to make the aviation system safe. This teamwork between the public and private sectors has been the hallmark of civil aviation in the United States and certainly one of the key reasons for its great success. This teamwork between Government and industry this past year was instrumental in resolving the problems associated with the introduction of the Boeing 747 into commercial service. The success of these efforts speak for themselves as the Boeing 747 has already logged more than 15.5 billion accident-free passenger miles in airline operations around the globe. At present, this great aircraft carries one-quarter million passengers each week and this figure is climbing.

Progress also has been made in several other aviation activities in 1970. Congestions and delays at the Nation's airports have been reduced substantially. During the last 6 months of 1968, there were 84,337 delays of 30 minutes or more in the air traffic control system. In the same period in 1969 delays were down to 50,721 and in the last half of 1970 the num-

ber had been reduced to only 23,230. That is better than a 50 percent reduction between 1970 and 1969 and better than 70-percent improvement between 1970 and 1968. For the most part, this progress can be traced directly to actions taken by FAA to break—or at least widen the bottlenecks in the airport/airways system.

It is encouraging to note that hijackings of U.S. aircraft dropped more than 40 percent last year from the 1969 total of 33. Only three of the 19 U.S. hijackings last year occurred during the last quarter, reflecting the increase in ground and in-flight security measures under development for the past 2 years.

As a member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee I have been keenly interested in all aspects of air safety and have consistently led the fight for more budget funds to expand the number of air traffic controllers, improve their working conditions, and to modernize the air traffic control system.

It is gratifying to report that during 1970 the program to automate the air traffic control program was accelerated to meet increased demands. The IBM 9020 central computer complex, which is the heart and brains of the en route automation program, is now in use for flight data processing at 14 of the 20 air route traffic control centers serving the domestic United States. Seven of these computer installations went on line in 1970 alone.

The terminal automation program for air traffic control also is moving forward. Two automated radar terminal systems have been delivered and 10 others will provide greater safety and efficiency while handling far more aircraft in the future.

In addition to upgrading the hardware in the air traffic control system, the FAA has been working to improve the working conditions and career opportunities of the men who operate the system, in line with the recommendations of the Air Traffic Controller Career Committee, established by Transportation Secretary Volpe. During 1970 another record was set with 3,600 controller trainees added to the work force, more than in any single year in the history of the agency. I am both a private pilot and a frequent user of commercial airlines in commuting between Washington and my district in Cleveland. My admiration and gratitude are boundless for the tireless roles our air traffic controllers have played in bettering the air safety record. I am particularly well acquainted with the outstanding jobs they do in handling traffic at both Washington National and the Cleveland airports. These men deserve a special accolade for their high standards of precision, presence of mind, and what often approaches prescience under conditions of great stress. Despite their heavy workload the traffic control centers are most cooperative in giving VFR advisories when conditions in today's congested airways permit. These advisories contribute greatly to air safety.

I would be remiss if I did not single out the wonderful work done by the flight service stations who, though undermanned and underequipped, give

pilot briefings to commercial and private pilots. They do a magnificent job.

While we are learning to expect significant progress in aviation activities, when it occurs I do not feel that it should pass unnoticed. I commend FAA Administrator John Shaffer and his staff, the airlines, private pilots, and all the air traffic controllers for their outstanding record in aviation safety in 1970.

MINED LANDS CONSERVATION ACT

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

Mr. MEEDES. Mr. Speaker, a town in my district called Issaquah is suffering from land dropout. At the turn of the century subsurface coal mining flourished in the area. But now the old timbers rot in unused shafts and the surface land gives way.

I am today introducing a bill to prevent subsidence of this land—it is entitled the "Mined Lands Conservation Act." The bill would provide Federal money for up to 75 percent of the costs of technical assistance and filling abandoned shafts.

Not only are there places where the land has fallen, but land values are also down. This legislation is designed to shore up both the land and land values.

In November of 1967, two young boys and three of their rescuers were overcome by mine gas when they entered an opening at the bottom of a caved-in area. All five would have died had the Issaquah Fire Department not recovered and revived them. This kind of potential disaster is precisely what we seek to avoid with the Mined Lands Conservation Act.

This legislation is national in scope. It deals not only with subsurface coal mining, a problem in my district, but also provides for reclamation of strip and surface mined areas—a serious problem in the East. Additional provisions outline stiff penalties for on-going mining operations which violate the conservation standards set up in the bill.

BONNEVILLE UNIT—CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

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

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I was keenly disappointed in reviewing the President's budget to discover that only \$8,199,000 new money had been requested by the administration for work on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project. When the Bonneville project was authorized, the projected cost was \$324 million, and the estimated time for construction was 15 to 20 years. Since work was begun on this unit some 5 years ago, the project has been consistently underfunded; but at the rate of development recommended by the latest administration request, the project may well take 50 to 100 years and cost over twice the projected figures, according to the estimates of the Utah officials involved.

Moreover, the need for this water is urgent. Utah's two most populous counties may face critical shortages in this decade without it. And when we consider that ultimately most of the money advanced for this project will be paid back with interest by those who will use the water, then the delays on financing seem particularly inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for any special treatment in regard to this project. I am simply concerned that the Bonneville project be completed within the time and for the costs contemplated by Congress when it authorized the project in the first instance.

The project has been authorized, and it will be built. Delays incident to inadequate financing can only increase the costs by necessitating inefficient construction measures and subjecting the work to the pressures of inflation.

If the President is truly concerned about unemployment, he should be promoting these necessary projects in areas, like our district, where the construction industry has suffered.

I am sure that the Congress will review these and the other areas in which the administration's false efforts at "economy" will cost the people more in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned in examining the administration's budget that they have failed to follow through with the long-range plan for topographic mapping. There are areas in my district which have never been adequately mapped, and it is a matter of critical importance to the development of our State.

You will recall that the initial planning for this project anticipated that it would be completed during the bicentennial year, 1976. Already, the project is behind, and the estimated costs are exceeding those in the long-range plan. The initial plan called for \$48 million to be expended in fiscal 1972. The President's budget has allocated only \$32,869,000. Once again we have an example where needless delay may result in additional cost for services which are needed now.

A further matter of concern to the West is the enactment of the proposals of the Public Land Law Review Commission, particularly those proposals which deal with payments to States for federally owned lands in lieu of the property taxes to which the States would otherwise be entitled if the lands were privately owned. Those of us in the West are hopeful that legislative action can be taken soon on these proposals, a hope which is apparently not shared by the administration because it has failed to consider the costs of such programs in its budget.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's budget has not adequately handled the legitimate needs and expectations of people in the West, and I trust that Congress will be more sympathetic to us.

NEW KENSINGTON PROTESTS FREE FLOW OF STEEL INTO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to present a resolution.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution from the city of New Kensington, Pa., a political subdivision in my community protesting the free flow of steel into the United States and begging this Congress to do something about it.

It may interest the House to know that this community of 55,000 population now has more workers drawing trade adjustment assistance than it had in the active production of goods. This community is down to less than 600 payroll jobs in the entire population of 55,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I refer to is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEW KENSINGTON

Whereas, the City of New Kensington, a political municipal corporation situated in the County of Westmoreland and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the United States of America is cognizant and aware of the free flow of foreign steel to the United States, and

Whereas, this municipality is also aware that the local steel companies are in an economical disadvantage in competing in the sale and production of steel with the foreign imports, and

Whereas, as a matter of fact, local steel industries are operating at an unhealthy economic level of employment and possibly at the very lowest in thirty (30) years, and

Whereas, the Council of the City of New Kensington feels impelled to prevail upon the proper authorities to remedy the unhealthy situation which now exists,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City of New Kensington in the County of Westmoreland and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requests that the proper officers, Senators, Representatives and officials of the United States government take immediate and necessary steps to perfect an embargo as to the import of foreign steels in order to protect the economic steel situation and as a result of said embargo would increase the use of man power in the production of steel and the sale of more steel in the United States.

Resolved at a special meeting of Council of the City of New Kensington on this 26th day of January, 1971.

HOUSE MAJORITY WHIP—REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was quite pleased that my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., was designated as the Democratic whip for the House of Representatives. He has served admirably in the House since 1952, and rounds out what will prove to be an excellent Democratic leadership team. He will serve the Nation, New England, and his own State of Massachusetts with spirit and effectiveness.

I would like to add to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a biographical sketch of Representative O'NEILL written by David E. Rosenbaum for the New York Times' "Man in the News" column. This column provides some sense of the spirit of Congressman O'NEILL, and I recommend it to all my colleagues:

HOUSE MAJORITY WHIP: THOMAS PHILIP O'NEILL, JR.

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Whether he's talking with constituents in Cambridge pubs, debating on the floor of the House or negotiating behind the scenes with other politicians, Representative Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. of Massachusetts likes to make his points with stories and personal anecdotes. So when Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana sought him out a couple of weeks ago and began talking in generalities about whom Mr. O'Neill would support for majority leader, Mr. O'Neill told him a story.

"I told him," Mr. O'Neill recalled today, about the time when I was 21 years old and running for City Council in Cambridge. One day, Mrs. O'Brien came up to me on the street and said: 'Tip, I'm going to vote for you even though you never asked me to.'

"I said: 'Mrs. O'Brien, I've been shoveling your walk and mowing your grass ever since I can remember. I didn't think I had to ask you to vote for me.'

"'Tip,' she told me, 'I always like to be asked just like everybody else.'"

Mr. Boggs then directly asked Mr. O'Neill to vote for him for majority leader. He said that he would, but only if his fellow Massachusetts Representative, Edward P. Boland, decided not to run.

After Mr. Boland pulled out of the race and Mr. Boggs was elected, Mr. O'Neill went back to the new Democratic leader and asked him if he had remembered the story about Mrs. O'Brien. Mr. Boggs said that he had and Mr. O'Neill said: "Well, you know that I wasn't going to support you originally, and you owe me no obligations, but I'd like to be whip, and I'm asking you for it."

THE NATURAL CHOICE

The Massachusetts Democrat did not find out that Mr. Boggs had picked him for whip, the No. 3 spot in the Democratic House leadership, until about 10 minutes before it was announced Friday afternoon.

In many respects, Tip O'Neill was the natural choice for the job. As an Easterner, he provided geographical balance to the leadership, the other members of which are from the South and Southwest. As a close friend of the former Speaker, John W. McCormack, he was part of the House Establishment and had for years been part of the so-called "Board of Education," an informal late afternoon gathering of House leaders and their friends.

And, as a former Speaker of the Massachusetts House and as a long-time member of the House Rules Committee, he is considered to be an expert in parliamentary procedure. This should be especially valuable in executing the most important functions of the party whip—rounding up Democratic votes and maneuvering on the House floor.

Politically, Mr. O'Neill describes himself as an "Establishment Liberal." It is an accurate assessment, but he is not so close to the Establishment that he cannot be independent in his views. In 1967, he was one of the first members of Congress to come out strongly against the war in Vietnam, a position that put him sharply at odds with President Johnson and Speaker McCormack.

Thomas Philip O'Neill Jr. was born in Cambridge, Mass., on Dec. 9, 1912. He picked up the nickname "Tip" as a child, after a baseball player named James Edward O'Neill, who had the uncanny knack of hitting foul tips until the pitcher finally walked him.

After graduating from Boston College, Tip O'Neill lost that first race for City Council by 150 votes. But he was never far from politics and was elected to the Massachusetts House in 1936. In 1948, the Democrats gained control of the state house for the first time in more than 100 years and Mr. O'Neill was elected Speaker.

WON KENNEDY'S SEAT

"Being Speaker was the most important thing that ever happened to me," the new House whip said.

In 1952, John F. Kennedy resigned from the House to run for the Senate, and Mr. O'Neill won his seat. At the beginning of his second term, he was named to the Rules Committee, the committee that determines which legislation is called up for debate.

In those days, his five children were young, and he and Mrs. O'Neill, the former Mildred Anne Miller, decided not to take them out of school and move to Washington. So Mr. O'Neill moved into an apartment with Mr. Boland. They have been roommates ever since.

Two of the children, Rosemary, 27 years old, and Susan, 24, now live in the Washington area. Rosemary is in the Public Affairs Office of the State Department and Susan is a teacher in Alexandria, Va. Thomas 3D, 26, is a stockbroker in Boston, and Christopher, 21, and Michael, 19, are students at Boston College.

A hulking man, well over 6 feet tall. Mr. O'Neill, who is 58, became worried about six months ago that he was seriously overweight. He weighed 290 pounds. He signed up for a weightwatchers class near the Capitol. At the first meeting, Mr. O'Neill discovered that he was the only man in a class of dozens of women. But he stuck with the class and lost more than 50 pounds.

STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE QUOTA

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn yesterday from President Nixon's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Ambassador Carl J. Gilbert, that an agreement had been reached by the U.S. and Japanese governments relating to a proposed tariff quota on certain stainless steel flatware. I have been working since 1967 on this problem with officials of the Government and representatives of the domestic industry, particularly INSILCO, and I am pleased that this conclusion has been reached voluntarily. The agreement calls for a tariff quota of 16 million dozen pieces a year for a period of 5 years. This compares with imports of approximately 35 million dozen pieces in 1970, an import rate approximating 60 percent of domestic consumption.

This was welcome news to me and to the people in my State where unemployment has reached staggering figures. More than 850 employees of INSILCO have been laid off and a principal reason has been the competition of foreign imports.

I have had considerable correspondence with President Nixon and with Ambassador Gilbert to recommend the application of the tariff quota on stainless steel flatware and only last week I had talked with Theodore R. Gates, the President's Acting Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to recommend that the negotiations with Japan and other producing countries be pushed to conclusion because of the impact of imports on U.S. employment and sales.

I include the text of a press release issued by the Office of Trade Negotiations:

STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE QUOTA

Ambassador Carl J. Gilbert, President Nixon's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations today announced that the United States had entered into an agreement with the Japanese Government relating to a proposed tariff quota on certain stainless steel flatware. The agreement was completed on February 1, 1971 by an exchange of notes in Washington.

The tariff quota would relate only to stainless steel flatware valued under 25¢ per piece and not over 10.2 inches in overall length. It would provide for an annual tariff quota of 16 million dozen pieces, the current trade agreement rates of duty allocated on a quarterly basis. This level of imports is slightly larger than those of 1968 when total imports reached 14.9 million pieces. Any imports in excess of the tariff quota would be subject to the statutory rates of duty.

The tariff quota would be allocated among supplying countries on the basis of average annual imports from them during 1968 and 1969. The quota would last for five years unless extended and could be increased by the United States by as much as six percent annually.

The negotiations leading to the agreement were held in accordance with Article XXVIII of the GATT. The United States gave notice under the GATT that it was reserving the right to renegotiate its tariff concession on stainless steel flatware and that reservation was invoked in August 1970. Agreement with Japan, the principal supplier of stainless steel flatware to the United States, is the first of several steps to be taken to enable the United States to impose the tariff quota. Additional negotiations are now being conducted with other suppliers. At least 30 days notice will be given before the tariff quota becomes effective.

The provisions of the tariff quota were developed and approved by the Trade Staff Committee composed of representatives from Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, State, Treasury, and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. The negotiations were coordinated through that committee which is chaired by Mr. Allen H. Garland of the Special Representative's Office.

Tariff relief had previously been provided for the stainless steel flatware industry from November 1959 to October 1967. President Johnson permitted the tariff relief to expire in 1967 but requested government agencies to maintain surveillance of the industry to determine if further assistance was needed in the future. Imports of stainless steel flatware that would be covered by the tariff quota have risen drastically since then rising from 14.9 million dozen pieces in 1968 to 26.0 million dozen pieces in 1969 and to approximately 35 million dozen pieces in 1970. The import rate in 1970 is close to 60 percent of domestic consumption.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced four bills which I consider to be of the utmost importance. All four bills concern and would alleviate the rapidly deteriorating conditions in which over 25 percent of our senior citizens find themselves.

I was dismayed—but frankly not surprised—to learn that over one-fourth of Americans over the age of 65 must live on a poverty-level income. Between 1968 and 1969 the number of aged poor rose by 200,000. What promise does America hold for its citizens if they must face the

realization and live with the fear that in their last years they may not afford enough food or sufficient medical care, much less the amenities which would make those years more pleasurable, more relaxing, and most important, more dignified?

I say that I am not surprised at the increasing number of older people who must live on a poverty income, because reports and statistics have been pointing to these conditions for many years. And for many years I have been urging both the increase and liberalization of benefits which would make our social security system a fair and equitable system, one which every citizen could count on to deliver the promise of his country.

Mr. Speaker, the four bills which I have introduced would first, provide an additional across-the-board increase in benefits of 10 percent over and above the increase which we passed as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1963. This would actually constitute the 20-percent increase which I have supported for the last 3 years.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted annually without deductions from benefits. I believe that the \$3,000 figure would reflect more accurately the increase in the cost of living. There are many older persons who can and want to work. Many of the senior citizens are able and willing to put in time with service organizations or private industry and feel that their labor should be compensated. Many others cannot support themselves on their pensions and must supplement their incomes in order to live. I realize that the conferees on last year's social security bill provided for a 5-percent increase in benefits—that is 10 percent over the previous increase. I do not consider this sufficient.

In addition to the previous two bills, I have also introduced legislation today which would give full social security benefits to women at 62 years of age as well as a bill which would liberalize disability conditions of blind persons to receive disability insurance.

I do not consider that these bills will resolve all of the inequities of the social security system. They would resolve, however, some of the more glaring problems. In the next few months I shall introduce additional legislation which would further allow older Americans to live out their lives in dignity, with pride, and with a decent standard of living.

HEART-SAVER SQUADS BILL

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 I introduced H.R. 644, the heart-saver squads bill designed to launch an attack on heart disease, the Nation's prime killer. This bill would amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act in order to provide Federal assistance and encourage local initiative to demonstrate the effectiveness of emergency heart-saver squads for heart attack victims.

These squads would include specially trained persons operating out of specially equipped ambulances which would give emergency care to persons suffering with congestive heart failure. It is estimated that these units could save as many as 60 percent of the 400,000 deaths occurring annually due to coronary artery disease.

In my introductory remarks on this bill, I pointed out the excellent "heartmobile" unit operating in nearby Montgomery County, Md. This unit had been functioning under a 3-year grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and from contributions from private organizations.

I was most distressed to learn from news reports of January 23 that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suddenly canceled the \$100,000 grant for the third year of operating Montgomery County's lifesaving heartmobile. I have been in touch with the Honorable GILBERT GUDE, the Representative from Maryland's Eighth District which includes Montgomery County, and with the county's Heart Association, and offered my support and assistance in helping them reverse the decision to halt Federal funding of the heartmobile.

The grant to the heartmobile had been canceled without justification or explanation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For the people of Montgomery County, this apparently arbitrary cutoff of funds means that the heart-saver unit will cease to be operational as of February 28.

The Montgomery County Heart Association had planned to use the grant to also train all the county's fire and rescue personnel in heart-saver emergency care techniques. Thus, by enlarging the trained paraprofessional staff, emergency coronary care could be provided throughout the county, reaching its approximately 550,000 population.

I want to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) for his prompt efforts to aid the people of Montgomery County. Following a meeting between Congressman GUDE and Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on January 27, it was reported in the Washington Post that Dr. Egeberg will request the necessary Federal funds to continue operation of the heartmobile.

The entire story from the Post follows:

U.S. HEARTMOBILE FUND ASKED

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said yesterday he will request federal money to operate the Montgomery County Heartmobile for another year.

The heartmobile, a vehicle manned by physicians and paramedical personnel, uses special mobile equipment to aid heart attack victims on the way to Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring. It has been in operation for a year, financed as a demonstration project.

Egeberg had announced earlier that cost effectiveness studies indicated that the heartmobile, credited with saving 10 lives in the last year, is not worth continued federal support, which amounted to \$85,000 last year.

Egeberg met yesterday with Rep. Gilbert Gude (R-Md.), who said later he had urged Egeberg to seek about \$125,000 to carry the program another year while local money could be sought for the future.

This tragic situation in Montgomery Country serves as a vivid illustration of the urgent need for congressional action on H.R. 644. Heartmobiles are needed across the length and breadth of this country to reduce the deaths, because emergency care is not available to heart attack victims within the first 60 minutes of their affliction. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of H.R. 644 and provide the Federal mandate for operation of emergency heart-saver ambulances with trained personnel.

Without this bill, another 250,000 Americans will die this year before they can receive the proper treatment for heart failure. Let us act now to end this needless and tragic waste of life.

RELIEF FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is a very little news these days concerning any progress in negotiations between the United States and Japan with reference to the voluntary limitations on textile imports. As a matter of fact, I am curious to know whether or not such negotiations are being conducted by the Department of Commerce at this time. However, there is one thing that I do know, and it is that the depression in the textile industry is worsening.

The Japanese-led import campaign has caused foreign textile imports to jump from 976 million yards in 1959 to more than 4 billion yards in 1970. Textile employment across the Nation dropped, in the past year alone, from 991,000 to 945,000, a decrease of 4.7 percent. In South Carolina, the effects of this have been disastrous. As a recent editorial in the Greenville News has pointed out:

Through the middle of 1970, more than 7,000 textile workers, representing salary losses of \$23.6 million and state revenue of \$633,000, lost their jobs. Indications are that final figures for the year will push the totals much higher. The list of mills closing down or sharply curtailing expensive expansion plans grows longer every day.

This is not the whole picture. Some two-thirds of South Carolina's industrial labor force is employed by textile and textile-related industries. Similarly frightening statistics can also be found to obtain in North Carolina and other States greatly dependent on textiles for their economic well being.

Mr. Speaker, a regionwide, industry-large depression threatens this country if the much needed relief for the domestic textile industry is not promptly brought about. In this connection, it should be remembered that relief for the textile industry was promised by Mr. Nixon in his 1968 campaign, as an election, vote-getting pledge. Support has been coming from the White House, it is true, but it has been lukewarm at best. The President should put himself totally behind the effort at this time. During these next few weeks, while the textile quota legislation is hopefully being processed by the Congress, the President should vigorously push for voluntary import agreements

with Japan and other countries. If such efforts fail, or indicate little promise, then the President should vigorously support the legislative effort of those who are backing the textile quota bill. He should do so in a timely way, so as not to slow the progress of the legislation. He should do so in a practical way, perhaps accepting relief for other industries as a necessary condition of practical politics. If he does not accept a practical approach, then his pledge to help the textile industry "alone" is an empty gesture. The economy of this country demands that both Congress and the administration heed Japanese Premier Sato's wise advice:

In any country, if a certain industry is in trouble, it is natural for that country to take steps to protect that industry.

REPUBLICAN PARTY ENTERS THE WORLD OF 20TH CENTURY ECONOMIC PRACTICE

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

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, these are historic times. We are witnessing the entry of the Republican Party into the world of 20th century economic practice. It has been a breach birth if there ever was one.

In the past few days, a Republican President has announced that he is a converted Keynesian—a Republican administration has submitted what they term an expansionary or full employment budget—and on Monday we received an economic report which indicates that Republicans are at long last conceding that Government must play an active role in the management of the economy.

Without detracting from this great leap forward by the Republican Party, I must say that they are three decades late and considerably more than the proverbial dollar short.

When a Republican President states that he is a converted Keynesian, Lord Keynes, himself, would be the first to realize that it is time to push on, lest he be passed by stragglers.

And this is my point: what is needed now is not merely the adoption of one of the successful economic policies applied by Democrats over the past generation; what is needed is the promulgation of economic policies relevant to the state of the economy in the 1970's.

It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. We Democrats are flattered. It is also said, however, that a little learning is a dangerous thing. We Democrats are worried.

We are worried that our Republican friends have learned—however painfully—only the first chapter of the textbook of enlightened economic policies written by Democratic administrations.

Let me be more specific. The President has made full employment an economic goal. Democrats should applaud this, for full employment has been the goal of our party throughout the 20th century.

Yet full employment is not precisely a self-fulfilling prophecy, even with an expansionary budget. We must also have

adequate manpower and retraining programs. Neither the budget message nor the economic report discuss manpower policy; and last year, the President went so far as to veto manpower legislation.

The administration, moreover, is basing its budget and economic policies on the premise that during the next calendar year the gross national product will grow from \$977 billion to \$1,065 trillion—an incredible 9 percent. I think this forecast is unrealistic, especially since last year the real GNP shrank for the first time in anyone's memory. Democrats know that the road of recovery from Republican recessions is not so easy. I believe the growth rate of the economy will be considerably less than 9 percent. I think Federal revenues will fall short of current estimates. The budget deficit next year, I believe, will be larger than \$11.6 billion.

Last week, it was announced that during the past 2 years, inflation has increased at a rate of more than 11 percent. During 1970, the rate of inflation was 5.5 percent. The December rate of inflation—annualized—was 6 percent, just about as high as it has ever been in our history.

Republicans say that the rate of inflation is declining. What they are really saying, however, is that things are not getting bad quite as fast as they were. They are, however, getting bad at a rapid rate.

Republicans say that this inflation was inherited from the past administration. I think there ought to be a statute of limitations on that kind of argument, and I think we ought to invoke it.

I urge the administration to learn the rest of the economic lessons of the past few decades, particularly those chapters relating to the use of Presidential powers of persuasion to control wage-price spirals.

Republicans, of course, deny all this: They say that their party is a party of bold innovation, and they point with pride to the President's state of the Union address last week.

The rhetorical smoke screen surrounding the "New American Revolution," however, is beginning to dissipate. The American people are beginning to perceive the revenue sharing proposal for what it really is: A Republican shell game in which the cities and States are invited to surrender what little they have in exchange for something considerably less. Other proposals are similarly failing to bear close scrutiny. The "new comprehensive health strategy" turns out to be a vague proposal 3 or 4 years down the road. A \$100 million "total national commitment" to find a cure for cancer turns out to be \$30 million more for the coming year, but hardly what was cut or vetoed in health programs in the past 2 years. And so it goes.

In closing, let me say that the Democratic Party is the genuine party of innovation and bold leadership. Democrats have their eyes on the future. The Republican Party is a party with a mythical past—a time which never existed outside of their imagination. With the reins of Government in their hands, they sit reversed in the saddle, staring at where they have been instead of watching where they are going.

PRESERVING OUR ETHNIC MOSAIC

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

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, most of us, I believe, would identify themselves with the English philosopher Edmund Burke, who, in describing his philosophy of life, said he regarded himself as one "having an ability to reform with a disposition to preserve."

There is an element of this philosophy in the recent trend toward redefining the melting pot concept in America. The old definition was that all incoming minorities lost their identities and became part of the homogenized mass. The alternative definition which I believe is very much in keeping with the American dream, is that the various ingredients each contribute their flavor and make their contribution, yet retain their individual identities.

America at its best represents a symphony of many cultures. Our society can be both interesting and cooperating if people are free to manifest or submerge their ethnic heritage as they choose.

In Detroit's public schools the submerging of ethnic consciousness seemed to work inequity upon those school administrators who would by ability or random selection, be entitled to a wider share of administrative positions. It is a delicate matter. They seemingly have been discriminated against and only the assertion of Slavic ethnicity called attention to their situation. It is an example of the positive use of ethnic consciousness in career matters, which is more difficult to properly focus than is the nonconflict aspect of cultural enjoyment.

I note that the superintendent of Detroit schools has conceded the discrimination. I also understand that the school administration has quietly ordered an ethnic census of its school administrators.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I set forth below a Detroit Free Press editorial of January 21, 1971, "Preserving our Ethnic Mosaic," and an article from the Polish Daily News on the initiative of Kazimierz Olejarczyk, whose action opened the issue for responsible discussion:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 21, 1971]
PRESERVING OUR ETHNIC MOSAIC

The Detroit school system, having tried as valiantly as it has to make blacks feel they are a part of the larger society, could scarcely be less than responsive to the demands of other ethnic groups for equity.

Thus, Dr. Norman Drachler, the superintendent of schools, responded with a simple admission to the complaint of three Slavic groups that they are under-represented in school administrations and faculties. Of one of their complaints, he said, "This is wrong, and it is wrong that we did not know it until it was pointed out to us."

What is happening is that, under pressure of black demands for equity, society is having to realize that it assumed too much about the American "melting pot." This country and this city do have dozens of ethnic groups whose members think of themselves as Americans and Detroiters, but who have not forgotten their distinct ethnic identity and do not wish to forget it.

If there is a place for black pride and for the accommodation of black pride, then there

is a place for accepting as a reality all the other strains that go to make up this city's rich mosaic. They can be fostered and nurtured; they need not conflict with the sense of being part of a larger Detroit community. The idea that the melting pot was going to produce some homogenized, peculiarly American type was a mistake all along.

The school system ought to broaden its efforts to assure that all the elements in this city—including most decidedly the large percentage with a Slavic background—have a stake in the schools. This is doubly essential with the decline in the number of parochial schools, around which some ethnic communities frequently centered their lives. It is an important part of making Detroit a community, and making the schools community schools.

[From the Polish Daily, Detroit, Mich., Jan. 23 and 24, 1971]

POLES, OTHER SLAVS CHARGE BIAS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A survey of the number of children of Polish and other Slavic descent in the enrollment of Detroit's public schools in relation to their representation on the staffs and in the administration of the schools would be made in order to achieve a balance.

Such was the reaction of School Superintendent Norman Drachler following charges of discrimination against the Slavic groups made at a meeting of the Detroit Board of Education Tuesday night.

Kazimierz Olejarczyk, president of the Michigan Division of the Polish American Congress, made the bias charges in a two page prepared statement on behalf of the Congress, the Czechoslovak National Council and the Ukrainian Congress Committee. The text of his statement follows:

The City of Detroit is made up of many different ethnic communities. The multiplicity of groups is the source of much of Detroit's uniqueness and strength. To maintain and develop cultural differences, while avoiding needless conflicts, requires unity of all the people in the city to effectively respond to the challenges of the present school decentralization plan.

Speaking for the Slavic groups (Polish, Ukrainian, Czech and Slovak) I would like to inform the Central Board of Education of the City of Detroit, that the Polish, Ukrainian and Czech groups, the largest ethnic groups in the city, want to share in the decisions which shape their lives and the lives of their children.

To assure the success of the centralization plan, I call upon the Central Board of Education to be more liberal and responsive to the Slavic community and provide opportunity for greater Slavic participation and representation in the decision making positions of the Detroit Public Schools.

Also, speaking for the Slavic groups, I would like to state that ethnic discrimination against the Slavic groups exists in the Detroit Public Schools. To support this statement, I would like to call to the attention of the Board the following facts.

In the General Administration of the Detroit Board of Education (the superintendent assistants to the superintendent, assistant executive superintendents, deputy superintendents, and assistant superintendents) not one member of the Slavic community is represented.

There are eight region superintendents. Of Slavic descent there are none.

There are sixteen region assistants. Of Slavic descent there are none.

To continue not one high school principal is of Polish, Ukrainian, Czech or Slovak descent. In the history of Detroit Public Schools only one high school principal was of Polish descent. That was over 40 years ago. Czech, Slovak and Ukrainian representation in this position is still to be attained.

In the Division of Curriculum and Educa-

tional Research less than 10% of the members are of Slavic descent.

In the office of personnel there are no individuals of Slavic descent.

In the division of school housing, not one director is of Slavic descent.

In the division of School Community Relations the Slavic group is not represented. No attention is given to the Slavic groups although they comprise 30% of the Detroit population.

In the Department Head positions Slavic names are extremely scarce. The number during the past few years has steadily been decreasing even though more positions were made available.

In the official publication of the Detroit Public Schools, the Roster of Key Personnel, the number of Slavic names is less than 3%. And individuals listed occupy only minor positions.

In the naming of schools, in the selection of books for the school libraries, Slavic groups have been especially singled out for discrimination. An examination of the names of the Detroit schools and the library catalog of books available for purchase will readily confirm this observation.

Although the Slavic group is the largest ethnic minority group in the City of Detroit, nevertheless they are by the Detroit Board of Education, the most neglected and ignored group of all the peoples who make up our great City of Detroit. While excellent surveys have been written about other Detroit minorities, the Slavic groups possess not one embracing historical survey concerning their needs and aspirations in the Detroit Public Schools. Ethnic studies in the schools are non-existent. No attempt has been made by the administration to improve the image of the Slavic group of Detroit.

Our demand for participation will be insistent and continuous. Our demand will not be silenced until it is heard. The success of the decentralization plan will be assured only when the Central Board of Education investigates and eliminates the ethnic discrimination which is so blatant in the Detroit Public Schools.

We believe that the Central Board of Education is sincere and dedicated in promoting unity among all the groups in Detroit. We also believe the Board will respond to our just request.

And in conclusion I would like to state that the Polish American Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Czechoslovak National Council of America have always maintained that when the rights of any group are threatened by discrimination, the rights of all are endangered.

KAZIMIERZ OLEJARCZYK,
President, Polish American Congress
Inc.

WILLIAM KOLODCHIN,
President, Ukrainian Congress Com-
mittee of America, Inc.

DR. JAN SKLENAR,
President, Czechoslovak National
Council of America.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, even before the President's 1972 budget message was received by the House, the distinguished majority leader attacked the budget as "a twofold tragedy" which failed to carry out the goals of President Nixon's state of the Union message. I suggested at the time in replying to the distinguished gentleman that his demonstration of speed

reading might excuse the many errors evident in his analysis, and refrained from compounding a truly twofold tragedy by prolonging debate without myself studying the fiscal 1972 budget document in detail.

The distinguished gentleman has doubtless discovered by now how superficial examination of the budget may be misleading. For the information of the House, however, I would like to comment on several of his statements which seem particularly inaccurate.

The gentleman expressed dismay that the President's budget "recommends an appropriation of zero dollars for water and sewer facilities for next year."

First of all, as I pointed out to the gentleman, the new budget doubles the recommendation for Environmental Protection Agency grants for construction of waste treatment facilities from \$1 billion to \$2 billion.

Moreover, the Department of Housing and Urban Development program to which the gentleman referred has not been eliminated but rather phased into a more flexible community development program described on page 333 of the budget. This will permit resources made available to localities for growth and redevelopment to be directed to specific State and municipal needs.

In addition, the \$4 billion special allocation for revenue sharing in fiscal 1972 described on page 502 of the budget would also be available for water and sewer facilities, waste treatment or other high priority needs. In this and other respects the budget reflects the Nixon administration's commitment to broad Federal reform rather than the piecemeal programming of the past. The funds it proposes are sufficient and flexible enough to meet the highest priority requirements as determined by State and local authorities for themselves.

The distinguished majority leader also appears to have been misinformed in his allegation that the budget reduces spending for urban renewal and community development grants. As shown on page 134 outlays and commitments actually are increased in 1972 with increased flexibility to meet specific local needs under the new community development program. Of course, the \$4 billion special allocation of shared revenue to which I previously referred is also available in these areas.

I very much regret the gentleman's charge that President Nixon's budget proposes reduction in the funds for medical facilities, since this need is fundamental to so many Americans. The fact is that the budget proposes a loan program with subsidized interest to replace part of the previous grant program which, if approved by the Congress, will generate many times more construction of medical facilities at a lower cost to the taxpayer. As stated on page 151, the amount proposed for interest subsidies is increased fourfold to \$20 million in fiscal 1972. Only \$5 million was provided for this purpose in fiscal 1971 and this is expected to generate \$166 million in construction loans this year.

Under the fiscal 1972 proposals it will also be possible in some situations to

allow a grant for the matching requirement and make up the difference in a subsidized loan.

President Nixon's proposals will permit the total hospital construction and modernization effort in this country to be increased to a level of \$1 billion by the end of 1972, at the same time making far more efficient use of Federal funds. Once again the \$4 billion special revenue sharing allocation is also available if hospital construction represents the greatest local need.

The distinguished majority leader was correct in his concern for ample funding of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration but he is wrong in concluding that the new budget would reduce these funds. On page 365 the President asks for an increase of \$166 million—31 percent more than in fiscal 1971. Total funds for all law enforcement programs in this budget, as shown on page 564, come to \$1.5 billion as compared to \$1.1 billion of this year. Also, the \$4 billion shared revenue allocation is available in the area of local law enforcement and crime control.

There is no magic in fully funding every item in the Federal budget without regard to what can be effectively used in any one year and without taking into consideration the total Federal budget and the total revenue available. If we were to do this with every item, we would not need any Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as one who served many years on the Committee on Appropriations, I would not describe this budget or any budget as perfect. But this is a responsible budget designed to improve the effectiveness with which we use Federal revenues. This is a reform budget designed to eliminate the helter-skelter administration of Federal grants that has evolved over years of piling Federal program upon Federal program. It is a revolutionary budget designed to allow State, city, and other local governments to direct larger sums of money to specific problems under their own particular priorities. It is a full employment budget designed to deal with the realities of the economic situation, without returning to the inflationary spiral from which we have suffered long enough.

I urge the distinguished majority leader and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle to study the President's budget submission for fiscal 1972 carefully and with open minds so that we may benefit by its innovations and improvements. I do not suggest that we buy every recommendation blindly, but I do strongly urge that we consider them conscientiously.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 11]		
Abbitt	Foley	Myers
Abourezk	Ford.	Nix
Anderson,	William D.	Obey
Tenn.	Frey	O'Neill
Aspin	Fulton, Tenn.	Patman
Baring	Gallagher	Patten
Barrett	Garmatz	Pepper
Betts	Gettys	Pryor, Ark.
Blaggi	Gialmo	Purcell
Blatnik	Grasso	Quie
Boland	Gray	Rallsback
Brasco	Griffin	Rangel
Broomfield	Grover	Roberts
Brotzman	Gubser	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	Rostenkowski
Byrne, Pa.	Harrington	Roy
Caffery	Hathaway	St Germain
Celler	Hawkins	Sandman
Chisholm	Hébert	Scheuer
Clancy	Howard	Shipley
Clark	Hungate	Sisk
Clausen,	Jacobs	Smith, N.Y.
Don H.	Jarman	Snyder
Clay	Jones	Staggers
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton,
Delaney	Kee	J. William
Dellenback	Keith	Steele
Dellums	Kemp	Stubblefield
Diggs	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Dingell	Koch	Sullivan
Donohue	Long, La.	Symington
Dowdy	McCloskey	Talcott
Downing	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Drinan	McDade	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	McDonald,	Ullman
Edwards, La.	Mich.	Waldie
Erlenborn	Mizell	Wiggins
Esch	Morse	Wright
Eshleman	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). On this rollcall 320 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Since this was the first quorum call conducted under the new rules, why is it that tally sheets were not placed at the desk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is within the discretion of the Chair, as to how quorum calls will be conducted; and for the time being we are proceeding under the old rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is it within the knowledge of the Speaker that several additional employees of the House are being sought to take care of papers that may be used at some time in the dim distant future with respect to quorum calls?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, it is not within the knowledge of the present occupant of the chair, but it is entirely possible that help will be required.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 396(i) of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, as amended, I hereby transmit the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting covering the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1971.

THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE PROGRAM—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In this first year of the new decade, we have been working to establish a firm basis for a balanced national aeronautics and space program which is compatible with our national priorities, goals and resources and which insures continuing progress throughout the decade. 1970 has been a year of transition from past successes to new challenges.

The activities of our space program during the year are consistent with the recommendations I made in March for a balanced space program. Our goals are continued exploration, scientific knowledge and practical applications. The technology acquired through our space programs has many practical applications on earth ranging from communications, meteorology and navigation to agriculture, education and transportation.

Specific objectives guide our space endeavors. We should continue to explore the moon and increase the scientific return on the investment in the Apollo program. We should also continue to explore the planets of our solar system and the universe. We must strive to reduce the cost of space operations. We should try to expand our knowledge of man's ability to perform productively in the hostile environment of space and to relate this knowledge to uses here on earth. We must apply space-related technology to the critical assessment of our environment and to the effective use of our resources. We should also promote international cooperation in our space program by pursuing joint space ventures, exchanging scientific and technical knowledge, and assisting in the practical application of this knowledge. We are greatly encouraged by European interest in joining us in cooperative post-Apollo planning.

From our aeronautics activities have come substantial contributions to continued U.S. pre-eminence in civil aviation, major improvements in aeronautical services, and impressive developments in a sound SST program. This year has seen the initiation of new military aeronautics programs that will enhance our national security. We must

consider other new means to insure that our national aeronautics program is given the opportunity and encouragement to contribute to our national well-being.

I am pleased to transmit to Congress this report of our national aeronautics and space activities during 1970. I take this opportunity to express my admiration for the men and women whose devotion, courage and creativity have made our aeronautics and space progress a source of national pride.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1971.

PROPOSED FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-41)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my State of the Union message, one of the six great goals that I proposed to the Congress was a renewal of the Federal Government itself through a sweeping reorganization of the executive branch. The structural changes I outlined would enable us to bring greater coherence to the management of Federal programs, and to raise them to a new level of effectiveness. But even the best of structures requires the effective utilization of highly qualified people. The need for the best people and for making the best use of their talents, becomes more vital as we improve the structure and organization of the Federal Government.

It is on our Federal executives—both career and non-career—that the task of translating broad public policy into operational reality rests most heavily. These men and women are among the most valuable resources that we have as a government. We must not use them wastefully. We must not let their talents and their dedication be squandered. And we must constantly seek better ways of attracting into the executive ranks of the Federal service new people with the capacity and the drive to help us meet our national needs.

The time has come, therefore, to take a critical look at the existing Federal system for selecting, training, assigning and rewarding executive manpower, and to see whether it cannot be improved. We have carried out such an examination, and have concluded that it can be significantly improved by incorporating principles of modern personnel management.

For some time now, the Government's executive manpower systems have shown increasing evidence of weakness. The present arrangements have grown up over the years without any comprehensive plan. Disparate systems for the authorization, appointment, and assignment of Government executives have prevented

adequate planning and provision for constantly changing requirements. The resulting complexities and rigidities have reached a point at which it is now futile to try to patch the present structure further. Too often, the present system serves only to frustrate the conscientious agency head and the dedicated career executive alike.

At my request, the Civil Service Commission has completed a painstaking and systematic analysis of the existing manpower management programs for executives. The Commission has informed me that reforms are essential, reforms that cannot be made within existing law. I agree. Accordingly, I recommend legislative action to establish an entirely new personnel system for upper-level officials of the executive branch, to be called the Federal Executive Service.

This Service would apply to those persons—now about 7,000 in all—serving in executive branch positions presently established at grades GS-16, 17, and 18, or within the same pay range under several other salary systems. It is designed to meet the special needs of managing the Federal establishment, and at the same time to preserve and strengthen merit principles.

In order to accomplish these purposes, the legislation I am proposing would:

- Abolish the present so-called supergrade system and establish the Federal Executive Service, to include both career and non-career officials. Preserving the present ratio, it would establish a minimum of 75 percent career appointments and a maximum of 25 percent non-career appointments.
- Establish a general salary range (from about \$28,000 to the equivalent of level V, now \$36,000), within which the agency head can set the salary of each individual member, provided that he maintains an average salary for all members of the Federal Executive Service employed by his agency as established annually by the Civil Service Commission after collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget.
- Require the appointment of Qualification Boards to pass on the eligibility, under merit standards, of all persons selected for future entry into the Federal Executive Service as career members. Holders of present supergrade positions and persons chosen for non-career appointment to the Federal Executive Service would be exempt from this requirement.
- Provide that new entrants into the career system be employed under renewable three-year agreements, and give present holders of career type supergrade executive positions the choice of entering the new Service under the renewable three-year agreements or retaining their present positions and salaries.
- In the case of a career Federal executive whose employment agreement expires without being extended (whether because renewal was not offered by the agency, or because the executive chose not to accept

the renewal offered), the legislation would provide for either severance pay, retirement, or reversion to the top grade of the Classification Act (GS-15) without reduction in pay from his previous level for a period of two years.

—Provide for the Civil Service Commission, after collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget, to establish annually maximum numbers and average salary for members of the Federal Executive Service in each agency, taking into account program priorities, level of work, work load, and budget allowances for the agency concerned.

To assure proper, periodic Congressional review of the operation of the Federal Executive Service the proposed legislation would also require the Civil Service Commission to make an annual report to the Congress on April 1, detailing the number of Federal Executive Service members it proposes to allow each agency for the coming year and the average salary level it proposes to set for each agency. At the same time, the Commission would report any variances it had allowed during the previous year under its statutory authority to meet emergency needs or provide for needs occasioned by changes in existing programs. If the Congress did not make any changes within the 90-day period, the Commission's proposed authorizations would take effect.

By establishing eminent Qualifications Boards, composed of highly respected professionals, to review the qualifications of all persons proposed for entry into career positions, this legislation would ensure the continued high quality of Federal career executives and enhance the prestige associated with executive service in the Federal Government.

By differentiating clearly, for appointment and retention purposes, between executives who make the Federal service their career and those appointed for brief periods, it would preserve the integrity of the career service.

By providing for renewable, fixed-term agreements for career executives, it would give agency heads the flexibility needed to use their high-level personnel most effectively in meeting the changing demands made on the Federal Government.

By giving him access to positions of high responsibility without jeopardizing his career rights, it would enlarge the horizons of the individual career executive. One of the many faults of the present system is that it results too often in bunching non-career officials at the top, with career officials relegated to lower positions. This new proposal would strengthen executive development programs and reduce the present obstacles to executive mobility.

By providing for an annual assessment of executive manpower requirements in relation to program activity in each agency, it would make it possible to respond promptly to changing needs and to eliminate wasteful overstaffing of low-priority programs.

In addition, it would give the Congress annually a comprehensive overview of Federal executive manpower programs and policies, an indispensable measure

for ensuring the exercise of Congressional responsibilities in monitoring the use of this manpower resource in partnership with the executive branch.

The Federal Executive Service proposal has been designed to ensure against an increase in the partisan political component of the executive group. It is to this end that I am recommending retention of the approximate present ratio of career to non-career executives—a ratio that has proved an effective one during several administrations of both political parties. I feel that it is imperative that we strengthen the career service and make Government careers more rewarding to individuals of high ability. This proposal will materially serve that end.

The proposed new Federal Executive Service would result in simplification of the existing fragmented system. But its most important result would be to improve the capacity of the executive branch to meet the challenges of our democratic system. Freed from unnecessary obstacles and from much redtape, the career executives of the Federal Government would be better able to realize their potential, both personally and in terms of program accomplishment. At the same time those responsible for agency performance would be given sufficient authority over the selection and use of their most able manpower to meet their agencies' goals more fully and more efficiently.

The demands upon Government today are great and pressing. I am convinced that the Government has attracted, and will continue to attract, men and women of the highest caliber. But too often we have enmeshed them in a web of rigid and intricate personnel policies which have frustrated their efforts and arrested their professional growth.

We need both dedication and high performance from our Federal executives. Mere competence is not enough. Mere continuity is self-defeating. We must create an environment in the Government service in which excellence and ingenuity can flourish—and in which these qualities are both encouraged and rewarded.

It is to this end that I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this landmark legislation.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1971.

CONFUSION IN THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a remark to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am confused about your fiscal management of the country. Last year, on January 27, 1970, you stated:

The inflation we have at the start of the Seventies was caused by heavy deficit spending in the Sixties. In the past decade, the Federal Government spent more than it took in—\$57 billion more. These deficits caused prices to rise 25 percent in a decade.

That is why I ordered Federal spending cuts this year.

You also stated, Mr. President, that the projected surplus for the current year, fiscal year 1971, would be \$3.1 billion. Last Thursday you filed a budget document showing that your administration borrowed \$2.8 billion in the last year, fiscal year 1970, and you diverted \$10 billion from the trust funds for a 1970 total deficit of \$13 billion.

Last week, instead of a \$3.1 billion surplus for the current fiscal year, fiscal year 1971, you showed a deficit of \$18.5 billion plus a diversion from the trust funds of \$7 billion, for a total 1971 deficit of \$25 billion.

For fiscal 1972, as opposed to your planned surplus for 1971, you are apparently planning on a \$11.5 billion deficit and are also planning on borrowing \$11.5 billion from the trust funds, for a total of \$23 billion, or a total deficit of \$61 billion.

Mr. President, I am confused as to how you intend to control inflation.

CONVERSION OF BIOLOGICAL WARFARE FACILITIES TO PEACEFUL USES

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable gratification that I received the recent announcement that the biological warfare facilities at Pine Bluff, Ark., will be converted into a national center for research into the effect of chemicals on man.

The conversion of the Pine Bluff Arsenal to peaceful uses was a major recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments in its report on "Chemical-Biological Warfare: U.S. Policies and International Effects."

Following extensive hearings on the subject of CBW, the subcommittee concluded that every effort should be made to retain former biological warfare facilities and personnel, turning them to the solution of environmental problems for the benefit of all Americans and, indeed, all mankind.

In making its recommendation the subcommittee said:

Personnel and facilities at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and Fort Detrick, Maryland, constitute valuable resources for our Nation in the stepped-up campaign against environmental pollution, ecological hazards and dangers to human beings from chemical and bacteria. Beyond national benefits to be obtained from turning those facilities to peaceful pursuits, our Nation stands to gain worldwide repute by making available internationally the knowledge and techniques developed there.

I have written the President to commend him for his decision to turn the Pine Bluff Arsenal to peaceful pursuits, and for his earlier announcement that the United States would renounce the use of biological weapons and would destroy existing stocks.

At the same time I urged his personal intervention in the decision on the future

of Fort Detrick. It is my understanding that, to date, no final plans have been made for the use of that installation. It, like Pine Bluff Arsenal, should be turned to work related to health and the environment.

Many of our colleagues in the Maryland delegation have been working tirelessly to that end, and I am happy to have had an opportunity to add my endorsement to their efforts.

The article on the Pine Bluff conversion, which appeared in the January 28 New York Times, follows:

GERM WAR CENTER ASSIGNED NEW ROLE

WASHINGTON, Jan. 27.—President Nixon announced today that the biological warfare facilities at the Pine Bluff, Ark., would be converted into a national center for research into the effects of chemicals on man.

The announcement said the Pine Bluff Arsenal would be used to complete the destruction of biological warfare weapons and would then be turned over to the Food and Drug Administration for use as a national center for toxicological research.

The transition is expected to take about a year.

On Nov. 25, 1969, President Nixon renounced the use of biological weapons and ordered destruction of all existing stocks. The Pine Bluff Arsenal was the principal production facility for these weapons.

The White House announcement today said the new center would concern itself with developing "better approaches to the understanding of what the data acquired from experimental animals means for man" and would be used to evaluate chemicals in man's surrounding, such as pesticides, food additives and therapeutic drugs.

The announcement said experiments on animals to determine the effects of long exposures of low doses of chemical would be one function of the new center.

AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. Speaker, the American Advertising Federation is currently holding its government affairs conference here in Washington. I take this time to salute my fellow practitioners of this honorable profession who constantly strive to improve the ethics and standards of business.

I take this opportunity to speak a word in behalf of advertising, and to express concern about the antibusiness attitude which seems to be in vogue among certain restless and well-meaning people searching for a cause.

I feel strongly that advertising, as an essential part of business, must sharpen its awareness to the attacks which are being launched on business from several fronts. Advertising is an important function of business. It is important because its promotion of goods and products has been the impetus behind the growth of a free enterprise system which has surpassed all others in history.

Most advertising people that I know would not move an inch to defend false or misleading advertising, or other bad business practices. No one with any sense would.

Unfortunately, however, the attacks on business and its various arms, such as advertising, are going beyond the limits of reasonableness and all of us must be convinced of the necessity for defending the basic system of our free enterprise society. Under the guise of consumer interest, business is being tarred in a manner which, at times, almost makes one think that business and industry are un-American. Sure, there are problems in our industrial life. But it is still the lifeblood of the Nation. And it is the one segment of our society that is providing the people with the goods and services they need and want. I would be the first to acknowledge that every item off every production line is not perfect and that we all should be striving to improve quality.

But, with all of the faults within the business community, I ask you, does it rate the type of abuse which is being heaped upon it? I, for one, think not.

A couple of decades ago a man in the U.S. Senate became famous, or perhaps infamous is a better word, for the tactics he used in pursuit of his own pet ends. He made broad and damaging accusations, leveled unfounded and unproven charges against individuals and organizations. There often was a degree of truth in what he said. But that small seed of truth too often was exploded, bent, twisted and embellished until it became a vicious half-truth. It generally left its victim scarred and defenseless and without a platform from which to defend himself. I am sure you all remember it. The tactic became so refined it took on the name of its propagator.

Today, business is being hit with a newer and even more refined strategy. This one could justly be called Naderism. I realize that speaking of Ralph Nader in anything but reverential tones nowadays is somewhat less than a popular undertaking. As a matter of fact, he has all the earmarks and the trappings of a sacred cow. As an observer of the business scene today, it is obvious that many of Nader's charges are specious and unfounded. As a matter of fact, rather than being a sacred cow, a better description would be "bull."

Perhaps I would not speak thusly of Nader without the personal confidence that during my years in Congress I have been as staunch an advocate of consumer's rights as any man. And I will continue to do so anytime I find the public being abused or the consumer being deceived. The difference between Mr. Nader and myself, apparently, is that I believe we can correct abuses without tearing down our entire free enterprise system or weakening the economic structures which support it.

Furthermore, I do not believe his efforts are always constructive nor do his tactics always seem to indicate a devotion to fairplay. I have noted with interest that his offensives generally begin with a release to the press, leaving the companies or persons being criticized in the position of having to play catch-up ball to get their side of the story told. You probably read of his assault last week on the president of New York University. In this case, he sent a letter to the educator on Sunday and released it

to the press on Monday. When the press called Dr. Hester, what else could he do but decline comment since he had not seen the letter. But the story made headlines. And I might add that there seems to be no end to his expertise. I often am amazed that he and his raiders can spend weeks or months studying a company or industry and come up with solutions to problems that experts with years of experience have been wrestling with day-in-day-out. I suspect one reason for this is that Mr. Nader has a singleness of purpose that a responsible businessman cannot afford. The businessman must weigh the effects of his actions on his firm, his employees, and even on the economy.

I applaud crusades aimed at curing specific ills or deficiencies. But, as I said, I cannot condone throwing the baby out with the bathwater as often seems the case. It is sufficient, it seems to me, to call attention to, and make strong efforts to correct defects in automobiles if they place the consumer in jeopardy or do not function as they should. In my mind, however, it goes beyond a consumer crusade to try to destroy the entire industry which has produced thousands upon thousands of automobiles for the American public, which has provided high wage employment, and has become one of the mainstays of the economy.

I read a copy of the letter Mr. Nader sent to Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee and to Chairman HART of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last December 23 complaining that no one has taken action to break up General Motors and Ford. This letter summoned up all sorts of diabolical and political reasons why such action had not been taken. Perhaps, I can add two additional reasons. It is not sensible or logical. I suspect Mr. Nader has some very personal reasons for wanting to get at General Motors, without regard to its effect upon the economy.

It is not just a case of trying to break up GM that bothers me, though. It is this whole trend toward making business the goat for all of our problems. Of late it almost seems to be sport to shout that business, and particularly big business, is bad. I will readily admit that big business is one of the establishments in American life. But let us not forget for a minute that it gained that position by "establishing" itself over the years as a solid economic base for the growth of our country. Large corporations did not just spring up in this country overnight despite the fact that some crusaders feel they should be dismantled in that time span. They were built slowly and arduously. And only in response to the demands for more of the things that make ours the highest standard of living in the world. This may sound like a lot of flag waving but it is not. It is the story of American business and all of us should be quick to defend it against blithe attacks by so-called crusaders. We should be quick to speak out against such assaults no matter where they arise and—to my dismay—they are beginning to come from some pretty high places.

Unfortunately, all the attacks on business are not from outsiders or so-called

raiders or crusaders. The Government gets its oar in, too. For example, if you listen to the philosophy being espoused by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department these days, you hear some of the same type of pronouncement that Nader uses—"Bigness is Bad." Indeed they have not merely made noises in this direction but have sought to inflict this belief on the courts. So far they have been imminently unsuccessful, thank goodness. I have the impression that Mr. Nader and Mr. McLaren, who heads the Antitrust Division, are something of "kindred spirits" in their devotion to tearing down big business.

I bring this subject up before this group because I know that advertising has received more than its share of unjust criticism. But I ask advertising to remember it is just one arm of business and it is up to it not only to come to its own defense but to take up the cause for business as a whole. Advertising people know what business and industry do for America. They are in a sensitive area of business and know full well what happens to the whole economic structure when business suffers as a result of unthinking attacks.

I would not expect everyone in business to ride the highways and byways like Paul Revere shouting "The raiders are coming." But I would expect a few business people to take a stand at the bridge and fire a few volleys at the approaching enemy. I am happy to do so today.

THE PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUNDHOG

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at 7:29½ this morning the real weather vane of the next 6 weeks; namely, the Punxsutawney groundhog, made his appearance, saw his shadow, and immediately returned to his burrow.

Now, I realize that there are many fakes around the country who have tried to move in on the Punxsutawney groundhog, wishing to take his place as the Nation's foremost weather forecaster. But just to show you that the Punxsutawney groundhog, wherever he is located, is a real prognosticator of the weather, last fall I had transported here to Washington one of his progenies and lo and behold at 7:29½ this morning on the Capitol grounds he came out of his hibernation, saw his shadow, and has returned. I regret to inform you folks that you should not put away your long underwear nor your asafetida bag because the next 6 weeks, according to Punxsutawney "Phil," will be cold, cold, cold.

PROGRESS IN THE NATIONAL FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

(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, it is important that progress in the national fight against crime be brought to the attention of the Congress and the American people. The 1970 crime

report for the District of Columbia represents such progress.

For the first time in memory, crime statistics show that crime in the Nation's Capital decreased from the previous year. The 5.2-percent decline in serious crimes is a direct result of our anticrime measures, including tough new laws and more policemen on the beat.

I served on the District of Columbia Committee in the 91st Congress for the express purpose of supporting President Nixon's anticrime legislation. These initiatives, including many provisions to speed criminal justice and to end discrimination against the economically deprived, should strengthen further the forces of law and justice against destructive criminal activity.

I am satisfied that the approach used successfully in the District of Columbia can produce progress in our fight to control crime. Every citizen can take heart at this evidence that the upward spiral of crime is not inevitable.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX PROPOSAL

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week the Commissioner of the District of Columbia presented a proposed budget for the District to the District of Columbia City Council which included a proposal to tax Virginia and Maryland residents who are employed in the District of Columbia. He estimated that this new tax on commuters would bring a revenue gain to the District of \$51.6 million each year and mean a net revenue loss of \$28 million to the State of Maryland and \$17 to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Justification for this tax was offered on the basis of studies apparently done by the District of Columbia Budget Office which indicated that "reciprocity" such as he proposed already existed between Maryland and 24 other States, and between Virginia and some 29 other States. These studies, by whomever they were done, are totally inaccurate, and indicate a misunderstanding of the reciprocity which does exist between Maryland and Virginia and, in the case of Virginia, a total of nine, not 29, jurisdictions including the District of Columbia.

Under reciprocal agreements between the Commonwealth of Virginia and Arizona, California, Idaho, Kentucky, Maryland, New Mexico, Vermont, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a person is considered to be a resident of a State if he has lived in the State more than one-half year, or 183 days, and his income tax is paid to the State in which he lived. The State in which he may have lived for a shorter period than 183 days yields its rights to tax him on income unless his tax in that State would be greater than it is in his State of actual residence, and, should this be the case, the State where he has lived less than a year would only tax him for the difference.

In all cases, reciprocity is based on the right of a State in which a person lives, not where he works, to tax his income to provide for essential community services.

Virginia residents, who live in Virginia more than 183 days a year, are taxed on all their income regardless of where the income is earned. What the District proposes to do is to impose a second tax on any income they earn in the District of Columbia, assuming that the State of Virginia will give them credit against their own income tax in their own State for taxes paid to the District. It is true that Virginia can and does in some cases give credit to Virginia residents for taxes paid elsewhere. But Virginia need not necessarily do so. In the case of the District of Columbia, Virginia took special action in the State legislature only 6 years ago to make it unnecessary for District residents working in Virginia to file income tax returns in Virginia, and under the present reciprocal working agreement employees of District residents withhold District income taxes for their employees and the District employers withhold Virginia taxes for their Virginia employees. Interestingly enough, this was done after appeals from District residents about the unnecessary and time-consuming necessity for filing returns in two locations when they would, because of reciprocity, be eligible for a refund in their place of employment and liable for tax on their full income in their place of residence. This arrangement would be scrapped by the Commissioner's proposal, and every commuter, regardless of his residence, would be required to file two tax returns in addition to his Federal tax return. Further, if either Maryland or Virginia refused, as they can, to credit residents with any tax paid to the District of Columbia, suburban commuters would be subjected to double taxation, and the fight to the suburbs for tax relief would be hard to imagine.

The Commissioner has called his budget a "barebones" budget, yet he offers no alternative source of revenue for this \$51.6 million he hopes to receive from suburban commuters. If it is, indeed, a tight and sound budget, it is unbelievable that there would be no alternative source of revenue proposed for a sum as substantial as \$51.6 million. If he offers no alternative, and Congress refuses, as it will, to give him this taxing authority, he faces the obvious cuts by the Congress, possibly in areas of most importance to him and to the District of Columbia. If he has exhausted all other areas of taxing the residents and businesses of the District of Columbia, and has presented the Council with the tightest budget he can offer, then he should scrap this ridiculous proposal, announce that he must have that \$51.6 million in additional revenue, and seek it from the Congress as an added increase, over and above the \$27 million increase he is asking, in the Federal payment to the District.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported the District in its efforts to obtain sufficient revenue to finance its essential operations. I know the city is in financial trouble, as are cities and suburbs across the Nation. If the District budget

presented to Congress is as tight as it can be; if all sources of revenue have been explored and the residents and businesses of the District are carrying a tax burden comparable or heavier than that of the surrounding communities, I will fight for a Federal payment sufficient to continue its operations even if it is as high as the \$75 million-plus more than the \$126 million authorized for this year. Realistically speaking, though, we must acknowledge that every city, county, and State has to operate for less if revenue is not available, just as every family can adjust its standard of living to its income if it is to survive. I submit, therefore, that it is incumbent on the Commissioner to go back to his Budget Office to see if and where he can make cuts where it will hurt the least, so that the budget when it comes to Congress will be in fact the bare bones budget the Congress expects. Again I say I will support the amount necessary to finance the District of Columbia, but I believe Congress should demand more responsibility from the District government than alleged total dependence for survival on an inequitable, unworkable, and unobtainable commuter tax.

WELL-BEING OF THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the well-being of the environment has come to be a major issue of the 20th century. Every man, woman, and schoolchild is concerned lest this magnificent planet on which we all live shall in our time or our children's time, because of man's own pollution, become a place as uninhabitable and desolate as our astronauts have found the moon to be.

Because the environment may be defined as all that is outside ourselves, man has perforce been managing, for better or for worse, the environment since before written history. What is really emerging as the burning issue of our times is the question of how wisely we have managed the environment. We are able to see now that all of our past activities impacting the environment, utilizing it, altering it, have produced significant effects. Today we realize that the induced effects have not always produced a net benefit and in many instances have been completely destructive.

The Federal Government has for over a half century recognized the need for measures to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment. But only in recent years have these efforts been accelerated and the gravity of the situation officially acknowledged. Moneys have been spent and laws passed. Institutional arrangements have been adjusted and serious planning has been proposed for the future stewardship of our national resources.

Today at the outset of the 92d Congress, it is time to look at these efforts in an atmosphere of cold calculation without hysteria and to appraise them; it is time to look toward the future and evaluate the requirements for funds to

complete our self-assigned task of pollution abatement; and it is time to think about the most efficient social and institutional framework to provide for the kind of environment we want for ourselves and for our children.

A REVIEW OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO CURB POLLUTION

In order to appraise myself of the tasks before this Congress to curb further pollution of our environment, I have made a thorough study and a complete review of all past legislation in this field, including past appropriations and future requirements for further appropriations, insofar as such requirements could be identified. I request that significant portions of this study be appended to my remarks.

It seems fairly clear to me from my study that past Congresses have taken very significant steps to establish a sound, adequate body of regulatory laws to curb the pollution of our environment by the Federal Government, State governments, private industries, public utilities, and the individual citizen.

Beginning with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which contained several sections prohibiting the discharge of refuse other than liquids from streets or sewers into navigable waters without a permit from the Corps of Engineers, the body of regulatory laws to control pollution of our environment has grown significantly. While legislation until very recent times dealt with water rather than air or land pollution, today this body of regulatory law is most complete and affects a variety of controls over every aspect of man's existence.

We have established laws which not only provide for stringent standards of water quality, by prohibiting the pollution of our streams, rivers, lakes, and oceans by industries, governments, utilities and people, but we also have established similar regulatory laws to curb pollution of our air and land resources. Under these laws, provided they are properly administered and funded, the American people can expect an automobile that is relatively pollution free by 1975; stream, rivers, and lakes that will be clearer and cleaner than they were when our country was only inhabited by the American Indian; and methods for disposing of our garbage and waste from both humans and industry which will additionally yield usable heat, power and by other by-products. We can also be reasonably assured that man's technological creations, such as the jet aircraft, will not disrupt our delicately balanced life-giving atmosphere, and will also be able to operate at lower noise levels than current air vehicles. Moreover, by a combination of ecological engineering and development and production of pollution-free automobiles, buses and trucks integrated with expanded use of rapid-rail urban transport systems, we will not only be able to preserve and improve our present transport systems, but will be able to expand man's ability to move about our cities, suburbs and countryside more economically and efficiently, with a reduced impact on our total environment. As the Congress is well aware, it is of utmost importance that our peoples win this battle of air-pollution, not only to

preserve our health and the health of our children and their children, but we must win this battle to maintain a vast economy which brings the very bread to our mouths. We must also win it to permit our people to remain as free men, unhindered by restrictions which would by necessity, if such development does not take place, force us to adopt life styles and confine us to living in highrise dwellings along railroad tracks, unable to travel freely to work or play.

MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Another problem which remains to be solved by the Congress is to determine whether the current management system employed by the Federal Government to implement the laws passed by Congress will get the job accomplished. Certainly we have in the past established enough agencies or subagencies within the Government to examine and identify our environmental problems. However, until very recent times we have done relatively little to focus these agencies into a logical direction which could supervise the regulatory laws we have enacted, the research we have authorized or the funds we have appropriated to improve our environment. We did manage in the last Congress to enact the National Environmental Policy Act to create a Council on Environmental Quality to establish a national policy on environment. Also, the executive branch recognized its own management problems and by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970 brought most of these separate agencies under the Environmental Protection Agency. Certainly, further examination of this management problem is necessary and should be closely and continuously examined by the Congress. We should also bring our own house in order and pass legislation establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on the Environment to give the Congress a complete overview of our national problems in this most vital field.

A PARTICULAR MANAGEMENT PROBLEM: POLLUTION IN THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

An example of a type of management problem facing the Congress is the establishment of a more efficient means of providing water and sewage treatment for the National Capital region. The responsibility for establishing and maintaining such a system stems directly from the Constitution of the United States.

The Potomac River Basin has a long and distinguished history of freedom from detrimental factors. The first basin-wide problem to make itself evident was water pollution. The need to deal with this problem led to the first basinwide activities other than scientific studies. Soil conservation practices for sediment control were instituted in the 1930's and in 1940 the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin—Incopot—was formed by compact among Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Incopot's powers are only advisory in relation to State and community action against pollution, and it has never been generously financed. In spite of its efforts, along with those of several Federal and State agencies, pollution of the Potomac has increased together with an

evermore precarious situation of water supply. Today we have a situation wherein the Potomac River in the area of the Nation's Capital is unfit for swimming because of excessive bacteria; the water is rendered unsightly by mats of algae supported by excessive nutrients; sludge beds cover the river bottom; the oxygen content of the water is depleted, excluding desirable fish life; and in general the river is seriously degraded.

Coupled with this is the fragility of our water supply because of limited storage capacity. At times in the last few years, the Washington area was within several days of water use restrictions.

It is apparent, then, that the whole water supply and pollution control situation in the Potomac River Basin as it impacts the Washington area must be considered on a regional basis and that institutional arrangements must be made to permit wise management of our water resource. The District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1970 provides for this in section 704. This section calls for a study which will produce legislative recommendations concerning: First, the water pollution problems of that part of the Potomac River located within the Washington metropolitan area; second, the water resources of the Potomac River for that area; third, the problems relating to the provision of adequate facilities for

water, sewer, and related services for the area; and fourth, most importantly, the establishment of an independent regional entity to control and resolve the water pollution problems, to regulate and control the water resources of the area, and to provide such services to the various jurisdictions of the area at reasonable cost.

This study also will contain specific legislative recommendations as to the amount of funding necessary to establish and maintain such a regional entity, recommendations as to what functions now performed by Federal and District of Columbia entities should be transferred to the new regional entity, and guidance for the actual mechanics of effecting this proposed transfer of functions. This study is being performed by the newly formed Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Department of Interior, the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. It is expected that much of the information for this report will be extracted from the numerous previous studies performed by these various participants in the past and will form the best basis for the recommendations which will guide the creation of a new Metropolitan Regional Authority. This report will be submitted on March 31, 1971, to the Congress.

The conference report pertaining to the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1970—House Report 91-1672—discussed the state of affairs that demanded this new approach to water supply and pollution control in the metropolitan Washington area. The need for the establishment of a regional authority is carefully spelled out and expressed fully the complexity of the current situation, a situation which will only get worse unless bold, innovative action is not taken in the near future.

PRIOR FUNDING OF NATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

It is readily apparent that the task of abating pollution is neither simple nor cheap. Assuming that technology is available or will become available as needed, the factors of cost versus benefit must be evaluated. Most of us feel that we appreciate the benefits of a clean environment and that effort must be made to preserve and enhance the world in which we live. But, as in so many other human endeavors, availability of resources influences both our aspirations and our achievements. The table I below indicates funding over the years 1965 through 1971 for the three major pollution control agencies. Projections are shown for the years 1972 and 1973 to indicate present authorizations:

TABLE I.—FEDERAL FUNDING FOR POLLUTION CONTROL—FEDERAL WATER QUALITY ADMINISTRATION, NATIONAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF SOLID WASTES

[In millions of dollars]

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	Total
Water:										
Authorized	110	175.0	215.0	581.0	836.0	1,190.0	1,420.0	(¹)	(¹)	4,527.0
Appropriated	130	187.0	235.0	296.0	303.0	886.0	1,120.0			3,257.0
Air:										
Authorized	25	30.5	46.0	109.0	185.0	179.0	200.0	350	450	1,574.5
Appropriated	21	27.0	36.0	62.0	80.0	102.0	114.0			442.0
Solid wastes:										
Authorized		7.0	14.0	19.2	20.0	19.8	41.5	*172	*238	531.5
Appropriated		4.4	12.4	13.4	15.2	15.4	19.4			79.9
Totals for period:										
Authorized										6,633.0
Appropriated										3,778.9

¹ Pending legislation. ² Includes Bureau of Mines.

In addition to these sums, construction grants have been supplied by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture for the development of basic water and sewer facilities in rural areas and by the Office of Resources Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for water and sewer facilities in cities. These funds are separated out from the above table because of their application for a water supply as well as for pollution abatement. In fiscal year 1970, the Farmers

Home Administration was appropriated \$46 million for other purposes. This amount was increased to \$100 million in fiscal year 1971. The fiscal year 1970 appropriation for the Office of Resources Development water and sewer program was \$135 million; increased to \$350 million in fiscal year 1971.

Other Federal agencies also expend considerable sums for pollution control and abatement. The following three tables—tables II, III and IV—reproduced

from the First Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality, "Environmental Quality," show these expenditures in detail. Note in table II that the total budget authority in fiscal year 1971 is \$4.8 billion. This does not include any authorizations established after July 1970, thus the actual figure is somewhat greater. It is also interesting to note that 19 agencies are identified as having major roles in pollution control.

The tables follow:

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDING FOR POLLUTION CONTROL AND ABATEMENT PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEARS 1969-71 BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY

[In millions of dollars]

Type of activity	Budget authority			Obligations			Outlays		
	1969	1970	1971	1969	1970	1971	1969	1970	1971
I. Assistance for State, interstate, and local governments ¹	289	887	4,089	312	626	1,336	217	255	649
(a) Funds for capital investments; e.g., treatment facilities	232	825	4,020	256	564	1,265	170	199	580
(b) Funds for operations of pollution control agencies	36	30	45	35	39	46	25	35	45
(c) Technical assistance	21	23	25	21	23	25	22	21	24
II. Research, development, and demonstration ¹	319	319	346	330	332	361	292	317	339
(a) Primarily for pollution control and abatement	249	241	267	253	251	277	220	242	259
(b) For some other primary purpose but contributing to pollution control and abatement	70	78	79	77	81	84	72	75	80
III. Monitoring and surveillance ¹	49	46	50	48	46	51	48	46	51
(a) Primarily for pollution control and abatement	41	38	40	40	38	41	40	38	41
(b) For some other primary purpose but contributing to pollution control and abatement	8	8	10	8	8	10	8	8	10
IV. Standards promulgation and enforcement	23	27	32	22	28	32	22	26	31
V. Manpower development	17	18	19	16	18	19	17	17	18

Type of activity	Budget authority			Obligations			Outlays		
	1969	1970	1971	1969	1970	1971	1969	1970	1971
VI. Remedial actions to control pollution at Federal facilities.....	50	88	130	77	108	153	63	103	144
VII. Other:									
(a) Program administration and education.....	25	31	30	22	29	30	19	20	33
(b) Direct actions by AEC to control pollution from radioactive wastes.....	22	29	37	22	30	38	19	26	32
(c) Financial and technical assistance by Soil Conservation Service to control sediment and agriculturally related pollutants.....	68	75	79	68	75	79	66	75	83
Total.....	862	1,520	4,813	916	1,291	2,100	763	885	1,380

¹Totals of amounts below.

Source: Compiled from data supplied by the Office of Management and Budget, July 1970.

Note: Details in the tables may not add exactly to the totals due to rounding.

TABLE III.—ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDING FOR POLLUTION CONTROL AND ABATEMENT, BY AGENCY AND BY POLLUTED MEDIUM AND SELECTED POLLUTANTS (FISCAL YEAR 1970 OBLIGATIONS)

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	Polluted medium				Selected pollutants ¹					Total
	Air	Water	Land	Pesticides	Radiation	Solid wastes	Noise	Thermal	Other	
Interior.....	4.0	629.9	2.6	5.2	0.2	5.7		2.4		640.0
AEC.....	4.6	5.8	.2	.1	133.3	2.1		1.8		147.9
HEW.....	94.2	3.5		11.7	18.6	15.2	0.1		7.9	151.2
DOD-military.....	19.9	35.5		7.7	.8	.2	12.5		.1	69.7
Agriculture.....	12.0	120.7	7.9	23.2	.7	2.6			.4	167.5
Transportation.....	5.8	6.0		.2		.4	7.3			19.7
NASA.....	2.3	.9				.1	14.0			17.3
Appalachian Regional Commission.....		4.6	6.5			1.0				12.1
TVA.....	14.5	10.2	.1		1.4	.1		6.8		33.1
Corps of Engineers.....	.4	3.0				1.8				5.2
Commerce.....	1.7	3.4	.2		.1	.2	.2		.4	6.2
Justice.....	.3					.9				1.2
Other.....	3.5	5.0	.2	.1	.2	.4			.4	9.8
Total.....	163.2	828.5	17.7	41.2	155.3	30.0	34.1	11.0	9.2	1,290.9

¹ Excluding funds reported in media columns. Source: Compiled from data supplied by the Office of Management and Budget, July 1970.

TABLE IV.—ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDING (FISCAL YEAR 1970 OBLIGATIONS) FOR POLLUTION CONTROL AND ABATEMENT, BY AGENCY AND BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	Aid to State, regional, and local governments				Research, development demonstration			Monitoring and surveillance			Standards and enforcement	Manpower development	Pollution control: Remedial actions at Federal facilities	Other		Grand total	
	Capital funds	Operating funds	Technical assistance	Sub-total	Primarily for pollution control	Contributing to pollution control	Sub-total	Primarily for pollution control	Contributing to pollution control	Sub-total				Program administration and education	AEC control of radioactive wastes		Finan- cial-technical assistance by SCS
Interior.....	514.8	12.5	11.4	538.7	57.4	16.2	73.6	4.4	5.5	9.9	4.4	6.2	7.0	9.8		650.0	
AEC.....			.1	.1	71.2	17.1	88.3	15.9		15.9	11.7		1.5		30.4	147.9	
HEW.....		26.7	10.6	37.3	62.8	7.0	69.8	10.0	1.0	11.0	7.4	11.1		13.9		150.4	
DOD-military.....					.5	6.5	7.0	4.6	.3	4.9		.4	57.8	.1		70.1	
Agriculture.....	32.3			32.3	32.8	17.7	50.5	.7	1.2	1.9	3.2		3.1	1.2	75.1	167.2	
TVA.....			.3	.3	.8	3.6	4.4	1.5		1.5			26.9			33.1	
Transportation.....					9.4	7.1	16.5				.9		.5	1.8		19.7	
NASA.....					14.1	3.1	17.2						.1			17.3	
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	10.4			10.4										1.8		12.1	
Commerce.....	2.3		.4	2.7	.5	2.7	3.2	.2	.2	.4			.2			6.5	
Corps of Engineers.....								1.0		1.0			4.2			5.2	
GSA.....													2.3			2.3	
HUD.....	2.5			2.5												2.5	
VA.....													1.8			1.8	
Post Office.....					.2		.2						1.4			1.6	
Justice.....	.5			.5									.7			1.2	
State.....	.8			.8					.1	.1	.1					1.0	
NSF.....					.8		.8									.8	
Smithsonian.....					.2		.2									.2	
Total.....	563.5	39.2	22.8	625.5	250.5	81.0	331.5	38.3	8.1	46.4	27.7	17.7	108.1	28.5	30.4	75.1	1,290.9

Source: Compiled from data supplied by the Office of Management and Budget, July 1970.

PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE COST OF POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The appropriate question now is "Will these expenditures do the job, assuming funding continues at the indicated level?" Dr. Allen V. Kneese, director, Quality of the Environment Program, Resources for the Future, Inc., has prepared a preliminary paper entitled "The Economics of Environmental Pollution in the United States." In this draft he has bravely attempted to project the cost of natural programs to reduce environmental pollution. Dr. Kneese writes:

V. WHAT WILL NATIONAL PROGRAMS TO REDUCE ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION COST?

A large number of published estimates of the costs of improving environmental quality are brought together in Table V. A glance at it will quickly convince the reader that these numbers are extremely difficult to interpret. They are partial, relate to different time frames, are based on different assumptions (as often as not unstated), pertain to different goals, are unclear about what are increases and what costs of continuing present programs, and are generally lacking in comparability.

Under these circumstances, an effort at precise interpretations would certainly be misplaced. In an attempt to give readers

some feeling for the general magnitude of these numbers, I have selected some estimates, rounded them drastically, and made various heroic judgments. The results are put together in Table V. It appears that for the period 1970 to 1975, expenditures for making substantial improvements on all fronts (air, water, solids—including a lot of cleaning up of problems inherited from the past) might run between 20 percent and 35 percent of the increase in GNP which could be expected over this period. These figures are loosely based on goals which have been seriously put forward for this period. The figures probably err on the high side because they are mostly based on simply administrative approaches to the problem rather than

sophisticated management approaches. As is explained in section VI below and illustrated in Appendices C and D . . . (omitted), the difference in cost of major components, if the latter were adopted, might be very large, perhaps by a factor of 2 or more. Also, there is a lot of capital investment for catching up in these estimates, especially if one includes the separation of storm and sanitary sewers. Probably more than three quarters of the expenditures would be investment. Accordingly, expenditures could "hump" and then drop off considerably. Perhaps one should not overstress this point, however, because some further steps could be extremely costly. To take perhaps the major example, it has been estimated that to remove or recycle nutrients from all treated sewage effluents to protect streams and lakes from excessive enrichment and eutrophication might cost \$90 billion.

A few words of explanation should be inserted here about the separation of sanitary and storm sewers because the cost magnitudes are so large. In most of the older cities of the United States, at least a portion of the sewage is carried in the same passages that are used for storm water runoff. During dry weather there is no problem, but when there is substantial storm runoff, treatment plants cannot accommodate the large volume of water, and at least part of the sewage must be discharged, with the storm water, to the watercourse without treatment. In some large old systems, this is a frequent event. In New York and Boston, bypass occurs on the average of about once a week. To rebuild the sewers so as to prevent this condition from occurring periodically is extremely costly and therefore presents a difficult problem of social choice.

In any case the estimates shown in the table V suggest that while achieving major environmental improvements is likely to be very costly, the amounts are not so great as to preclude a substantial growth in product available for other purposes—especially since the projected expenditures are heavily investment.

This is a short-run conclusion, valid for perhaps a few decades. The implications of very long continued growth in population and material and energy conversion could be quite different, as I will discuss later.

Table V follows:

TABLE V—A Collection of Rough Estimates of Increase in Costs During Period 1970-75 to Achieve "Substantial" Reductions in Environmental Pollution

[Estimates in billions of dollars and including investment and operation cost]

WATER	
Treatment of municipal sewage.....	12
Reducing nonthermal industrial wastes..	6
Reducing thermal discharges.....	3
Sediment and acid mine drainage control	3
Reducing oil spills, water craft discharges, and other miscellaneous items	1
Added reservoir storage for low flow regulation	1
Separating storm and sanitary sewers...	40
Total	66
Total without last item (industry share of this may be 50 percent)	26
AIR	
Controls on stationary sources (one-half industrial)	5
Mobile sources:	
To modify refining and distribution of gasoline	2

Engine modifications	2
Added fuel costs.....	1
Total (Industry share of this may be two-thirds)	10
SOLIDS	
Increased coverage of collection.....	1
Increased operating cost, including environmental protection costs.....	3
Total (Industry share? Nothing included for increased recycling of autos and other things)	4
OTHER	
Controls of heavy metals (mercury, cadmium, etc.), stopping the use of persistent pesticides, improving water treatment, control of pollutant-bearing soil runoff, control of feed-lot operations, etc. (a sheer guess)	15
Total (percent of GNP increase about 35)	95
Total without storm sewer separators (percent of GNP increase about 20)	55

¹ \$90 billion additional, if funds are to be provided to remove or recycle nutrients from all treated sewage effluents to protect streams and lakes from excessive enrichment and eutrophication.

From a cursory, initial review of President Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1972 it is rather obvious that we again fall short of providing adequate funds to meet our national goal to clean up our environment within a reasonable time-frame.

Comparison of the amounts of money authorized and appropriated against the amounts of money needed to control and abate pollution quickly tells us that either our goals must be reappraised or our funding levels must be increased. Certainly considerable thought must be given to the disparity between the resources needed and those available.

SUMMARY

There is no longer any debate concerning the importance of environmental issues in the day-to-day and in the long-range programs of Government, industry, agriculture, and individuals. The debate today is concerned with clarification of goals, establishment of national priorities, how best to achieve these goals, funding, and optimum institutional arrangements. Too often, environmental issues are presented as clear-cut choices between pro and con, with industrialists and developers on one side and conservationists on the other. In fact, such situations exist only in the context of narrowly defined goals and the apparent conflict over the environment is really one of differing opinions concerning which of the many needs of man are most critical in the use of the resource under consideration. There are many worthy human goals, frequently conflicting among various individuals and groups of people. Judgments must be made which are fair and equitable for all peoples concerned. All too often in management of the environment and natural resources choices must be made which are more or less exclusive of other op-

tions. These choices are rarely those of good use against bad use, but usually require a selection between two good and valid options. Either one will result in some benefit to man, but the difficulty lies in determining which of these benefits is greater, and to whom.

It is essential in any discussion of environmental management to remember that all benefits are secured only at some cost. The quest is for maximum benefits at least cost and to arrive at a wise and proper balance between exploitation of natural resources and conservation of the environment. My purpose has been to examine the past and existing legislation dealing with preservation and enhancement of the environment. We have seen that extensive measures exist and that large sums of money have been authorized to partially implement these laws. Studies by economists and scientists have predicted that even these sums are woefully inadequate to meet the goals established, thus certain management and legislative decisions must be made concerning the value and wisdom of the course we have charted. Perhaps we have been overambitious.

Perhaps we have been underinformed as to the many ramifications and expenses involved in environmental programs. Certainly we must examine closely all sides of the cost-benefit aspects of our current programs and perhaps develop alternative ways of pursuing our goal of a clean environment. Certainly, in view of the large sums of money involved, possibly as much as \$185 billion, we must make sure that all of our efforts are conducted in the most efficient fashion, and that we receive maximum benefit from all expenditures of money, effort, and time. Equally, certainly, we must develop and create the most efficient institutional arrangements to permit optimization of investment and minimization of overlap and waste.

It is for these reasons that I am so enthusiastic about the regional authority approach to solution of regional resource problems.

The Congress has: First, established the necessary framework of laws, second, provided some extent of financial support, and third, supplies planning and technical assistance to State, local and regional bodies. The national program of research and development is essential to the State and regional efforts and has already developed the bulk of technology necessary for the successful abatement of pollution. As has been repeatedly demonstrated, the real bottlenecks are in the failure of lower level institutional arrangements to provide for optimum utilization of money, technology, and effort and the failure of Congress and the executive branch to adequately fund a meaningful program.

During the coming session of the Congress, I intend to introduce amending legislation to substantially increase the President's budget requests for funds to further improve the quality of our environment. Moreover, I also intend to introduce legislation in the Congress to improve the management of these funds and the programs they sustain.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING POLLUTION CONTROL, WATER

The bulk of Federal legislation devoted to pollution control has dealt with water rather than air or land until very recent times. The first of these antipollution measures was contained within various acts concerned with preservation of rivers and harbors and gave jurisdiction to the Corps of Engineers as an adjunct to their responsibility for maintaining the Nation's navigable waters. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 contained several sections prohibiting the discharge of refuse, other than liquids from streets or sewers, into navigable waters without a permit. Penalties were specified. Although originally enacted to provide for construction, to facilitate navigation, and to regulate associated facilities, this law has been interpreted as applying to pollutants whether or not they hamper navigation. Supreme Court action has held that this broad interpretation is valid but in their decision only specific pollutants, primarily solids and oils, were cited as examples. Enforcement activity under this law was relatively rare until 1969, when its applicability once again became recognized. As of February 28, 1970, the Justice Department reported over 110 cases pending with another 99 closed out in fiscal 1969. Most of this activity has been in the areas of southern Michigan, Lake Erie, and New York Harbor.

In just the last year even more emphasis has been placed on the value of this law and many more suits have been entered. In what may become a landmark case, the Department of Justice is suing the Florida Power & Light Co., contending that the waste heat being discharged to Biscayne Bay constitutes "refuse" within the context of this law. The Environmental Protection Agency, along with the Corps of Engineers, is now insisting on approved permits for some 40,000 existing industrial discharges and all new outfalls.

The Public Health Service Act of 1912—Public Law 62-265—directed that organization to conduct research concerning the health aspects of water pollution. In the course of complying with this directive, the Public Health Service has not only virtually eliminated major health threats from waterborne disease, but has also provided a solid base of knowledge for later work.

The Oil Pollution Act of 1924—Public Law 68-238—prohibited the dumping of oil into navigable waters except in cases of emergency threatening life or property, unavoidable accident, or as permitted by regulations. It dictated that the person responsible for such discharge would immediately remove it from the water and adjoining shorelines, and provided that, if that person failed to act, the Secretary of the Interior would undertake the cleanup, with the offending party liable for all expenses incurred. The act also provided for criminal penalties of a fine and/or imprisonment. The enforcement of this act was under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, with assistance from the Coast Guard and the Corps of Engineers. This act was repealed in 1970 and replaced by the

more stringent regulations of the Water Quality Improvement Act.

The first modern act specifically designed to abate water pollution was the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948—Public Law 80-845. This was an experimental, temporary measure designed to expire after 5 years. This act specifically recognized the primacy of the States in the field of water pollution control. It provided for Federal research and Federal technical and planning assistance through the Public Health Service and the Federal Works Agency—phased out in 1950. These Federal activities were supported by annual authorization of \$5 million for expenditures and \$22.5 million in lending authority. The act was extended until 1956.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956—Public Law 84-660—is the basic act amended in 1961, 1965, 1966, and 1970 to form the legal backbone of our current national campaign for clean water. This legislation provides for construction and other grants, establishes enforcement procedures, and expands existing research programs. This act authorized a 5-year program of grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants at the rate of \$50 million a year. The now classic conference technique of enforcement proceedings still in use was developed within the framework of this legislation.

The amendments of 1961—Public Law 87-88—increased authorization for construction grants to \$80 million for fiscal year 1962, \$90 million for fiscal year 1963, and \$100 million a year for fiscal years 1964-67. Other provisions of the granting arrangement were liberalized also. The act increased research funds to \$5 million a year, authorized the establishment and construction of seven field laboratory and research facilities, and directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies on the water quality of the Great Lakes. Federal agencies constructing dams were directed to include potential benefits from low-flow augmentation in their considerations and Federal enforcement authority was expanded to include navigable as well as interstate waters.

The Water Quality Act of 1965—Public Law 89-234—elevated the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to form the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the same Department. The act authorized a research and demonstration program to deal with the problems caused by combined sanitary and storm sewers and increased authorization for construction grants to \$150 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. The provisions for Federal aid were liberalized and incentives were developed to promote comprehensive regional planning. The act also provided for a program of mandatory water quality standards for all interstate and coastal waters.

The newly created Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior by the Ex-

ecutive Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966. This unit was subsequently placed in the Environmental Protection Agency by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970.

Title I of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966—Public Law 89-753—authorized grants to appropriate State, interstate, local, and international planning agencies to support development of comprehensive basinwide pollution control and abatement plans. Title II of the act contained provisions for research and development grants to State and other agencies and persons, increased program support grants, revision of the construction grant program, modified enforcement procedures, the national estuarine pollution study, a study of pollution caused by wastes from watercraft, a study of incentives to industry for pollution control, and a study to develop a detailed estimate of the costs involved in carrying out the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The research, development, and demonstration grants were to encourage work on controlling combined sewage pollution problems, for development of advanced waste treatment and water purification methods, for improved means of treating joint municipal and industrial wastes, and to develop methodology for the prevention of industrial pollution.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is the vehicle by which significant amounts of money were made available for research and development. Additional grants were made available to State agencies for research and demonstration grants projects relative to combined sewers, advanced waste treatment and water purification, and joint municipal/industrial treatment works, and to persons for research and demonstration projects concerning the prevention of pollution by industry. Grants were also made available to support State and interstate programs. Construction grants were liberalized to where the Federal Government could pay up to 55 percent of the construction costs of a treatment plant. Moneys were authorized for this purpose through fiscal year 1971. Granting authority for construction through the years has been:

Fiscal year:	Million
1962	\$80
1963	90
1964	100
1965	100
1966	150
1967	150
1968	450
1969	700
1970	1,000
1971	1,250

Title I of Public Law 91-224, entitled the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, is the most recent amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Section 11 provides for improved control of oil pollution. This provision gives the Federal Government the authority to immediately undertake cleanup actions following an oil spill, with the costs of the cleanup charged to the offending party. Unless he can prove that the spill resulted from an act of God, of war, of U.S. Government negligence or an act or omission of a third party, the owner or

operator is absolutely liable to the United States for the costs of the cleanup. Limits on the liability are set at \$14 million or \$100 per gross ton, whichever is less, in the case of vessels and \$8 million in the cases of on or offshore facilities. If the United States can prove willful negligence or conduct, the full penalties will be sought.

Failure by the owner or operator to notify the U.S. authority of a spill may result in a fine of up to \$10,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year. This section further directs the President to prepare and publish, within 60 days of its enactment, a national contingency plan to provide efficient and effective means of dealing with spills. It establishes a revolving fund of \$35 million to carry out the removal of oil discharges. It gives the President the authority to define by regulation the amounts of oil which can be released without violating the act. Title I also repeals the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 and renames FWPCA the Federal Water Quality Administration.

Section 21 of the Water Quality Improvement Act provides that any applicant for a Federal license or permit must obtain certification from the concerned State that his operation will not violate the existing water quality standards. A 3-year grace period is extended to facilities for which actual construction was initiated prior to the date of enactment of this act, and a 1-year period for pending applications for Federal licenses or permits.

A third provision of the act is for the control of sewage from vessels. Section 13 directs the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices, and the Coast Guard to formulate regulations covering the design, construction, installation and operation of those devices. These standards and regulations will become effective 2 years after their promulgation in the case of new vessels and 5 years in the case of existing vessels. The Federal Government, upon their promulgation, preempts the control of vessel sewage from local and State governments, unless, in the event it is necessary to meet water quality standards, the State applies for complete prohibition of vessel sanitary waste discharges.

The law applies to all U.S. owned and operated vessels with exception only in the interest of national security as determined by the Secretary of Defense. Penalties for violations under this section of the act range from a maximum of \$2,000 for persons operating a vessel without a working marine sanitation device, to a maximum of \$5,000 for manufacturers marketing a device which is different from a certified test device, and for persons rendering a device inoperable prior to the sale or delivery of the vessel. The Coast Guard is directed to enforce this section, and is given power to board and inspect vessels, and to execute court orders.

Other elements of the Water Quality Improvement Act provide for: First, the identification of hazardous substances, and a report to the Congress by November 1, 1970, discussing the need for and

desirability of enacting legislation to impose liability for the cost of removal of hazardous substances from onshore and offshore facilities and vessels, including recommendations on enforcement and recovery of costs; second, \$15 million for grants to State and interstate agencies for acid mine drainage control demonstration projects; third, \$20 million for grants to Great Lakes pollution control demonstrations; fourth, \$62 million for training grants and contracts and scholarships; fifth, \$1 million for Alaska village water and sewer demonstration projects; sixth, the extension for fiscal years 1970-71 of the research and demonstration program at the level of \$65 million per year; and seventh, an additional \$15 million for the study of the Nation's estuaries.

PROGRAMS

Under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961—Public Law 87-128. The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture provides planning and construction grants for the development of water and sewer systems in rural areas.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also provides significant grant moneys for basic water and sewer facilities. Through its Office of Resources Development under authority of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The Emergency Facilities Act of 1970—Public Law 91-431—amended title VII of this act to authorize appropriation of \$1 billion for basic water and sewer facilities.

AIR

The development of the Federal air pollution control effort has followed the pattern as set by the water pollution program. The first Federal legislation—Public Law 84-159—was passed in 1955, authorized the Public Health Service to conduct a research program and to give technical assistance to State and local governments. The policy was established that State and local governments have prime responsibility and the Federal Government is obligated to provide leadership, information, and support. In 1960 Public Law 86-493 directed the Surgeon General to conduct a special study of air pollution due to automobiles. His report was published in 1962 as House Document 87-489, "Motor Vehicles, Air Pollution, and Health."

The Clean Air Act of 1963—Public Law 88-206—authorized direct grants to State and local governments to establish, develop, or improve control programs, and provided for Federal enforcement action in interstate cases.

The act designated three areas of research for special attention: control of motor vehicle exhausts, removal of sulfur from fuels, and development of air-quality criteria on which to base source-emission limits and ambient air-quality standards.

The Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act of 1965—Public Law 89-272—amended the Clean Air Act to provide for Federal regulation of motor vehicle emissions, expanded the research program, created a Federal laboratory, provided for the investigation of new sources of pollution, and instituted a procedure

for the abatement of international air pollution.

The Clean Air Act Amendment of 1966—Public Law 89-675—authorized an expansion of the program. Grants were made available for the maintenance of effective State and local control programs, supplementing those formerly available.

The Air Quality Act of 1967—Public Law 90-148—brought major revisions in the total program of air pollution control and abatement. The Division of Air Pollution within the Public Health Service was enlarged to form the National Air Pollution Control Administration—now a part of the Environmental Protection Agency. A sequence of criteria, ambient air quality standards, and enforcement was established, modeled after the water quality standards program. In the absence of the clear boundaries provided by river basins as for water, it has been necessary to define air regions with common problems. Eight broad atmospheric areas dividing the United States according to climate, meteorology, and topography have been recognized and further subdivided into 57 air quality control regions on the basis of common air pollution problems.

As in water pollution, the States bear the basic responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of standards with support and backup from the Federal Government.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 also provides for expansion of the Federal Government's air pollution research and development activities; continuation of grants to States and communities to assist them in their efforts; financial aid for planning activities in interstate air quality control regions; action by the Secretary to obtain court orders to curtail pollution during emergencies; continuation of Federal standard setting to control motor vehicle pollution; awarding of grants to States to assist them in developing programs for inspection of motor vehicle pollution control systems; continued efforts to control pollution at Federal installations; creation of a 15-member Presidential Air Quality Advisory Board; establishment of technical advisory groups to assist the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; registration of fuel additives; a study of the need for and effect of national emission standards for stationary sources of air pollution; a study of the feasibility of controlling pollution from jet and conventional aircraft; comprehensive economic studies of the cost of controlling air pollution; and investigation of manpower and training needs in the air pollution field.

The most recent legislation the Clean Air Amendments of 1970—Public Law 91-604—were passed during the second session of the 91st Congress. This legislation is discussed below.

SOLID WASTES

The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, title II of the Clean Air Act of the same year—Public Law 89-272—marks the beginning of Federal involvement in this growing problem. The purposes of the act are to initiate and accelerate a national research and development pro-

gram for new and improved methods of proper and economic solid-waste disposal, including studies directed toward the conservation of natural resources by reducing the amount of waste and unsalvageable materials and by recovery and utilization of potential resources in solid wastes and to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments and interstate agencies in the planning, development, and conduct of solid-waste disposal programs. Unlike air and water pollution, the Federal program thus far has not tended toward regulation.

The Federal program was administered jointly under a memorandum of agreement by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior. The HEW program is carried out by the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, and the Interior program—concerned with handling the wastes generated in the extraction, processing or utilization of fossil fuels, and with the recovery of valuable materials from municipal wastes—by the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau of Solid Waste Management—now a part of the Environmental Protection Agency—conducts research and demonstration grants and contracts to universities, private industry, and other nongovernmental groups for the improvement of methods of collection and transport, recycling and reuse, and processing and disposal of solid wastes. The Bureau also awards grants to universities for training programs, and provides technical and planning assistance to governmental agencies. To provide a basis for its program, the Bureau conducted a national survey of community solid waste practices which was designed to define the extent of the problem, and to assess the means currently employed for handling it. The act provided authorization for appropriations as follows: for the Bureau of Solid Waste Management in HEW, \$7 million for fiscal 1966, \$14 million for fiscal 1967, \$19.2 million for fiscal 1968, and \$20 million for fiscal 1969; for the Bureau of Mines, \$3 million for fiscal 1966, \$6 million for fiscal 1967, \$10.8 million for fiscal 1968, and \$12.5 million for fiscal 1969. The Public Health Service Act Amendments of 1968—Public Law 90-574—extended the program with authorizations of \$19,750,000 for the Bureau of Solid Waste Management and \$12,250,000 for the Bureau of Mines. As with the other environmental pollution programs, appropriations for solid waste management have lagged behind the authorizations, most clearly so in the case of the Bureau of Mines which, as of fiscal 1970, had a total gap between authorizations and appropriations of \$32,906,000.

The latest legislation in the field of solid waste management is the Resource Recovery Act of 1970—Public Law 91-512. This act is discussed below in the section dealing with the second session of the 91st Congress.

NATIONAL POLICY

A key portion of the national program of environmental protection and enhancement was the establishment of a national policy on the environment and creation of Council on Environmental

Quality to act as consultant to the President. These actions were accomplished by passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—Public Law 91-190.

This act declared that it is the policy of the U.S. Government to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. Title I recognizes that "each person should enjoy a healthful environment and has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment." It required all Federal agencies to take into account the environmental impact of all actions they propose. Specific directives to prevent adverse environmental effects of Federal agency activities are indicated. It created in the Office of the President a permanent Council on Environmental Quality of three members, modeled on the Council of Economic Advisers, and authorized an annual appropriation of \$1 million to cover the expenses of a small professional staff. The principal functions of the council are to recommend environmental policies to the President and to assist him in the preparation of an annual environmental report to be submitted to the Congress beginning in July 1970. The national goals of environmental policy are specified in title I as follows:

First, fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

Second, assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

Third, attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

Fourth, preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our natural heritages, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;

Fifth, achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

Sixth, enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

ACTION BY THE SECOND SESSION, 91ST CONGRESS

Thus the onset of the second session of the 91st Congress saw a solid foundation of environmental legislation on which to proceed. The existing enabling authorities were not perfect and organizational difficulties hampered the most efficient pursuit of the goal of a clean environment. Funding was far from adequate, but the key State, Federal, and local roles had been identified and to some extent supported. The Congress, the executive branch, and the country in general were acutely aware of the need for additional action and for a reordering of national priorities in respect to the environment.

The President sent to the Congress a special message on the environment on February 10, 1970. This message proposed a 37-point action program, with special emphasis on strengthening the fight

against air and water pollution. The major legislative recommendations included:

WATER POLLUTION

First. Authorization of \$4 billion to cover the Federal share of \$10 billion needed for construction of municipal waste treatment plants; to be allocated at a rate of \$1 billion per year over the next 4 years, with a reassessment in 1973 of further needs for 1973 and subsequent years.

Second. Establishment of an Environmental Financing Authority to insure that every municipality can finance its share of treatment plant construction costs.

Third. Extension of Federal-State water quality standards to include precise effluent standards for all industrial and municipal sources.

Fourth. Extension of Federal pollution control authority to include all navigable waters, both inter- and intrastate, all interstate ground waters, the U.S. portion of boundary waters, and waters of the contiguous zone.

AIR POLLUTION

Fifth. Publication of new, more stringent motor vehicle emission standards for 1973 and 1975.

Sixth. Authorization for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to regulate gasoline composition and additives.

Seventh. Establishment of national air quality standards, with the States preparing abatement enforcement plans to meet national standards.

Eighth. Accelerated designation of interstate air quality control regions.

Ninth. Establishment of national emissions standards for pollutants that are extremely hazardous to health and for specified classes of new facilities.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Tenth. Redirection of solid waste research toward techniques for recycling materials and producing packaging materials that are easily degradable.

INDUSTRIAL INVOLVEMENT

Eleventh. Establishment of a National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Twelfth. Full funding of the \$327 million available under the land and water conservation fund.

Thirteenth. Review of all federally owned real estate to identify properties that can be converted to public recreational use, or sold, with the proceeds used to acquire additional recreational areas.

Fourteenth. Relocation of Federal installations that occupy locations that could better be used for other purposes.

Fifteenth. Provision that the land and water conservation fund is maintained or increased as a source of funds for purchase of lands in future years.

The President also described 14 measures he intended to implement by Executive action.

By and large, this program has met with a fair amount of success. Each of the Executive initiatives have been implemented and the National Industrial Pollution Control Council has been created within the Department of Com-

merce. Executive Reorganization Plan No. 3 created the Environmental Protection Agency. This new agency assumes the major role of regulating water quality, air quality, solid waste management, pesticides, and radioactive materials. It is comprised by the Federal Water Quality Administration from the Department of the Interior; the National Air Pollution Control Administration from HEW; the Bureau of Water Hygiene, Bureau of Solid Waste Management, and Bureau of Radiological Health from the Environmental Control Administration of HEW; Pesticides Standards and Research from HEW and Interior; Pesticides Registration from the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; the Federal Radiation Council from the Executive Office of the President; the Environmental Radiation Standards function of the Atomic Energy Commission; and responsibility for studies of ecological systems from the Council on Environmental Quality. The Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—hence is the major agency responsible for pollution control and abatement. It carries extensive regulatory and granting authority, conducts research and provides financial and technical assistance to the States and municipalities in support of their programs.

The Clean Air Amendments of 1970—Public Law 91-604—provided everything the President requested and more. There are 10 major provisions to these amendments.

First. Vehicular sources. Legislation provides statutory deadlines by which new automobiles must be substantially pollution free. By 1975, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions must be reduced to 10 percent or less of present emissions. Oxides of nitrogen emissions must be reduced the same extent by 1976. The Federal Government preempts State emission standard setting functions for vehicles except for California. Penalties of \$10,000 per vehicle may be assessed against violators.

Second. Motor fuels and additives. The Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to control or prohibit the manufacture or sale of motor fuel additives.

Third. Low-emission vehicle. Certification and Federal purchase of low emission vehicles is authorized. A Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board is created.

Fourth. Aircraft emissions. EPA is to prescribe emission standards for civil aircraft. The Federal Aviation Administration—Department of Transportation—is responsible for enforcement of these standards.

The States are preempted from adopting or enforcing any but identical standards.

Fifth. Air quality control regions. States continue to have primary responsibility for assuring air quality within designated regions. The EPA Administrator will establish appropriate interstate and certain major intrastate areas as a control region if necessary for "attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards."

Sixth. National ambient air quality standards. Federal standards will be set

for sulfur oxides, particulates, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and photochemical oxidants within one month of passage of the law. As criteria become available, standards will be established for nitrogen oxides, fluorides, lead, polynuclear organic matter, and odors.

Seventh. State implementation plans. Each state must develop implementation plans which assure attainment of primary ambient air quality within 3 years from date of approval of such plan.

Eighth. National standards for new stationary sources. The Federal Government may set national standards of performance on emissions from new stationary sources with emphasis on 19 specified industries.

Ninth. Hazardous substance emissions. Within 6 months, EPA must set standards providing for an ample margin of safety to protect health.

Tenth. Enforcement procedures. Primary responsibility for enforcement lies with the States for enforcing requirements established under their implementation plans. If they fail to do so, EPA can act.

This bill authorizes a total of \$1.1 billion for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973.

The Resource Recovery Act of 1970—Public Law 91-512—extensively rewrote the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, extending it for 3 years, and set the stage for a tenfold increase in Federal funding in solid wastes management. The purpose of the act is to promote improved management of solid wastes and the development and construction of resource recovery systems; promote research; provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments; provide guidelines for waste management systems; and to provide for training competent manpower.

The President also received support for his program concerning parks and recreation. As in other environmental issues, Congress provided not only for the President's request but also authorized additional funds for the land and water conservation fund.

There was no legislative response to the administration's proposals concerning water pollution. As things stand, the latest authorization for funds to combat water pollution do not provide for funding beyond fiscal 1971. Several elements of the President's program have proven to be controversial; not in their goals, but as to the best method of achieving these goals. There is no question that water pollution will be one of the issues before the 92d Congress and that meaningful legislation will be enacted.

STANDARD 1-MINUTE SPEECH SHOULD BE DEVELOPED

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had seen the President deliver his state of the Union message to the Congress but in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and certain segments of the press since then one could get the impression that he did not appear since every pass-

ing day brings a torrent of words about this or that pet project or "world-saving" program that the President failed to mention.

In that regard, I thought it might be of some assistance to my colleagues and also make it easier for the folks down at the Government Printing Office who print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if we could develop a somewhat standard 1-minute speech that would be adaptable to most any issue or subject by simply filling in the blanks with the appropriate word or words.

I include this form in the RECORD at this point and also assure my colleagues that there will be no royalties involved and that it may be used freely without attribution to the gentleman representing the 18th District of Illinois:

(NOTE.—The following has been prepared for use by any member of the opposition party or by anyone of the President's party who has an axe to grind. Simply fill in the blanks and choose the appropriate phrases.)

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DISREGARD OF -----

(Mr. Speaker), I was profoundly disturbed that the President, in his State of the Union address, mentioned the word ----- (agriculture, education, labor, health, research, etc.) (1. not at all; 2. only once in passing; 3. only ----- times, with scant recognition of its significance.)

It is incomprehensible to me that this Administration could show such utter and complete disregard for this highly important aspect of our ----- (economy, society, culture, etc.).

The major contributions of ----- to our nation's well being must not be ignored by our citizens or our government. It is impossible to understate the vital and significant role which ----- plays in making our nation strong.

The Administration's lack of concern in this vital area is further demonstrated in their failure to recognize the critical need for allocation of adequate financial and human resources to deal with the pressing ----- (economic, social, etc.) problems facing our nation today.

Until ----- begins to receive from this Administration the kind of attention it requires—until the highest policy councils of our government become willing to place it on our list of highest national priorities, I fear this whole ----- (area, field, segment of our economy, etc.) will continue its present downward spiral of deterioration and decline.

The need is great (Mr. Speaker) and I call upon the President and his Administration to take immediate steps toward strengthening our national commitment to deal with the serious problems in -----.

(The above material can also be handily utilized for a hard hitting, politically significant press release.)

ALARMING SPECTACLE OF TOTAL NEWS BLACKOUT OVER WHAT APPEARS TO BE A WIDENING OF THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days we have witnessed the alarming spectacle of a total news blackout over what appears to be a widening of the war in Indochina. I, along with other American citizens, am shocked and

dismayed that the Pentagon has undertaken to widen the war. But—more importantly—I am shocked that this action has been shrouded in secrecy, and that Government officials have imposed an “embargo” on all news reporting on this vital topic. Surely the first requirement of a free society is that public debate be possible on major public issues. Yet, here, the U.S. Government is undertaking a major military operation on the Laotian border, and the people of the United States are deprived of all information.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to revise and extend my remarks by including an article which appeared in the New York Times on January 31. This article, by Tom Wicker, expresses my sense of outrage over the events of the past few days, and my abiding conviction that this increased activity on the Laotian border makes it even more clear than before that we must withdraw all American Armed Forces from Indochina no later than July 4, 1971.

The article follows:

A WIDER WAR FOR WHAT?

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—The way Secretaries Laird and Rogers tell it, any air strike for any purpose anywhere in Southeast Asia serves the Administration's ultimate goal of protecting the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam, and is thereby justified. That means that in the guise of winding down the war, the Nixon Administration is widening the war in the most destructive way.

The first and most terrible fact of this policy is that it will perpetrate a thousand Mylars throughout the region. Air warfare is indiscriminate; villages are burned, children and women killed, the countryside blasted. Napalm and bombs do not make distinctions or respect the innocent.

But considerations of elementary humanity rarely move statesmen. They are practical men. They must make large decisions, ponder global questions, gauge the national interest. Even on that rarefied level, the statesmen of this Administration seem singularly immune to the most compelling truths.

The nation was told last spring that the invasion of Cambodia was the greatest success of the war, a veritable Marengo—that it had bought amounts of time ranging up to two years to bring off the American withdrawal, that it would not involve American forces in another limitless war, that it had proved the capacity of the South Vietnamese army.

Now, just as critics said would be the case, the invasion can be seen to have moved, not destroyed, the so-called sanctuaries. They have been shifted out of Cambodia, it seems, into the Laotian panhandle. So still another country must be invaded if the sanctuaries are to be wiped out, and the withdrawal to proceed. American air power, which Mr. Nixon himself said would not be needed in Cambodia, now is needed throughout Southeast Asia. Some success!

In fact, the Administration's achievement in Southeast Asia is reminiscent of the financier who boasted: “Last year I was broke, but today I owe millions.” The situation could, of course, be much worse, and no doubt it would be if the Administration had not been saved, over its own objections, from even greater folly.

Mr. Nixon and his men fought hard against the so-called Cooper-Church amendment. It invaded the President's prerogative, they said, as if that were original sin; it tied his

hands in protecting the lives of American troops, and it wasn't needed anyway because Mr. Nixon had no intention of doing any of the things it sought to prevent him from doing. Some assurance!

But the most important matter today is not whether the Administration has violated either the letter or the spirit of the amendment, or both, by using air power. What matters is that, if the amendment were not part of the law, American troops might well be going into the Laotian panhandle or down Cambodia's Route 4 with the South Vietnamese.

It matters also that the Cooper-Church amendment imposes at least some Congressional limitations upon the escalation now going on, and that its mere existence means that both Congressional and public scrutiny of Mr. Nixon's war policy will be more searching than anything applied in the early years of the war in Vietnam—a classic case, perhaps, of locking the barn after the horse has been stolen.

Congress, as Senator Fulbright has conceded, can do little to make the President desist from his Southeast Asian air war. It is important to remember, therefore, that this air war is not some dreadful natural catastrophe, like a typhoon, and that Mr. Nixon cannot ask, as Lyndon Johnson used to ask, “What else could I do?”

The fact is that the widened air war is a direct consequence of the President's policy of Vietnamization, as even Mr. Rogers made plain. As withdrawal proceeds, there is a growing danger of strong attack on the remaining troops, and Mr. Nixon must take steps to protect them.

It ought to be asked how the million-man South Vietnamese army can be expected to protect the whole country, once the Americans have left, if it cannot now protect even the American withdrawal. But above all, it has to be asked why the policy of Vietnamization, requiring an expanded air war, further invasions of other countries by the South Vietnamese, and all the wanton destruction and indiscriminate killing that will result—why is Vietnamization to be preferred to a negotiated settlement of the war?

How does Vietnamization, rather than negotiation, lead to what Mr. Nixon repeatedly refers to as “a generation of peace”? What is the logic of a policy that requires the bombing of three countries and the invasion of two in order to evacuate one? And to the extent that protecting the troop withdrawals requires the bombing of North Vietnam itself, how can that be a step toward peace when it shatters the only real achievement of the Paris talks, the so-called “understanding” why the bombing was stopped in 1968?

It is true that to make or allow a negotiated settlement in Southeast Asia would require large concessions by Mr. Nixon and probably would result in political arrangements for the region that he does not desire. But there is no guarantee whatever that Vietnamization will not ultimately bring equally undesirable or worse conditions; the chances are that it will. A wider war, more indiscriminate slaughter from the air, the continuing corrosion of American society, the mounting destruction of Southeast Asia—if Mr. Nixon really believes that by such costly means a generation of peace can be achieved he owes it to humanity to explain how.

IS ANYBODY THERE? DOES ANYBODY CARE?

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

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, in the haunting caricature of our national beginnings, the Broadway musical “1776,”

John Adams stands alone in the darkened congressional chamber at Philadelphia. In the depths of his despair at the seemingly elusive dream of national independence, Adams cries out “Is anybody there—Does anybody care?” It surely seemed to the Massachusetts statesman at that dark hour, that American freedom had only been a bright promise, now becomes broken on the apathy of a war not going well for the colonies; now stifled in the sultry heat of a Philadelphia summer.

“Is anybody there—does anybody care?” Thus it has always seemed to those most wishing freedom in a long night of slavery and tyranny. Freedom is really a quantitative thing and its quality remains pure and true whether men speak of the freedom and liberty of nations or of single human beings. In its essence, it is the freedom of human beings that count and it has been a highly elusive dream throughout man's path on earth—always sought, seldom obtained, easily lost.

In the stinking, rooting confinement pens of Southeast Asia, American sons must similarly cry out in the long night “Is anybody there—does anybody care.” To these husbands, fathers, sons and brothers, the night must indeed seem long, the future dark and without promise. To the families of these same men, made at least aware of public and official concern for the plight of American prisoners of war, the continued inequity of the enemy response, the darkness can only be a little less severe. The marching years of fruitless effort, the continued inhumanity exhibited by the north, the endless repetitive failure of the enemy to provide a valid response to the entreaties of much of the free world—there can be little cause for joy or hope or rejoicing in such a time, in such a night.

And how much more terrible it must be for those families cast into the abyss of uncertainty concerning the very existence of the life of a loved man. Are we widows? Are we orphans? The cry in the dark is very real—and there is no answering response in the heart of an enemy seemingly bereft of all humanity.

The plight of American prisoners, of those men missing in action, has caught the fancy of much of the American public. It is all too true that too often it has been the “fancy” and not the well-springs of the human heart which responds to such a cause. We are too often a fickle nation of fickle causes, burning bright, faddish, mod butterflies of the hour—we tire of futile enterprises, we grow weary with goals that are not fulfilled. It must never be so with America's imprisoned flesh and blood. If these, our sons, are to be discarded by the ineptness of our purpose—then we must accept the condemnation of history and the accurateness of those who charge us with being a nation immoral.

If we cease for one minute the quest for applied humanity to our sons, then we must stand condemned at the bar of history for abandoning our own—for not finding some continuing flame in the human heart that cannot be extinguished by the passage of years or the tide of events.

Over 150 Members of this House have joined me in asking that we once again pause to remember these men. This latest effort has requested that a week be set aside in March to again pause and bring national concern to bear on the plight of American prisoners who see nothing but the darkness of their enslavement. We call again for a rekindled national purpose that will shout to the leaders of the Communist north:

Grant our sons the minimum decency of the Geneva accords. Let them communicate with those who love them with the quiet desperation that comes from knowing that letters may be all that shall ever be. Tell us who lives and who does not, so that families may reorder their lives and live again in the certainty of the essentials of life or death. Care for those of our men who suffer the ravages of tropical disease, or injury, or malnutrition.

Those joining this resolution stand as did John Adams at Philadelphia and echo the cry of these imprisoned national patriots and their families "Is anybody there—does anybody care"? The flame cannot be allowed to flicker and die. We cannot rest on the circulation of letters, the gathering of petitions, the commemoration of special days or weeks, the establishment of diplomatic contacts with the Communist world on the prisoner question. When all has been done, when every action has been taken, when every speech is made, there must always be one more step to take, one more candle to light in the night.

RESOLUTION TO STOP SENDING U.S. REPLACEMENT TROOPS TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution urging President Nixon to stop sending any new U.S. troops to South Vietnam after March 1, 1971.

Those of my colleagues who know me and who have been here in the House over the years know that I am no dove. I have been one of the strongest supporters of Vietnam and our role in Vietnam. I make no apologies for the Herculean contributions that America has made in defense of freedom in Southeast Asia. I believe that we needed to help that little country when that country needed help, and I believe that the American people have written a magnificent chapter of courage in coming to the help of those people when they needed that help. When South Vietnam was on the verge of collapsing into Communist hands, America made a great sacrifice in helping that nation. Indeed, we can say with certainty today that the Communists have been driven back in Southeast Asia, whereas some 8 or 9 years ago it appeared that the Communists would take over the whole of Southeast Asia, using Vietnam as a jumping-off point.

So I do not come before this House today as one who has been critical of our policies, but rather as one who has con-

sistently supported those policies because I believed that those policies were right.

But I believe with the same fervor that the time has now come to get out of Vietnam.

As we look at what is happening in Laos, and as we look at new involvements in Cambodia, the time has come for America to engage in a major reappraisal of our further reinvolvement in that theater of conflict.

I am certain the American people do not want to escalate our involvement in these new war zones.

My resolution proposes that as American troops are rotated back home after completing their 1-year tour in Vietnam, that they not be replaced as of March 1, of this year. Consequently, all U.S. troops would be out of Vietnam in 12 months.

The resolution calls for no change in the policy which guarantees soldiers rotation after 12 months in Vietnam. This policy of rotation has been one of the greatest stabilizing factors in upholding American troop morale in South Vietnam, for indeed each of our soldiers now knows almost to the day when he is going to be rotated, and I do not suggest in my resolution that we in any way alter that policy. On the contrary, my resolution provides that there shall be no change in this policy.

The resolution is a simple resolution. It says:

H.J. Res. 258

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of Congress that, after March 1, 1971, the President of the United States shall not send any United States armed forces to Vietnam. No law, rule, or regulation in effect on the date of enactment of this resolution shall be amended or modified to authorize the extension of a tour of duty with respect to any member of the United States armed forces assigned to duty in Vietnam on such date of enactment.

Further, it is the sense of Congress that as present United States troops in Vietnam are rotated at the conclusion of their one-year tour of duty, their remaining units shall be consolidated until ultimately no U.S. troops will remain in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that if this new policy were to be announced to the world, North Vietnam would agree to an immediate release of American POW's and negotiate a ceasefire which would guarantee the safe withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam.

The United States presently is sending approximately 33,000 fresh U.S. troops to Vietnam every month as replacements.

Even if President Nixon's announced troop reduction policy were to be completed by May 1, we will still have 285,000 U.S. troops remaining in Vietnam requiring a monthly replacement rate of more than 20,000 U.S. troops for an indefinite time.

I am not at all persuaded by those who argue that the remaining 285,000 troops will be logistical support troops and will not be engaged in combat. Every soldier is a combat soldier when he is in a com-

bat zone. And Vietnam will remain a combat zone for a long time if we remain there.

I am disturbed and worried, very seriously disturbed and worried, when I hear the President state, as he did in one of his recent messages that while we intend to take our American troops out of combat and leave the remaining 285,000 Americans as logistical support troops, should they at any point be endangered, we would not hesitate to renew the escalation of the war. It is clearly apparent within this context that this war could last for another decade or two with full American involvement.

While the United States is bogged down in the swamps of Vietnam, the Soviet Union continues to wage with uninterrupted ease its campaign of intrigue and conspiracy against freedom all over the world. Here we have all of our resources tied down in Southeast Asia and in South Vietnam, while the Soviet Union rearms all of the Arab States to wage aggression in the Middle East, and carries on all sorts of penetrations of the continent of Africa, so rich in natural resources, and conspires in all sorts of rebellion and subversion in South America.

The Soviet fleet now has moved into the Mediterranean and is on the verge of driving U.S. influence out of the Mediterranean.

So here we see the Soviet Union, free to roam all over the world with its conspiracy of subversion against freedom, while the United States continues to remain bogged down in an endless struggle in Vietnam.

So I say to you, that while we are being assured the 285,000 remaining troops in Vietnam after May 1 will be noncombat troops—this is an illusion. They will be as much combat troops whether they serve as supply clerks, cooks, guards, or artillery men—as they would be leading a search and destroy mission of Marines in the jungles of Vietnam. So long as American troops remain in Vietnam, they will be constant targets for Communist terror and subversion.

As I pointed out a moment ago, the President has said that if at any point these 285,000 troops are endangered, we will not hesitate to escalate the war all over again. Simply stated, this policy means that full scale conflict can be resumed at any moment and those noncombat "logistical support" soldiers, on a moments notice, become combat troops.

I have discussed this proposal with sources at the Pentagon and I have been assured that such a troop freeze is feasible. I believe that a troop freeze at this time would provide a new and dramatic dimension to the deadlocked peace talks in Paris.

It should be a source of great concern to all of us as Americans, and starting with the President on down, that not a single nation in this world has responded with any kind of assistance of help in marshaling world opinion in support of our efforts at the peace talks in Paris.

These peace talks have been bogged down now for 2 years. Every week we read of new casualty lists and new American deaths in Vietnam while the peace talks go on and on without any meaningful results.

I believe a new dimension is necessary. I honestly believe a troop freeze at this time; an announcement by the President that we are not going to send any replacement troops to Vietnam, and that through this policy, all of our troops will be out of there within 12 months, would rally the rest of the free world behind our cause and marshal moral support for a meaningful cease-fire in Southeast Asia. The nations of the world up to now have heard the same record—we talk of troop withdrawal and we discuss peace, but we continue to send 33,000 fresh American troops into Vietnam every single month.

This incongruity has brought no results in Paris nor has it marshaled any world support to our side.

Hanoi has said it is willing to release our POW's and negotiate a cease-fire if we get our troops out of Vietnam. We have said we will get our troops out in a year, but insist on a cease-fire now. It occurs to me that the proposal I make here today is a sensible compromise between the two sides. A freeze on replacement troops would in itself effectuate a timetable for withdrawal which, I believe, can break the deadlock.

The first order of business would be the release of our POW's while the second item of the negotiations will be to permit the orderly withdrawal of our American troops from all of South Vietnam. I do believe this can be done and I also believe the proposal I am making here today is totally feasible.

South Vietnam now has a fully trained and completely equipped army of 1,200,000 men. President Thieu and Vice President Ky both have stated publicly that their armed forces are now capable of carrying on the war successfully without our troops.

Actually, South Vietnam today has the biggest and best trained army in Southeast Asia.

An American troop freeze at this time is not tantamount to any surrender. On the contrary, it is a reaffirmation that the United States has given South Vietnam the time needed to build her own defenses.

South Vietnam is now fully capable of handling the war with her own troops and resources. We can say this with great confidence. We went into Vietnam because South Vietnam was totally unprepared and the Communist invasion threatened the collapse of that country. When we went into Vietnam there was no government, there was no economy, and they had no armed forces. The Vietcong were destroying every single village and every institution of South Vietnam.

Today, 6 years after our total involvement, South Vietnam has the finest army in all of Southeast Asia; 1.2 million fully trained men, fully equipped. As a matter of fact, all of our new equipment is being assigned to South Viet-

namese troops while our American soldiers are getting the used equipment, the "spitbacks," on the theory that American soldiers are better capable of repairing the equipment and reusing it.

We have built for South Vietnam Cam Ranh Bay, a deepwater port which was the dream of a thousand years by Southeast Asians. It will become the new Hong Kong of Asia. We have built ports, heliports, airports, railroads, and supply depots. In 6 years, we have given South Vietnam sinews to victoriously continue its struggle, such as we have never given any other country ever before.

No nation in the world is as well prepared to defend itself today as is South Vietnam, and I say America has no mandate to remain in South Vietnam until the last bloody shot is fired.

I believe the question now is no longer whether or not South Vietnam can win. Everyone agrees they can win. The question now is when do we as Americans pull out?

I say the time has come for us to pull out now.

I notice that the Gallup poll taken over the weekend shows 73 percent of the American people agree in urging all of our American troops be out of Vietnam by the end of this year.

Under my proposal, we would provide for an orderly withdrawal and disengagement of American involvement in Vietnam.

There is no further justification for sending fresh U.S. troops to Vietnam, when these expenditures can now be used for urgently needed programs here in the United States.

The President spoke to a joint session the other day. He talked about deficit spending. They are estimating that the deficit for fiscal 1972 will be somewhere in the vicinity of \$11 billion or \$12 billion. But I say that estimate is totally unrealistic. If we look at the budget, and look at the needs of the country, and look at the programs in the pipeline, and look at the mandatory programs which must be met, I believe it is safer to predict here today that the deficit for fiscal 1972 will be closer to \$25 billion or \$30 billion, and not the \$11 billion or \$12 billion, estimated by the administration.

I speak with some degree of knowledge on the subject. I stood in the well of this House a year ago and I warned that the deficit for fiscal 1970 would be in excess of \$15 billion. I was challenged on that statement. Well, time has proved me right, as time will prove me right on the deficit for 1972.

So I say that if South Vietnam were not totally prepared, and if the South Vietnamese could not provide the necessary defense of their country, I would not be making this recommendation today. But I was in Vietnam. I saw the troops. I watched them in action. There is no question in my mind that the South Vietnamese troops are more than capable of providing their own defense.

History is on our side on that score. There has not been an American soldier in the Mekong Delta for 9 months now.

There have been some bloody battles in the Mekong Delta, and the South Vietnamese forces, the ARVN forces, have magnificently held their own. There have been some bloody battles in Cambodia, and we have not found it necessary—nor can we, by law—to send American aid. The ARVN troops and the Cambodian troops have demonstrated they are more than capable of holding their own in these areas.

So I say to you, faced with a \$30 billion deficit in fiscal 1972, it occurs to me that enormous savings can be made by turning the remainder of this conflict over to South Vietnam. This will help President Nixon avoid this huge deficit which is anticipated.

But more significantly, American disengagement at this time would make Hanoi realize it is in for a long, drawn-out battle with South Vietnam. I submit that American continuance in South Vietnam is prolonging this war. Hanoi needs only read the various public opinion surveys, to know that the American people have come to a point where they no longer support our exercise in Vietnam. Hanoi knows only too well that there are great pressures on the American Government to do something about it, and Hanoi is counting on Americans to help them impose upon South Vietnam a coalition government. What they cannot win on the battlefield they hope to win at the bargaining table by forcing the United States to impose a coalition government on Saigon as the price for peace.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me finish this statement and I will in just a moment.

I say to you that if we have a disengagement at this time, it would make it very clear to the Communists that they have a long battle with the South Vietnamese and they might as well come to some terms among themselves and get this conflict over with.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on the change of heart he has had since 1966 when I was one of his companions on a trip to South Vietnam. Thirteen of us reported to the President and out of those 13 I was the only man who said, "Mr. President, we are in trouble. We are not winning this war." I believe the distinguished Speaker in the chair today recalls that very situation.

Again let me mention your change of heart, your change from hawkishness to dovishness is quite obvious.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his observation and contribution. I think perhaps the first thing we ought to do as Americans is to stop calling each other names. We are all Americans.

We looked at the situation when we were in South Vietnam and looked at the chronology of the events.

We started American involvement in Vietnam on October 23, 1954, when President Eisenhower offered U.S. military aid to South Vietnam because it was very apparent what was happening in

South Vietnam. The Communists had realized that big wars—nuclear exchanges between the major powers—are out of the question. The Communists realized the major powers have such devastating capabilities that a major war would produce no winners.

Time has run out on big wars. Nobody knows it better than the Soviet Union. We went out of our way to tell the Soviets what we had and what our capability was and what the consequences were if they violated the peace of the world on a major scale. We went out of our way to show them our capability. Many Americans said why did we do this and why did we tell the Soviets what we had. We said it was because history teaches us that all of man's conflicts were started by a miscalculation. The most tragic miscalculation was Hitler's in 1939 when he invaded Poland and triggered World War II. He thought the free world could never repond. Here was the most tragic miscalculation, and the history of warfare in general shows all wars are started by miscalculations. So we went out of our way to say to the Soviets this is what we have. These are the consequences if you are foolish enough to trigger a major war. The Communists had to find new techniques to carry on their aggression. They never quit. They have a grand design for the conquest of the world, and they are not about to quit. So they discovered a concept which is very old in the history of warfare; namely, terrorism and subversion. They trained the Vietcong and terrorists from North Vietnam to come in the middle of the night to small villages and hamlets, seize the mayor or police chief or the principal of a school, yank them out of bed and drag them to the village square and there brutally massacred them for all of the populace to see. The whole conspiracy of breaking down resistance to Communist occupation was shown there.

That was what happened in 1954.

A great American President, Dwight Eisenhower, saw what was happening. He realized what the Communists were doing and realized that the Communists were developing a new concept of warfare through terrorism and subversion. So he sent a military aide mission to South Vietnam to see what we could do in the way of offering help.

On January 1, 1955, the United States began to deliver direct military aid to South Vietnam.

On April 28, 1956, the French military high command in Vietnam was dissolved. The French were not defeated; they just copped out on their responsibility, as the young people say today, and left all of Southeast Asia at the mercy of the Communists. So the United States was faced with this horrible situation.

On May 1, 1957, the French responsibility for training the Vietnamese Navy and air force was terminated. This made their disengagement complete.

On April 28, 1959, the American Military Assistance Advisory Group officially assumed responsibility for recruiting and training a South Vietnamese Army. Up to that time there was no army. They had nothing to defend themselves with. We can contrast that situation with the

situation today, when they have 1.2 million men under arms.

The United States quite properly went to the defense of this tiny country because it symbolized a testing ground for the Communists to try out a new concept of warfare. We know from a conference held in Havana, Cuba, in 1965, the Communists agreed that if their techniques of terror and subversion worked successfully in Vietnam, they were ready to use the same techniques in 83 countries of Asia, Africa, and South America. The United States properly went to the defense of South Vietnam. I will never apologize for our involvement in this conflict and for the help we gave these struggling people when the rest of the world walked away from its responsibility.

On October 25, 1960, President Eisenhower assured the South Vietnamese President of continued military assistance.

On May 5, 1960 the United States announced that the mission would be increased to 685 men. Before that there were only 327.

In the spring of 1965 we sent in combat troops. Before that we only had advisers.

In 1965 the bombing of North Vietnam began.

In February of 1965, a Marine Corps Hawk antiaircraft missile battalion was deployed at Danang.

On March 8, 1965, the first U.S. infantry battalion landed in South Vietnam.

In May of 1965, the United States sent in more troops and the escalation began. These things were done because of the necessity of defending that tiny, helpless country.

But I say to you today things are different and there is a different picture.

Today they have an army of 1.2 million men. In the 6 years that we have been there we have given them time to build up a tremendous defense posture in South Vietnam.

South Vietnam in 1971 is not what South Vietnam was in 1965.

We gave that little country the tools she needed with which to defend herself. Americans wanted to help her in order for her to help herself.

Now the time has come for us to get out as we did in Lebanon, when President Eisenhower sent 12,000 marines to help that country. They stayed only 4 months. When the situation became stabilized, we pulled them out.

We stayed in the Dominican Republic only 48 hours because the situation had stabilized and because that is all the time that was required to help that little nation.

Mr. Speaker, American policy ought to be to help a country help itself as we did in South Vietnam. Once we have achieved that mission, we should get out, so we can be free to resume our leadership of the world and assume our position of great leadership, morally and spiritually.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this hope that I have introduced this resolution today. I hope it will receive the support of the Members of the House and the other body.

In taking this action today, I know that there is a constitutional question involved. This is why I have treated my proposal only as a resolution. I know there is a constitutional question as to who has the right to commit American troops to combat. The executive branch as represented by the President, reads the Constitution one way. The President as Commander in Chief, claims he has the right and the responsibility to commit American troops wherever the safety of our country is at stake.

But we in the Congress read that Constitution differently. We in the legislative branch interpret it that only the Congress of the United States can declare war.

I do not want to get involved in that conflict today. This is why I am proposing a sense-of-Congress resolution which the President may accept or reject. It is a resolution that says to the President, "Mr. President, it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States that we ought not to send any more replacement troops to Southeast Asia after March 1; as American soldiers are returned at the conclusion of their 1-year tour of duty, they will not be replaced in South Vietnam."

I believe this is the road to peace. I do not agree with the Vice President when he says that a troop withdrawal at this time would be tantamount to surrender. In my judgment, and I believe the facts bear me out, the United States has successfully concluded its mission, its historic mission of helping South Vietnam, and it is now capable of providing its own defense.

We have no greater authority on this subject than the President of South Vietnam himself when President Thieu said recently in a public statement that his armed forces of 1.2 million men are now capable of carrying on the defense of that country.

And Vice President Ky, when he was in America recently, publicly stated the same thing. Our own people have said that Vietnam is now capable of carrying on its own defense.

President Nixon himself has said that he hopes to have the troops out of Vietnam by the end of this year, or early next year.

I say to you that not sending any more troops after March 1 would have a tremendous impact on the people of America.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is to sit in my office on a Saturday morning and see the dozens of American families coming in and saying, "Congressman, is there not something we can do to keep our son from going to Vietnam?"

Nothing has stirred this country more at all levels than the prospects that 33,000 American families must bid farewell to their loved ones every month and see them go to Vietnam.

I say to you that the question today is not whether or not we are surrendering, of course we are not surrendering, we

have won that battle. Now the question is how do we get out?

When American troops do finally get out of Vietnam, there will be no ticker tape parade down LaSalle Street, or down Wall Street, and there will be no battleship *Missouri* steaming into Hanoi harbor for a formal surrender of the enemy. Modern conflict, as witnessed in Korea or Vietnam, has no beginning and no ending, and all I am saying is that an announcement by the President of the United States at this time would solidify the world and would indeed show everybody that the United States is going to be out of there in 12 months, and the forces of freedom in Southeast Asia can use our equipment, but not our men, to carry on their heroic struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I will now be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. The gentleman is making a very important statement. I think that the pronouncements by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have amply reassured the Members of this body and the country of their agreement that the time has come to withdraw our forces from Vietnam at a rate which will not endanger those Americans remaining, or pull the rug from under the South Vietnamese.

However, I have this question to ask the gentleman from Illinois: If we try to get a withdrawal from Vietnam down to some kind of a formula, such as agreeing not to replace troops who are rotated from Vietnam, do we not run into the problem that we may run very short of troops with certain skills, whereas we might have a plethora of troops with other skills in that country?

In other words, should not there be some flexibility, so we may maintain the type of forces we need over there and that it might not be possible to do so under a willy-nilly withdrawal formula such as the gentleman mentions?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman raises a good question, and I think it is a very important question in this discussion, but if the gentleman from Arizona will keep in mind, we are now in the process of withdrawing 150,000 troops by May 1. No particular consideration is being given to their skills. In other words, when they have completed their 12-month tour, they are added to the pool of those being rotated and no particular effort is made to replace those with particular skills. Field commanders merely consolidate remaining troops into new units and when a particular skill is necessary to complete the unit, they transfer those in Vietnam to the new unit.

In other words, they do not necessarily replace the same military occupational specialties that have been rotated stateside when they send replacement troops from here. We are sending draftees with 18 weeks' basic training as replacements for those being rotated, for the most part. I am quite sure that while there may be some problems here and there, the consolidation we propose could continue, because that is what they are doing now, and they have been doing so for some time.

All I am saying in my proposal is that we make a national commitment now that we will not replace our troops as they are rotated back home in order to provide a new dimension in the peace talks in Paris.

I want to make this point clear to my colleagues, that I do not question the honesty of the President or the intentions of the President. I believe that President Nixon wants to get out of Vietnam just as quickly as everyone else does, and I hope that what I say will not be construed as in any way challenging the President's good judgment. All I am offering today is a different formula, and one that I believe could bring immediate results in many ways.

Just imagine the intensive joy and happiness to thousands of parents in America who all of a sudden would get a new lease on life, knowing that their son will no longer be threatened with shipment to Vietnam. It is no comfort to these people to know that their boy is not going in as a combat soldier, but that he is going there as some form of logistical support. People are deeply depressed on the subject of Vietnam. I have seen mothers turn gray virtually overnight when they learned their youngster will be shipped off to the jungles of Vietnam.

And let me repeat, as I said before the gentlemen came in, that the Vietcong, the Communists, would now have to face up to the stark reality that they have one of two choices to make, either they sit down and work out a peace treaty with the South Vietnamese, or they will be faced with a conflict for many years to come. Because once the Americans have been detached from personal involvement in Vietnam, once the pressure on the United States is eliminated, I tell you that the South Vietnamese may carry on this war for another decade, and nobody is going to be hurt by that more than the Communists themselves. So they will have to face up to the realities of carrying on a military conflict with a very different type of South Vietnamese because now the South Vietnamese are ready. Five years ago the South Vietnamese were not ready, and the country and the people were at the mercy of the Vietcong, but today with an army of 1.2 million men, South Vietnam is fully capable of handling her own defense. And that is why I am making this proposal today.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding further. I want it understood that I certainly would not accuse the gentleman from Illinois of engaging in discussion other than one based upon a very thoughtful statement about a subject which is most important to the American people, including the President of the United States. I would like to probe a little further into the thinking of the gentleman by suggesting that what we are here talking about is really the removal of combat troops.

I recognize that, having been in Vietnam twice, and having had a son who

served a year there, that what the gentleman has said about the attitude of parents is true, because there is danger in Vietnam even if you are there in a so-called noncombatant's role.

But it seems to me in order to get peace over there, and this is what we all want, it would not be wise to pull the rug out from under the South Vietnamese forces logistically.

It is true that they have 1,200,000 men and they are learning the skills that are required to operate an army of that size. But they do not have the skills yet. We are teaching them those skills, but it seems to me it would not be wise for us to leave before they learn those things that are necessary, including the mechanics of operating and maintaining equipment of the more sophisticated type of materiel, which they cannot now do—for us to walk away from the job.

Does the gentleman feel that I have made a valid distinction there?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think you have. I am very respectful of the argument that you make. But I would like you to take a look at the other side of that point.

We started in Vietnam in 1960 with 900 American troops.

In 1961 we had 3,000 troops.

In 1962 we had 11,000 troops.

In 1963 we had 16,000 troops.

In 1964 we had 23,000 troops.

In 1965 we had 184,000 troops.

In 1966 we had 385,000 troops.

In 1967 we had 486,000 troops.

In 1968 we had 543,000 troops.

In 1969 we had 542,000 troops.

We have heard the military people say: "Well, these Vietnamese will be ready at some point in time to assume the responsibility, but they are not ready now."

The gentleman has been there twice. I have been there once. The distinguished chairman who is presiding here today was there with me as well as some other Members who were here earlier.

If we were to follow the rationale and the logic of the Department of Defense, we will be there for many years to come.

I liken this situation in Vietnam to you and I as parents. There comes a time when we have to say to our sons: "Son, you are now big enough and old enough to stand on your own two feet." Your wife never agrees with you. She thinks he is not yet ready. Mothers never think their son is ready. Momma cries and momma says, "No, he is not ready. He has not grown up yet." But you and he know better and indeed he has grown up.

The fact of the matter is that there comes a time when everybody has to stand on their own two feet.

I am expressing to you my own judgment based on extensive studies. I have talked to Vietnam combat soldiers who are now in hospitals here at Walter Reed Hospital or in my own city at Hines Hospital or Great Lakes—I have also talked to hundreds of American soldiers who have come back. I have said, "You have been there. You have fought there. Is it your judgment that the South Vietnamese can now handle their own defense?"

Almost uniformly their answer is: "Yes, if we get out but so long as we stay

there, they have a very convenient fall-back position."

So I say to you, while I am mindful of the problems that are involved of matching skill against skill—and I am mindful that there might be some skills in shortage, I am mindful that this kind of one-for-one rotation could create some problems, we still ought to put a freeze on sending any new troops to Vietnam.

The American people have been most tolerant and have been most generous. That is why I honestly believe the time has come to now look at this thing and to ask, is South Vietnam capable of doing the job? That is the question. In my honest judgment, it is.

I respect those who disagree with me, but in my honest judgment I believe South Vietnam is capable. It is for this reason I am making this proposal.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield further.

Mr. RHODES. I believe the only difference between the gentleman and myself is a higher degree of trust and confidence in the administration on my part than perhaps the gentleman from Illinois has.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I say to my colleague I have plenty of trust and confidence in this administration.

Mr. RHODES. But the gentleman does feel there has to be some sort of formula imposed for getting the troops out. I believe if we had an administration which had not shown by deeds and words it is dedicated to the idea of disengagement perhaps there should be a formula imposed. But so long as we have established in the administration the philosophy of disengagement then I cannot help but feel it would be best for the legislative branch to let the people best informed run the timetable as to getting out.

If, on the other hand, we see a lag develop, and if we see that the situation is not going as it should, then I believe the gentleman and I both would take another look at it. But now it is going very well, and I trust it will continue to go well and that U.S. forces will get down to a constabulary-sized force.

The gentleman from Illinois knows as well as I do that we still have large forces in South Korea. I certainly hope we do not get into a situation in South Vietnam where we will have to maintain large forces for a long period of time. I would resist it. I do not believe it is necessary, because the South Vietnamese are doing a good job and can take care of themselves if given time to learn to perform more sophisticated tasks.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The President has a timetable for withdrawal but even his timetable provides for leaving 285,000 American troops in Vietnam for an indefinite period.

I want to make one point clear. I do not question or challenge either the sincerity or the integrity of the President. He is my President, too, even though I may be sitting on this side of the aisle. He is my President and the only President I have right now, so I trust him and I have to trust him as an American.

But I am not so sure I can say the same about some of the people in the Pentagon. I think there is a kind of mili-

tary paternalism that has kept 20,000 troops in South Korea for 17 years and a vast army of American troops in West Germany since the end of World War II. It is costing \$14 billion a year to keep these troops scattered around the world, and I do not think they ought to be there. I do not think these 20,000 American troops could do anything if the Korean conflict should reoccur. North Korea during the 17 years of truce has violated every single one of the truce agreements.

President Eisenhower in good faith negotiated the truce in North Korea, yet we know that truce has been violated time and time again, by building airfields and military installations. North Korea today is one of the most formidable military bastions in the world.

Those 20,000 American troops we have in South Korea would not have a chance. I do not know why we keep them there. But the military or the Pentagon for some reason or other says we ought to keep them there. There is a kind of military paternalism. And the same is true in Europe. We have vast numbers of troops in Europe which should have been brought back.

So it is because of this military paternalism that I am concerned about the timetable. I believe the President himself is trying to move as expeditiously as he can. I am not too sure the Commander in Chief is always getting the best information from those in the Pentagon.

It seems to me, when we read about the involvement in Laos and when we read about the involvement in Cambodia and we see the Southeast Asian conflict being escalated, and we hear the President say that if our troops are in danger we will have to escalate our own activity, all of this makes one feel that somehow or other, despite good will and good intentions and good people, we are going to be involved in the Southeast Asian conflict for a long time to come.

I do not believe we ought to be. I believe we have fulfilled our mission. We have helped these people. Now is the time to cut the umbilical cord.

These Asians have been fighting among themselves for centuries. Long after we are gone they will continue to fight among themselves.

Our mission in Vietnam was only one, to help the South Vietnamese help themselves. I maintain we have discharged that responsibility with great honor and dedication, and now we ought to get out.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What was our mission or what is our mission in Vietnam, in the gentleman's view?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Our mission in Vietnam in 1954 was to demonstrate to the Communists that just as their big wars had been made totally unprofitable, so would their so-called small wars of liberation be unprofitable.

Vietnam is not a small war. It is the longest war we have ever been in. We have suffered 45,000 casualties, and 300,000 wounded, at a cost of well over \$100

billion, so no one can call this a small war. But in 1954 the Communists started out under a new doctrine or new theory. They knew they could not engage in big wars. They knew they could not destroy freedom through big wars, because the consequences were too costly, so they started testing a new technique in Vietnam, the so-called wars of liberation, through terrorism and subversion. President Eisenhower recognized this, and I give him credit for it, and may his soul rest in peace, because he made a great contribution and recognized what the Communists were up to.

So we wanted to demonstrate that, and we have. We gave South Vietnam the time she needed to build her own defense capability.

I do not necessarily like the Thieu government, but they are the government with the longest tenure of service that the South Vietnamese have had in more than two decades. They have a stable government and a viable economy. It is not a Yankee dollar economy. About 3 months ago we dedicated a new steel mill just outside of Saigon which will provide 10 percent of all the steel needs of Southeast Asia. So they have a viable economy now in Saigon. The Americans gave them what they needed, which was time to build their own defenses. They now have an army of 1.2 million men.

Our mission, I will say to the gentleman, in Vietnam was to demonstrate to the Communists that their plans to start so-called small wars of liberation in 83 countries of Asia, Africa, and South America are going to fail. We have demonstrated that. I say to my colleague that the time has come now to get out and to recognize the fact that you have concluded and completed a very successful mission. You did what you started out to do, namely, gave the South Vietnamese the time they needed to help themselves. Now I submit to you that any further prolongation of our involvement will defeat the very purpose that we are there for. That is why I suggest let us get out, but do it in an orderly way. What I am saying is according to my formula it will take us a year to get out. If we rotate 33,000 boys back every month, we will just not replace them, and in 1 year there will be no more American troops in Vietnam. You can just imagine what an impact it would have on our whole country. This glorious country of ours, 194 years old, has never been more divided than it is now. There were never greater forces at play dividing us, with good people concerned about their children and their family. We proved in Vietnam that the Communists can be stopped not only in big wars but that they can be stopped in this new technique that they tried to test out in Vietnam through a phony war of liberation. I submit to the gentleman that having done this we have made a very significant contribution.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Are you so naive as to believe that if we pull out of there the Communists will pull out of North

Vietnam? I have no doubt that the South Vietnamese can handle the North Vietnamese pressures and aggressions, but what assurance do we have without arriving at some sort of a negotiated truce with the Communists in North Vietnam, that they are not going to come in and bring about a blood bath? This is what the people in South Vietnam expect, if and when we leave without their having some sort of an understanding with North Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The word "naive" is the gentleman's and not mine. I am not naive and I do not consider the gentleman to be naive, but surely the gentleman is not suggesting and I am sure he must not be suggesting that he believes that at the end of this long and costly conflict in South Vietnam that somehow or other the truce or the negotiations or whatever they call it will bring about some kind of a diminution of Communist control over North Vietnam. That has never been our mission. I do not know of anyone who has suggested it as our mission. Our mission has been to save South Vietnam from the Communists.

Mr. LANDGREBE. The gentleman from Illinois is correct in the statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But we have never said we are either going to invade North Vietnam or that we are going to try to bring about the downfall of the Hanoi Communist Government, because that is not our mission. The only way we can do that, obviously, is to send a huge expeditionary force to North Vietnam, which no one has suggested, thank God. However, I want to make it clear, so we know what we are talking about, I hope that my colleague from Indiana is not suggesting somehow or other a continuation of American presence in Vietnam until we can drive the Communists out of the temples of North Vietnam, because I do not know of anyone else in this administration or in the previous administrations who has ever claimed that that kind of a situation could be brought about. I do not think it is in the books or that we ever talked about it. Our mission is to save South Vietnam from Communist aggression.

Mr. LANDGREBE. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I say this because I believe I can assure you that the South Vietnamese can have the right of self-determination and I state that as far as that is concerned the gentleman in the well has no doubt that the South Vietnamese with an army of 1.2 million men are fully capable of doing that. I do not think there is a chance in the world of the North Vietnamese defeating the South Vietnamese at the present time.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I beg to disagree with the gentleman. I have visited South Vietnam on two occasions and for some reason there are great areas of that land still in the hands of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese.

I have seen the vast array of the U.S. military present there. I do not know how the gentleman can suggest that with the removal of this vast array of equipment, the people of South Vietnam, the country which has been the bloody bat-

tleground of this war can defend themselves, unless we can have some sort of understanding with the North Vietnamese. I do not see how we can abandon these people and simply walk out. You and I have a total disagreement as to the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think, again, perhaps for clarity, we ought to know that the President of the United States has committed us to a withdrawal of combat forces. This is not the gentleman in the well saying that. The President has said this. The President obviously is not going to keep our forces there guarding those rubber plantations which are owned by the French. There are French rubber plantations in South Vietnam, and the gentleman is absolutely correct, which are under the control of the Vietcong today, but they are paying taxes to the French owners in Paris while our American boys are standing over there guarding these things. In my opinion this is sheer folly and a grave mistake.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I am not talking about property. I am talking about priests, doctors, shopowners—I am talking about people, not rubber plantations supposedly owned by the French Government. They are anti-Communist, the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Right.

Mr. LANDGREBE. We could go on with this discussion for many, many hours, but I give great tribute and credit to President Nixon for winding down this war. It took dramatic action when we went into Cambodia to clean out the sanctuaries that had been permitted to exist there for several years where real damage was done to our boys.

But at the same time I have been there and have talked to our military people. I am somewhat—not somewhat, I am in total disagreement with the gentleman in the well and the gentleman's opinion of our military leadership. In fact these people are champing at the bit to do what they know they can do, but because of the actions of this Congress they are not permitted to put forth a good solid effort. However, be that as it may, I have yet to find the first military person from private all the way up to Admiral Bardshar who simply want to continue this war for the sake of continuing the war and killing people. Their mission is to contain communism. They are dedicated to that purpose. They are not totally happy with the tactics which they are permitted to use, but these people—I do not have quite the same regard for them as the gentleman in the well.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have to remind my colleague—and I do not wish to be disrespectful of anyone and especially the military. There are good people and bad people. I certainly do not challenge the honesty or the loyalty or patriotism of them. But is it not a source of concern to the gentleman, as long as you want to talk on that subject—and I was hoping not to be diverted—as to this high posture the gentleman talks about with reference to the military. There must be something dramatically wrong with the training, leadership and policies of our military when we suffer 300,000 casual-

ties in Vietnam in 5 years. I would hope this will be of great concern to all of us and I would hope that the Armed Services Committee will take a look at this. I think, perhaps, we ought to look beyond the realms of what is assumed to be the case and ask ourselves what kind of leadership are these troops getting when we suffer 45,000 dead and 300,000 wounded.

There is something drastically wrong with a leadership that permits that kind of casualties such as we have suffered in Vietnam. I say this to my colleague because I see these figures and this is the longest war in which we have been engaged, against a relatively insignificant enemy who has proved very deadly, but I have to ask myself do I want to put complete abiding confidence in that kind of leadership.

I have to ask myself do I want to put complete, abiding confidence in that kind of leadership? I do not challenge the President, but I do challenge his advisers. I challenge the kind of advice that Mr. Nixon has, and I challenge the kind of advice that President Johnson had, and I challenge the kind of advice that President Kennedy had, and maybe even the kind of advice that President Eisenhower had, because this has been a long, costly, hard-fought war, and I think a lot of mistakes have been made.

It seems to me that in the light of those mistakes now they are saying to us, "Well, we have got to stick it out—we have got to stick it out."

Well, I am not too sure as a responsible Member of this Congress, who has studied this very carefully from all sides, and who has visited over there, I am not sure that that advice is right.

I believe that announcing a freeze on troops now would open up a new dimension for the peace talks in Paris, and would get our prisoners of war released, and would effectuate a cease-fire, and then let the Asians slug it out themselves now that we have brought parity of capability. That was not my idea 6 years ago when there was no military parity, but today when they have parity in defense capability—and as a matter of fact South Vietnam is superior to North Vietnam today, so I say that the smartest thing that we Americans can do is get out of there, and get out of there as fast as possible.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

May I say, No. 1, that I fail to agree that we have an insignificant enemy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I did not say it was insignificant. I agree that they are not insignificant. In fact, they are very deadly.

Mr. LANDGREBE. They are anything but insignificant.

There is no doubt in my mind but that Hanoi has had the advice and the help of the Russians and the Red Chinese, they have had the help that they have needed to carry on a very deadly war. Now, I can cite figures from my last trip to Vietnam, during which it was my good

fortune or bad to visit the hospitals there, seen our soldiers brought in from the battlefields. I believe, in all sincerity, that I have as much compassion for those boys who have suffered terrible injuries there, as anyone in this Congress. The casualties in South Vietnam gnaw at my heart as much as they gnaw at the heart of any of my colleagues.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Has my distinguished colleague heard of a single Russian who has been killed in Southeast Asia?

Mr. LANDGREBE. No. In fact, my answer is that I have not heard or read where a Russian soldier has died any place.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right.

Mr. LANDGREBE. But they are promoting and directing this war, and we are over there hammering away at them.

The gentleman talks about perhaps we could have a negotiated peace, but if the gentleman means we simply move out, total, that is the last thing we can offer them, because President Nixon has offered them the full bag of goodies, hoping that they would accept a negotiated peace, and they have flatly refused and ignored it. Just a couple of weeks before the last election our President made a dramatic plea in which he offered them almost everything but a total, complete, automatic troop pullout.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So that the record of our discussion will show that neither of us are recommending a complete abandonment of our responsibilities—I want to make it crystal clear my proposal today in no way adversely affects South Vietnam's capability to wage this war against the Communists for as long as necessary. We will continue giving South Vietnam all the weapons and armor she needs to defeat the Communists. All I want to do is recognize that the American participation can be terminated. If South Vietnam cannot win the war with an army of 1.2 million troops and all the equipment she needs, then the war can not be won. But I believe South Vietnam can go it alone now, otherwise I would not have introduced my resolution today.

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

THE 1972 FEDERAL BUDGET—A STRANGE DOCUMENT OF DECEPTION AND SEMANTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to discuss some aspects of the budget. I have had occasion to examine in some depth the administration's new budget and I must say that I am impressed—and also somewhat concerned.

I want to say at the outset that I commend the President for his effort to be creative and innovative.

Many of his recommendations and proposals are challenging and worthy of serious consideration.

Many of his proposals represent sharp departures and drastic change.

Many of his proposals obviously represent long hours of study and analysis.

Generally, however, the budget challenges the credibility of the public, members of the Appropriations Committee and others who have had some years of experience in examining our annual Federal budgets.

I am concerned by the rhetoric and fiscal juggling act called an expansionary but not inflationary budget.

Certainly I want to commend the President for his flexibility. I trust these goals can be achieved.

In last year's budget the President was calling for a balanced budget and reduced spending—this year he calls for a large unbalanced budget and deficit spending.

Now we are to accept the doctrine that the Federal budget can be used as an instrument to assist in bringing us out of the current recession to a prosperous full employment economy.

Certainly the new budget represents flagrant deficit-spending.

One may call it a full employment budget or whatever the public relations experts of the administration prefer as a sugar coat.

But this still represents deficit spending.

I want to make it clear that I have no quarrel with the President's effort to strengthen the economy and to reduce unemployment which administration policies have shocked into recession.

I do, however, have some reservations about the Madison Avenue buildup which attempts to hold up deficit spending as a panacea for all of our economic problems.

In view of the condition of our economy, we must move ahead with Federal expenditure increases to prime the pump and attempt to cut unemployment—now at its highest rate in 10 years.

The country faces critical economic problems and the new approach has been considered the only possible course to effect a substantial recovery—and that is not certain.

In submitting this budget, the President has utilized the "unified budget" concept which came into vogue in fiscal 1968.

Formerly the "administrative budget" was used which was based on income outlays of the Federal Government within a given budget year. The unified budget lumps together all Federal assets—including trust funds which were established for specific purposes: Highways, social security.

Including these large trust funds is nothing more than a smokescreen to obscure an extremely large deficit position. By using these trust funds as a means to increase a possible asset position—a fiscal paper tiger, if you will—the budget deficit is reduced to an estimated \$11.6 billion.

Without the trust funds the deficit emerges at approximately \$23.1 billion—and that could well be a conservative figure if the estimates of Federal revenue are as inflated as many economists believe.

The Knoxville News-Sentinel, in a recent editorial, said:

LBJ ran up deficits averaging around \$8.9 billion a year. Yet Nixon says his \$11 billion deficit (if he is lucky enough to come off that

well) will produce for the first time "a prosperity without war and without runaway inflation."

If he is right it will be wonderful and every last one of us will be grateful. If he is wrong—we hate to think about it.

In this connection the budgetary trend during the past several years presents an interesting study.

In fiscal 1969—President Johnson's last budget—there was a surplus of \$3,236 million.

In fiscal 1970—President Nixon's first budget—a deficit of \$2,845 million occurred.

In fiscal 1971—President Nixon's second budget—the estimated deficit is \$18,845 million.

And the President's budget for fiscal 1972 projects a further deficit of \$11.6 billion—more accurately the figure should be between \$15 and \$20 billion.

President Johnson's last budget called for \$198 billion—and was hailed as too high, excessive, and dangerous.

In fiscal 1971, the first year under the Nixon administration, the budget broke through the fiscal sonic barrier to an ear-splitting \$200 billion—\$212,755 million, to be exact.

And now we have before us a budget of \$229,222 million for fiscal 1972—an increase of more than \$44 billion since this administration took office.

While even bigger and bigger, this budget is also an interesting study in semantics.

When President Johnson was proposing his budget of \$198 billion, many "fiscal experts," who now acclaim the \$229 billion package, were decrying the Johnson budgets as wild spending—inflationary—irresponsible—and pie in the sky.

Even when a Democratic administration in 1961 was proposing a budget of less than \$100 billion, we heard the same sad lamentations about irresponsibility and excessive spending.

Today we do not hear these outcries. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has enacted a Truth-in-Packaging Act.

It is too bad this act does not apply to budgeteering. The Madison Avenue cult in administration circles would in all likelihood be subject to cease-and-desist orders because of their flagrant sugar-coating of critical problems with deceptive labels.

The Washington Star, in a recent editorial, said:

In making a rhetorical gimmick of the otherwise respectable concept of a full employment budget aimed at helping restore prosperity, Mr. Nixon perhaps has created a credibility problem he could have avoided. And credibility hazards abound in the budget.

The Star points out for instance that the administration translates its \$18.6 billion deficit of fiscal 1971 into "a full employment surplus of \$1.4 billion." Almost anything can be established by shifting figures.

This optimistic budget is based on the assumption that the administration can push a button and restore the economy to a sound expansion.

The administration deliberately braked and slowed the economy.

Needed public works projects approved by Congress were held back.

Needed public facilities were delayed.

These could have helped to ease the impact of the recession and at the same time provided needed public power, water supplies for municipalities, and other benefits.

Unfortunately our complex economy does not always respond to the push-button style of economics the administration champions.

Push a button—slow the economy.

Push another button—speed up the economy.

It takes time to feed into our economy the stimulus needed to reverse a recession and re-create confidence.

The administration could have begun this process months ago rather than waiting to make a big "splash" with its great reams of rhetoric and a large deficit budget disguised as a cure-all.

Believe it or not, this administration is attempting to spend us into prosperity.

That great champion of the people—President Franklin D. Roosevelt—must be chuckling somewhere as he sees a conservative administration adopting many of the approaches he developed to pull the Nation out of another Republican recession in the thirties.

Viewing history in perspective, it is interesting to review the inconsistency of those who traditionally maligned this great President—and who now are utilizing the same economic theories they criticized.

As we all know, an important concept in this new budget is revenue sharing with State and local governments.

I know that many of us favor revenue sharing in principle.

Certainly we want to provide State and local governments with as much autonomy and resources as possible. However, the needs of the people are paramount—the public interest must be served. Many are concerned over whether the funds will reach those who need them.

As I understand it, the first phase of the President's revenue-sharing proposal is \$5 billion to be distributed to our States and cities.

Another phase of this proposal projects another \$11 billion in revenue sharing—\$1 billion in new funds and \$10 billion in funds which will be recaptured and taken from existing grant-in-aid programs.

These funds would be allocated for broad purposes including urban community development, rural community development, education, manpower training, law enforcement and transportation.

This sounds logical and feasible.

But there are questions that must be answered.

When one examines carefully the budget message of the President, it is apparent that there will be a substantial impact on a number of very basic programs, many with established procedures of long standing.

Are basic essential vital programs to be cannibalized to feed the revenue-sharing plan?

For example, to share revenue under the general urban community develop-

ment category, funds would be taken from such programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development as urban renewal, model cities, water and sewer grants, and home rehabilitation loans.

With respect to rural development, the budget says this:

This fund (\$1 billion for revenue sharing purposes) would replace a set of present, unnecessarily restrictive, categorical grants and other cost-sharing arrangements directed toward this same general purpose.

Programs which would be affected include:

Agricultural extension service, agricultural conservation programs, rural water and waste disposal grants, Forest Service grants for forestry assistance, waterbank program, resource conservation and development programs, regional development assistance, and Appalachian Regional Commission.

Concerning education, the budget says this:

More than any other Federal activity, the school aid programs of the Office of Education reflect the excesses of the categorical grant system.

The following programs would be affected under this phase of the revenue-sharing proposal:

The school lunch program, the impacted areas assistance program, elementary and secondary education program, education for the handicapped, and vocational education.

Also affected by revenue sharing will be manpower training, law enforcement assistance grants, urban mass transit grants, airports grants, highway safety grants, Federal aid highways, and highway beautification.

The budget fails to make one thing clear: precisely how all of the programs will be affected and exactly which programs will be discontinued entirely, or which will be cut back and reduced.

Presumably these details will be provided later.

The New York Times, in a recent editorial, described the revenue-sharing proposal as "hastily improvised and inadequately thought through."

It is interesting to note that although the budget contends that this revenue-sharing plan will effect economies, the number of Federal employees would increase from 2,574,000 to 2,589,300—an increase of more than 15,000 Federal employees—to effect revenue sharing.

Suffice it to say that the Congress must carefully consider all of the complex ramifications of this proposal before making its decision.

There are those who believe that the revenue-sharing proposal will be used to destroy a number of progressive programs that have been passed over the years by the Congress in response to urgent needs in many areas after long and careful consideration.

Some assurance must be provided that the needs of deprived children will be met, for example.

The Appalachian regional development program apparently would be abandoned in the general shakeup. This program is tailored to a single region and was developed after years of hard

study and preparation. The program is just beginning to have a significant impact. Today I have introduced a bill to reestablish and extend the Appalachian regional development program.

In other words, will revenue sharing reach the people who need it most? The people of Appalachia, for example.

Another aspect of this budget which Congress must carefully consider is the proposed sale of Federal assets—the Alaska Railroad—the possible sale of some AEC facilities, the Washington National Capital Airport and Dulles International Airport.

The budget also proposes to eliminate direct loans for farm operations and increase the cost of Federal crop insurance premiums.

The Coast Guard Reserve would be phased out and changes made to effect economies in the medicare and medicaid programs.

The budget would also eliminate certain veterans and social security benefits, which are described as duplications.

With respect to public buildings, the budget proposes to sell certain Government-owned design and sites for construction of 45 new Federal buildings to private enterprise—and to be leased back to the Government. Well, my Committee on Appropriations considered this concept years ago, and the General Accounting Office, in detailed studies and reports has shown after careful examination has determined this is by far the most expensive method of providing Federal buildings. It would be leased over a 40- or 50-year period with interest over the same period.

Direct water and sewer loans by the Department of Agriculture would be discontinued and placed on an insured basis. The special milk program for children would be stopped and eliminated.

"Less efficient" field offices of the Small Business Administration would be closed and the rural loan program for the poor under the Office of Economic Opportunity would be closed down.

The budget would restrict "narrow purpose aid" for land-grant institutions like the University of Tennessee—college construction grants and undergraduate instructional equipment programs.

These and other proposals must be studied carefully by the Congress.

This budget proposes many changes which the Congress will evaluate.

This budget glows with a rosy hue of optimism.

Many hope that the goals of efficiency, economy, prosperity, and full employment can be achieved.

Time will tell whether the predictions held out for this budget are more accurate and credible than those for the one last year which predicted a surplus but produced a huge deficit.

PARKLAND AT THE BELTSVILLE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, President Nixon said:

I will put forward the most extensive program ever proposed by a President to expand the nation's parks, recreation areas, and open spaces in a way that truly brings parks to the people. For only if we leave a legacy of parks will the next generation have parks to enjoy.

I was very pleased to hear the President give such strong emphasis to the need for additional parkland and recreation areas because in September of last year, I proposed, on a smaller scale in Prince Georges County in my congressional district, virtually the same idea as President Nixon would like to implement on a national level.

Mr. Speaker, last year I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior, to open up the lands and facilities of the Agricultural Research Center in Beltsville, Md., for use as a national parkland without in any way giving up the agricultural research now being conducted there.

I became concerned about the lack of parklands in my congressional district, as well as throughout the entire country, after reading a report on the matter prepared jointly by the Maryland Department of Forest and Parks and the Maryland Department of Planning. This report indicates that there is a deficiency of 179,707 acres of parkland in the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas and in southern Maryland.

Former Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel enthusiastically endorsed my proposal. In fact, the Department of the Interior had just announced, at that time, that the Department would soon undertake studies designed to determine the feasibility of making national recreational areas and parklands more readily accessible to city populations. There is no doubt that the facilities of the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center would be accessible to the thousands of inner city youngsters from the District of Columbia.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin stated that the Department of Agriculture is currently conducting a review of the available facilities at the Research Center as well as other Department of Agriculture property to determine if the lands are being fully utilized.

Mr. Speaker, I am most hopeful that this proposal will soon become reality and that the children of the Washington metropolitan area will experience to a greater extent the pleasure of new and improved parklands and recreation areas.

Many youngsters living in urban and suburban areas rarely have an opportunity to see farm animals. By opening up the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville for joint use as a park, the youngsters in the Baltimore-Washington region, as well as tourists, would have that pleasure.

REVIEW OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR MISSION LONG OVERDUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for the umpteenth time, a bill which would bring about a total

review of our Nation's civilian nuclear program. Heretofore, the Joint Atomic Energy Committee has not seen fit to acknowledge that such a bill has been introduced, much less admit there is a need for such a review. However, the tide of public opinion and public uneasiness with respect to the proliferation of civilian nuclear plants is building and I confidently predict that the Joint Committee will soon acknowledge that it has a moral duty to hold broad hearings on the subject.

The importance and the necessity of this review implies that such study be conducted by as impartial a panel as can be found. Perhaps instead of "impartial" I should use the term "balanced." There are few persons who are "impartial" when it comes to nuclear power. I believe the President should appoint an ad hoc committee for the purpose of conducting this review and that all points of view, all manners of opinion, all degrees of expertise, and all segments of the population be heard by the reviewing body.

The joint resolution which I have introduced today is reproduced below. The statement therein indicates the breadth and depth of representation I would like to see on the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development. But I am not married to the format listed, nor am I married to the personnel recommended in this bill. What I am hoping to provide in this bill is a framework for a serious discussion by members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I have no desire to circumvent the committee even though that body has ignored similar pleas by myself and other Members of Congress in the past. I am fully cognizant of the fact that members of that committee have a near monopoly on congressional expertise and experience regarding nuclear matters. But in saying that, I also recognize that the power which has emanated from that combined experience is out of all proportion to the effect of that body's decision on the public-at-large. The Joint Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission may be the repositories of the bulk of knowledge about nuclear energy; they are not, separately or combined, the repositories of the wisdom necessary to guide the Nation along a safe course of nuclear development. I implore the members of the committee to share their wealth of knowledge with the Nation in order that the public can be reassured about the direction of our civilian nuclear program.

The joint resolution is reproduced below:

RESOLUTION

Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. There is hereby established the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 2. (a) The Committee shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be a member

of the general public having no ties to or connections with either the atomic energy industry or any competitive industry, and fourteen other members as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each political party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two Members of the Senate, one from each political party, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate;

(3) The Secretary of the Interior;

(4) The Secretary of Commerce;

(5) The Secretary of Labor;

(6) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) Six members of the general public who are specially qualified to consider and evaluate the technical, economic, and sociological impact of the atomic energy program.

(b) The Chairman, and the members specified in paragraph (7) of subsection (a), shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(c) Each member specified in paragraphs (3) through (6) of subsection (a) may designate another officer of his department to serve on the Committee in his stead.

(d) Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Committee may issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

DUTIES OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The Committee shall study, review, and evaluate the present provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and intensively probe the atomic energy program of the United States generally, with the specific objectives of ascertaining whether the existing civilian nuclear program is responsive to the public need, assessing the validity of the assumptions upon which the existing program is built, and determining what changes should be made in that program. In this connection the Committee shall consider and assess (1) the impact of the subsidized atomic energy industry upon competitive industries not subsidized; (2) the cost of the nuclear program not only in expended human and material resources but also in lost opportunities in nonnuclear fields; (3) methods for effectively integrating atomic energy into the general energy complex of the United States so that reasonable priorities may be determined; and (4) the potential impact of rapid atomic development upon the health and safety of the American public (including the effects of waste disposal, radioactive air and water pollution, the location of plants in urban areas, and possible losses caused by malfunction of nuclear plants.)

(b) As soon as possible after the completion of the study and review provided for in subsection (a) the Committee shall submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress, and shall make such report available to the public. Ninety days after the submission of such report, the Committee shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 4 (a) The Committee, or, on the authorization of the Committee, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person desig-

nated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192-194, inclusive) shall apply in the case of failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Committee is authorized to secure directly from any department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Committee, upon request made by the Chairman.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. The members of the Committee specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 2(a) shall serve without additional compensation. The Chairman and the members appointed under paragraph (7) of section 2(a) shall receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Committee. All members of the Committee shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Committee.

STAFF AND FACILITIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Committee may also procure (without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates), temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(c) To the extent of available appropriations, the Committee may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such property, facilities, and additional services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The state of the public's awareness about nuclear energy and nuclear power plants is being finely tuned by an increasing number of articles which can only be considered in the "scare" category. I know full well that in saying that, it would give the appearance of discounting such articles. I want to lay that particular charge to rest right here. A point, a sentence, a paragraph, or even some "facts" in any one or all of the articles I will append to my statement can be challenged. If the past is prolog regarding either the AEC's or the Joint Committee's reaction to the articles, it will mean that a tiny fragment of an article will be picked apart and that done, the Commission-Committee Defense League will have considered its job as finished. This has been the level and

quality of the "public debate" which has grown over the past 2 or 3 years. Having defended themselves, the commission-committee goes on the offensive with a counterspate of speeches or articles. The public is left confused.

I submit that this is no way to discuss a public policy that affects the future of every living American. The issue of public safety and nuclear development is too important to be left solely in the hands of the commission-committee or the publicists of the opposition.

The commission-committee gives the impression that anyone who opposes nuclear energy is some kind of nut, or worse, anti-American. There is a sanctimoniousness about commission-committee statements which belies the true fact that there are real dangers involved in dealing with the atomic genie released over a quarter of a century ago.

The purpose of my bill to establish a Review Commission is to get the debate into the open, get it discussed with intelligence, and ultimately, to get the problem of nuclear safety resolved in favor of the public's safety. I do not believe this is too much to ask of our colleagues in the House and Senate. I believe that once aroused, the majority of them would also like to lay the simmering issue of nuclear safety to rest.

But why is there a growing public concern? I have answered that partially above. Now, I want to give our colleagues a more complete reason. To do this I am appending to this speech a number of recent articles on the subject of nuclear safety which, in my opinion, should be read by anyone having anything to do with nuclear energy. I believe that you will agree with a friend of mine who, after reading one of the articles below, told me:

For Heaven's sake, if just fifty percent of that is true, we ought to stop producing nuclear energy until we know what the heck we are doing!

The articles attached are as follows: "The Nuclear Power Controversy—Safety," by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, from the January 23, 1971, issue of the *New Republic*; "Precautions Are Being Taken by Those Who Know—An Inquiry Into the Power and Responsibilities of the AEC," by Paul Jacobs, in the January 1971, issue of the *Atlantic*; and "Atom-Age Trash—Finding Places To Put Nuclear Waste Proves a Frightful Problem," by Dennis Farney, which appeared in the January 25, 1971, issue of the *Wall Street Journal*.

The articles follow:

THE NUCLEAR POWER CONTROVERSY: SAFETY

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

During the past two years the atom, largely exempt from controversy since the days of radioactive fallout, has become the focus of public concern. The nuclear hazard involved is associated with the siting of power reactors for the generation of electricity. The radioactive effluents and fallout from the routine operation of these nuclear plants, together with the water-heating effects of the reactors, have formed the primary basis for public fear. While these fears have fueled the controversy, there has been very little attention given to the problem of nuclear accidents. In this three-part series, the issue of nuclear reactor safety is examined first, be-

cause there are many unanswered questions about the siting of more and more, higher-power, nuclear plants closer and closer to cities.

At the outset it should be perfectly clear that a nuclear reactor operating for any length of time constitutes a unique hazard to people and property in its vicinity. The accumulation of immense amounts of radioactivity in the reactor core constitutes a potential threat¹ without precedent in urban life.

The US Atomic Energy Commission is directed by law to promote the development of nuclear power for peacetime benefits, and it also acts as the regulatory agency to control the industrial deployment of nuclear power plants. While there is a certain economy involved in this dual promotional-regulatory role, it introduces a potential conflict of interest. The time has come to split off this regulatory function from the AEC and to transfer it to the newly organized Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This transfer would favor an independent review of reactor safety and siting and might well serve to extricate the utilities from some of their hang-ups in "going nuclear."

Make no mistake about it, the utilities are depending on the atom to supply electric power. Nuclear electric energy has been a long time in coming, especially when one recalls the early postwar optimism about it, but it's here now. The following schedule of nuclear orders illustrates the pace at which utilities are proceeding to buy nuclear power plants:

1966: 24 units, 19,500,000 kilowatts.

1967: 30 units, 25,000,000 kilowatts.

1968: 14 units, 13,000,000 kilowatts.

1969: 7 units, 7,200,000 kilowatts.

1970: 15 units, 16,400,000 kilowatts.

The 1968-69 fall-off in orders reflects overbuying in the previous two years, saturation of the construction capability, and public opposition to nuclear power. It is notable that the 1970 upsurge in orders goes against the tide of environmental opposition and must be due to utility fear of fossil fuel unavailability on terms meeting their cost and pollution restrictions.

Two companies, General Electric and Westinghouse, account for 78 percent of these nuclear orders, and they are probably the only two American firms that have a real grasp of the nuclear safety issue. Both do little safety research with their own funds and the utilities do practically nothing, preferring to spend their money on advertising. For example, Sen. Lee Metcalf (D, Mont.) disclosed last month that in 1969 the utilities spent \$323.8 million on sales and advertising against \$41 million for research and development.

The AEC had its nuclear safety budget for this year slashed by the Bureau of the Budget and now spends slightly more than \$30 million per year in this area. When AEC officials are queried as to why they don't spend more on safety, they admit they should, but claim that industry should pay for it. It's rather late in the day for industry to be safety-researching its nuclear product that is now on order. In the critical area of reactor safety I would prefer to see the work done by the AEC. It has the facilities and the manpower and the real estate for the job. As a constructive suggestion, I propose that the utilities, who will reap the cash rewards of A-power, establish a safety research pool to fund AEC work on reactor safety. An initial annual outlay of \$12 million would serve to invigorate AEC activity on projects that have either slowed down or have not seen the light of day.

¹ One high-power reactor operating for one year burns as much nuclear fuel as is consumed in the detonation of more than 1000 Nagasaki A-bombs.

To understand the present status of reactor safety we have to go back to 1957 and review the sequence of events and change in philosophy attending the evolution of nuclear power risks. Furthermore, we need to know something about reactors themselves.

In March 1957 the AEC published its response to a request from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a study of damage potential from reactor accidents. It took the form of a 105-page document (WASH-740) titled "Theoretical Possibilities and Consequences of Major Accidents in Large Nuclear Power Plants." The AEC's description of these consequences was sufficiently spectacular to catapult the Congress into passing the Price-Anderson Act, providing for financial protection and government indemnity in the event of a reactor accident. The AEC undertook but never issued a revision of WASH-740; what appears in the public domain is a letter from AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg to Rep. Chet Hollifield, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, dated June 18, 1965. This letter deals with the likelihood of major accidents and their consequences, admits that higher power levels in reactors and longer fuel cycles could produce greater damage (although the likelihood of accidents, it said, "is still more remote") and calls for extension of the Price-Anderson Act.

On October 10, 1957 an atomic accident in the form of a uranium fire took place in England at the Windscale Unit 1 production reactor. Some 20,000 curies of iodine-131 escaped to the atmosphere and the British authorities had to stop milk supplies from farms in an area of 200 square miles downwind of the malfunctioning reactor. This particular hazard had received only passing reference to the AEC-WASH-740 analysis. The Windscale accident shook up officials in Britain and made them sensitive to reactor hazards.

On January 3, 1961 an explosion in the SL-1 reactor, near Idaho Falls, Idaho killed three young men with a blast-radiation effect. The 3000-kilowatt experimental boiling-water reactor blew up when a control rod was mismanaged, producing a power surge in the reactor vessel. Sited remotely at the AEC's National Reactor Testing Station, the SL-1 reactor had its consequences confined to the immediate vicinity, but the accident served notice that no man-made design was foolproof.

Nuclear power reactors were emerging from their research phase and on Feb. 10, 1961 the AEC issued its "Notice of Proposed Guides" requiring that applicants for a permit to construct a power reactor submit a reactor safeguards report including details of the siting. All applicants were required to calculate these three distances:

"(A) Exclusion area, which is the area surrounding the reactor. Access to this area is under full control of the reactor owner. Residence within this area would normally be prohibited. . . .

"(B) Low population zone, the area immediately surrounding the exclusion area. In this area the number of residents must be small enough so that they could be evacuated or other protective measures taken in the event of a serious accident.

"(C) Population center distance, which is the distance from the reactor to the nearest boundary of a densely populated center containing more than about 25,000 residents."

The whole concept enunciated in this AEC guide to reactor siting was one of minimizing risk through interposition of distance between the reactor and population. Anyone reading the details of how the AEC suggested these distances should be assessed would be convinced that the AEC was steering utilities away from close-to-large-city sites.

Dr. Clifford K. Beck, Deputy Director of Regulation of the Atomic Energy Commis-

sion, admitted the no-near-city prohibition in a speech delivered Sept. 25, 1963: "No reactor of high power level can be placed in or near a populated area if there is any substantial likelihood that significant portions of its accumulated wastes could accidentally be released to the environment." But, he went on to add, "there are virtually no sites acceptable, safetywise, if the worst conceivable accident must be assumed. . . ." Dr. Beck's speech was titled: "Engineering Out the Distance Factor." In it he outlined two alternatives to distance—one, design and construction to prevent a major accident from happening, and, two, building in safeguards to contain the consequences of an accident.

Here then was the turning point in reactor safety, in which engineering came to be substituted for distance. What sort of engineering? The details started to flow out of the AEC in 1967 and—this is what worries me—they have been upwelling ever since. New criteria emerges, more unknowns are identified and more research is indicated, but all the while more powerful nuclear reactors are being constructed closer to cities.

For example, the AEC issued its "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plant Construction Permits" on July 10, 1967. A total of 70 individual criteria is listed. That high AEC officials harbor their own doubts about reactor safety engineering comes out piecemeal in their speeches or may be read between the lines. (It comes out directly if you talk to AEC personnel at the operating or bench level. Reactor engineers tend to be somewhat habituated to their machines and most utility men are not very well informed about reactors.) None other than the AEC's Director of Regulation, Harold L. Price, put his finger on the real problem in mid-1967 when he said:

"The basic safety issue presented by metropolitan sites for large power reactors is whether, in lieu of partial dependence on distance from population centers, full reliance can or should be placed on the inherent safety of the reactors and their engineered safety features."

Yet almost at the same time that Mr. Price was identifying the issue, Dr. Seaborg was testifying before the Joint Committee: "While progress has been made in improving the safety of reactors, we need to obtain more experience and data in order to develop criteria for the siting of these units in urban areas." The full extent of the unknowns in reactor safety is revealed in 145 pages of AEC material introduced into congressional testimony in 1967 under the title "Water-Reactor Safety Program: Summary Description." This evidence includes brief descriptions of 100 individual reactor safety studies or projects, some of which were not even under way in 1967. Dr. Seaborg may have had these projects in mind when he testified.

At this point it becomes necessary to define the major physical problem in reactor safety. A nuclear reactor is basically a chain-reacting nuclear core sealed inside a stout pressure vessel which is rigged to permit entry and withdrawal of control rods that determine the power level of the machine. The reactor core consists of about one million pounds of nuclear fuel, control rods, and core structure. Most modern reactors of high power contain their nuclear fuel in the form of about nine million thimble-size pellets distributed in 12 foot long tubes all clustered together in a cylindrical array 11 feet in diameter. The very center of these uranium dioxide pellets is raised to a temperature of 4100° F producing a near-molten condition. The outer surface of the uranium fuel pellet is cooled by the swift passage of water under high pressure—from 1000 to 2250 pounds per square inch. Any interruption of the cooling water imperils the integrity of the fuel element, and it is a prime requirement in reactor engineering that provisions

be made for emergency cooling in the event of a loss of coolant.

What is the worst that could happen to cause a reactor to lose its coolant? Experts agree that it would be a double break in the huge pipes that conduct heated water away from the reactor core to a heat exchanger and then return it to the pressure vessel. Should such a pipe rupture occur, the high pressure hot water would gush out and produce what reactor men call a "blowdown." Dr. William K. Ergen of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory headed up a task force that reported out in 1967 with a 226-page analysis "Emergency Core Cooling." Using this as a guide I have sketched the sequence of events in a reactor core following a drastic coolant break on a time schedule as follows:

5 to 10 seconds: Core temperature jumps from 600 to 1500° F in localized sectors.

30 to 50 seconds: Temperature exceeds 2000° F. Coast structure begins steam reaction and energy release.

50 to 100 seconds: Core attains temperature of 3360° F.

2 minutes: Core, collapse begins.

10 minutes: Melt-down debris accumulates in vessel.

1 hour: Probable melt-through of pressure vessel with possible steam explosions.

1 day: Molten mass of reactor material breaks through containment slab.²

3 years: Molten material forms 100-foot glob in sand.

11 years: Cool-off of residual material shrinks to 80-foot diameter.

The point to stress here is that emergency core cooling systems which may spray water into or flood the reactor core have to work within five to 10 seconds. Otherwise one is no longer dealing with a reactor core but with a glowing mass of molten and melting material for which additional cooling or preventive measures are no longer effective. Yet as one reads through the Ergen report the phrases "a matter of speculation" or "it is not known" keep recurring. I have not been able to find any more recent AEC analysis of core-cooling, nor have I come across any overall evaluation of nuclear safety. I therefore urge that a high-level review of reactor safety be made by some independent group such as the National Academy of Engineering, funded by the Environmental Protection Agency.

No more important engineering challenge exists today than making sure that the reactors coming into use conform to a rigid set of codes so that the public safety is assured for the coming decades of nuclear power. The National Academy should establish a permanent Nuclear Power Safety Board whose first mission would be an evaluation of the status of reactor safety. The Academy already has a task force working on reactor siting and the new responsibility would be a natural addition to its present activity, involving however a much higher-powered organization to investigate the safety issue. This recommendation is in line with the example set by the British, who established a Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee with appointments to it being made by responsible Ministers. Incidentally, British siting policy emphasizes controlled population adjacent to reactors and thorough evacuation planning for zones closest to the site.

My basic reason for proposing an independent review of reactor safety is that the question of "How much safety?" is a public not an AEC matter. I would not impose a moratorium on reactor construction, because nuclear safety is a combination of reactor design and siting. Reactor safety is essentially a statistical concept. For example, the

² Reactor experts use the phrase *Chinese Syndrome* to describe the possibility that a liquid sodium-cooled core might break through confinement and keep sinking in the earth—Chinabound.

Calvert Cliffs nuclear station being built on Chesapeake Bay 46 miles southeast of the White House has fewer than 200 people living within a two-mile radius and the nearest large town is Cambridge, 20 miles across the bay. This contrasts with the two nuclear units New Jersey's Public Service & Electric plans to site at Newbold Island in the Delaware River, five miles south of Trenton and 10 miles north of Philadelphia. A 1985 projection puts the population at risk within a 10-mile radius of Newbold Island as three-quarters of a million people. An AEC construction permit for this plant was applied for last March.

The AEC procedure for granting a construction permit is a democratic one in that it allows for a public hearing. The utility is required to file a detailed Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR) which is then scrutinized by the AEC's regulatory staff. This safety review often takes a year and involves many conferences with the utility experts, often the vendor's people, but unfortunately these exchanges do not appear on the record. Furthermore, the AEC subjects the PSAR and the regulatory staff study to independent review by its Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS), a highly competent group of 14 nuclear experts. ACRS has the gullotine power of decision on a construction permit for a reactor. ACRS approval is often contingent upon the utility making changes in plant design and its reports pinpoint weak points in reactor safety, some of which indicate a need for further research and development.

Public hearings prior to the granting of a construction permit involve a three-man AEC tribunal selected from a 23-man Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel. Citizens and associations are allowed to appear as intervenors at public hearings and in some cases these interventions have produced lengthy delays in granting a permit. Finally, the AEC allows for public hearings prior to awarding an operations license, and a number of nuclear plants are now hanging fire because of intervention at this stage. Many issues get aired at these hearings, but that of reactor safety is extremely difficult for an intervenor to explore; he must bow to the judgment of the experts—almost all of whom are employed by the AEC, by the reactor manufacturer or by the utility.

When AEC Chairman Seaborg says, as he did before an AP editors' convention on Nov. 19, 1970: "We know that the benefits we gain will far outnumber the risks of the potential hazards," then I submit the "we" is not all of "us."

I do not make the charge that the AEC is imposing an unsafe system of nuclear power on the nation; I submit that the public record is not visible to substantiate public confidence in the AEC's assurance. It's deeply disturbing to read in the Oak Ridge National Laboratory *Review* an article on "Benefits vs. Risks in Nuclear Power—A logical, facts-and-figures comment on the current anti-atom literature," by ORNL Assistant Director Walter Jordan:

"The \$64 million question still remains, and that is whether we have succeeded in reducing the risk to a tolerable level—i.e., something less than one chance in ten thousand that a reactor will have a serious accident in any year. Thus when we have 100 nuclear power stations in operation, not too far in the distant future, an accident once every hundred years might be expected."

But before the year 2000 we will probably have 500 nuclear reactors of one million kilowatt rating, and it would appear a certainty we will have a serious nuclear accident—and by that time population, if uncontrolled, will hem in our reactor sites. To call it a \$64 million question is to sadly underestimate the hazard and to make a mockery of the Price-Anderson Act. Dr. Jordan concludes his article:

"We and the public should be prepared to face the possibility of a nuclear accident, just as we live with the possibility of major earthquakes which will exact a large toll in property and lives."

This time the "we" is separated from the public, but this gap between the nuclear community and the public is precisely the reason for worrying about a nuclear accident. Even a mini-accident could roadblock the future course of nuclear power.

The nation needs power, clean power, and I believe it is not beyond our technological capabilities to design, site and operate nuclear power plants and insure the public safety. But as we, meaning all of us, enter into the nuclear decades, it is essential that the record is clear—that we, not just a few experts in a closed community, audit the nuclear books and lay the basis for public confidence in our nuclear future. As a constructive way of proceeding, I propose the following:

Establishment of a permanent Nuclear Power Safety Board to study and report on the status of nuclear reactor safety. This body would recommend a national policy on reactor safeguards and siting.

Imposition of a ceiling on reactor electric power ratings, limiting output to 1,200,000 kilowatts of electric power. This restriction has the effect of limiting the accident consequences of a nuclear plant.

Intensification of reactor safety research and development at AEC sites, aided by funds supplied by the nuclear utilities. This activity would encompass full-scale operational testing of reactor components.

Prohibition of AEC construction permits for nuclear plants with a near-metropolitan siting posture like the Newbold Island units.

Separation of the regulatory function from the AEC with assignment of this responsibility to the Environmental Protection Agency.

"PRECAUTIONS ARE BEING TAKEN BY THOSE WHO KNOW": AN INQUIRY INTO THE POWER AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AEC

(By Paul Jacobs)

Early in 1957, Dr. Linus Pauling suggested that I might want to investigate a dispute between the editor of a small weekly paper in Tonopah, Nevada, and the Atomic Energy Commission. Pauling told me that the editor was troubled about the weapons-testing program conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission at the Nevada Test Site, not far from Tonopah. The editor, Robert Crandall, was convinced that the Atomic Energy Commission had been less than candid about the effects of radioactive fallout from the weapons testing on the people of his community and the surrounding areas.

It was very difficult to research an article about the Atomic Energy Commission at that time. In 1957, the cold war was still on, the United States was in a bitter nuclear weapons race with the Soviet Union, and the Atomic Energy Commission was considered sacred, the guardian of the only weapon that stood between us and the Communists. Scientists like Pauling, who were predicting wide-scale genetic damage from radiation, were derided and vilified. In those years, too, almost everything about the Atomic Energy Commission's activities was protected by security provisions. The Commission effectively controlled all information about itself.

Nevertheless, I went to Nevada to interview Crandall and as I got into the story, talking with him and the people around Tonopah, I became as involved in it as Crandall himself. Gradually, as I drove from ranch to ranch in the wild Nevada mesas and to quiet Mormon villages in Utah and Arizona, the pieces of the story began to fit together. And then I managed to obtain a document which verified, in precise detail, many of the

charges made by Crandall and other residents of the area.

The document was a report prepared by the U.S. Public Health Service on the Atomic Energy Commission's monitoring activities in the areas around the test site during the 1953 series of weapons tests. It revealed that while the AEC was saying publicly that there was no health hazard from the Nevada tests and that radiation levels were being adequately monitored and recorded, in fact there was great uncertainty within the Public Health Service over the effects of the tests. The report also indicated that the spread of fallout had been unpredicted in many cases, simply because the wind had shifted in a way that the AEC had not expected. The result of the wind shift was that large numbers of people had received doses of radiation in differing amounts.

The unit for measuring the amount of radiation to which the whole body, as opposed to a single organ, is exposed is called a "rad"; the present standards are that the average exposure of a given population should not exceed 0.17 rads and that no individual should be exposed to more than 0.5 rads. The current bitter controversy over nuclear reactors focuses on the 0.17 rad figure (sometimes given as 170 millirads). Those who oppose the AEC maintain that the 0.17 figure is much too high, while the AEC insists that it is low enough to protect public health adequately and that, in any case, the general population would never receive the 0.17 dosage, even from the operations of all the reactors now in existence or planned.

In my article "Clouds From Nevada," which appeared in the *Reporter* magazine May 16, 1957, I criticized the AEC for poor monitoring work, secrecy, the disguise of health hazards, and the Atomic Energy Commission's unrestrained use of its power. A few newspapers and wire services noted the story; the *Washington Post* printed an editorial praising it, and the Atomic Energy Commission blasted it and me. But the effect of the article was short-lived.

One day in late 1969, a newspaper in San Francisco, where I live now, carried a small item about the widow of an Air Force officer who had won a case against the Veterans Administration. Her husband had been one of the pilots who flew planes that monitored for radioactivity in the weapons tests about which I had written. He had died of leukemia. She lived in Santa Cruz, California, according to the article, and her name was Mrs. William Wahler.

Mrs. Wahler is a short, slender, energetic woman. Over a cup of coffee and a sandwich, she told me of her life with Bill Wahler and of his death from leukemia. Wahler had flown in the Eighth Air Force during World War II and had been awarded seven Air Medals. After his discharge in 1945, he reenlisted so he could continue flying. In 1951, he was assigned to Kirtland Air Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as a member of a special group of pilots trained to fly radiation monitoring and surveillance missions during the secret tests of nuclear weapons at Eniwetok, in the Pacific, and in Nevada. Some of the pilots in the group were trained also to drop the nuclear bombs used in the tests, both in Nevada and in the Pacific.

I asked Mrs. Wahler what kind of precautionary measures had been taken to guard the pilots against any overexposure to radioactivity.

"Well, they all wore film badges, but it was sort of haphazard in Nevada. The pilots didn't really have confidence in the men who were doing the tabulating; sometimes they'd skip taking the radiation exposure that day because the people weren't around at the right time or something like that. I guess everybody felt the levels they were exposed to were perfectly harmless. They didn't

know enough at that time to realize they build up.

"When Bill was at Eniwetok, he had rest and recuperation in October, 1966, in Hawaii, and I noticed while we were together for ten days that he wasn't well. He seemed pale and listless, had no pep."

But after Wahler returned to the United States, he seemed completely recovered from whatever had caused his listlessness in Hawaii. In 1961, he retired from active duty, and the family moved to Santa Cruz, where he got a job as a social worker.

"He began to slow down, and he just seemed to be aging rapidly," Mrs. Wahler said. "Between Christmas and New Year's of 1966, we went to visit his brother in San Diego, and his brother said Bill looked like he'd aged a lot in the year since he'd seen him. A week later, he woke up in the middle of the night with a severe headache, and he said he'd had a terrible, wild dream. This went on for a week or two, and he'd have these dreams and these unexplained bruises on his arms and legs. So he went to the hospital, and three weeks later he was dead."

He was dead, but his wife and children were alive, without any income. At the time, Mrs. Wahler hadn't made any connection between her husband's leukemia and radiation, until another pilot, who had come to the funeral, told her that some people thought such a connection existed.

"I started researching it then, and the more I got into it, the more convinced I was that radiation was involved." She applied for a pension, claiming her husband's death was service-incurred. The Veterans Administration denied her claim because the Atomic Energy Commission maintained that her husband had not received enough radiation to cause the leukemia. So she had appealed, been denied again, appealed again, and finally, after two years, was given the opportunity to present her case in person to a VA appeals board. The board reversed the previous denials after getting an opinion from an independent medical expert; enough doubt existed, they said to warrant making the decision in her favor. The Atomic Energy Commission continues to insist, however, that Major Wahler could not have received enough radiation to have caused his death.

Before I left Mrs. Wahler that day, I asked if she knew what had happened to the other pilots in her husband's outfit. She mentioned a flier named Marvin Speer, who she had heard had leukemia. And she remarked, "I kind of hesitated when I wrote to some of my husband's former buddies, because I was putting fears in them, and this was brought to my attention, and I stopped writing."

In the case of Marvin Speer, Mrs. Wahler need not have worried about arousing fears. As I discovered weeks later, Colonel Speer had died in September, 1968, also from leukemia.

A third pilot in the group, Major Richard Partrick, talked to me in Albuquerque of the monitoring flights he'd made. Major Partrick's words are difficult to understand because the left side of his jaw and part of his larynx were removed in 1968, after it was discovered that he had cancer.

And still another pilot from the group, who wishes not to be identified, repeated many of the same details about the radiation missions, his hand occasionally reaching up to touch the suppurating lesions on his head, lesions which he has had for more than ten years and which do not respond to treatment.

The Atomic Energy Commission insists no connection exists between the deaths from leukemia of Major Wahler and Colonel Speer, nor between Major Partrick's cancer, and the radiation to which they were exposed. No one can assert positively, at this time, that these deaths and injuries are from the radiation.

Neither is there any unassailable scientific evidence that the abnormal number of deaths from leukemia in the quiet Mormon villages of Parowan, Paragonah, and Pleasant Grove, Utah, and Fredonia, Arizona, were the result of the fallout from the tests to which the towns had been exposed. The death rate from leukemia in Pleasant Grove is approximately 6 times higher than normal, while in Paragonah and Parowan, neighboring towns, 4 cases were diagnosed in a period when only 1.4 should have been anticipated. Fredonia and its neighboring town, Kanab, Utah, suffered what one medical expert described as a leukemia "epidemic."

But neither can the AEC accurately claim, as it does, that no possible connection exists between these events and its activities. It cannot justify such an assertion because (a) no one knows, including the AEC, the exact amount or the type of radiation to which these pilots and communities have been exposed and (b) not enough knowledge exists about the effects of low-level radiation. The AEC continues to make such statements as the one it issued in 1970 in response to a critical NBC-TV program: "Small doses produce no damage which scientists have been able to detect." Many eminent scientists would worry over the implications of such a pronouncement. Nobel Prize winners Dr. Joshua Lederberg and Dr. Linus Pauling both warn that if the present permissible dose occurred it would kill thousands of people every year, and they argue, amongst other things, that it may be too early to detect damage already caused by small doses of radiation. Even the AEC's staunchest supporters in the scientific community tend to put the case cautiously. Thus, Dr. Victor Bond, of the AEC's Brookhaven Laboratory, said in November, 1970, that "for purposes of radiation protection, in the absence, of well-defined data otherwise, the cautious assumption must be made that any amount of exposure carries some probability of harm to a population, however small that probability may be."

"[N]ever before in the peacetime history of the United States has Congress established an administrative agency with such sweeping authority and entrusted with such portentous responsibilities," said the men who wrote the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Under the terms of that Act, and its 1954 Amendment, Congress gave the Atomic Energy Commission total and exclusive control over every aspect of nuclear energy, including both its military and peaceful uses. It has at its disposal more than \$2 billion a year, its own security force, the right to police its own activities, and the authority to classify any data which the Commission judges might threaten the national interest if they were to be released. In effect, the AEC is a government within the government.

The Commission also contributes more than \$300 million yearly in subsidies to academic research at universities, scientific consortia, and AEC-owned laboratories operated by educational organizations. The AEC's total investment in research facilities is more than \$3 billion.

In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission is charged with the responsibility for guarding the public safety from the dangers of radiation, for negotiating and administering international agreements involving nuclear energy.

Approximately 53 percent of the Commission's current budget is allotted for military applications. Since the first nuclear bomb was exploded in New Mexico, the AEC has conducted 512 announced weapons detonations, plus an undisclosed number of secret tests. The components for the nuclear weapons are produced at eight plants scattered over the country and operated by large corporations as AEC contractors.

The number of these weapons now stockpiled is kept totally secret, but obviously, must run into the thousands. Production continues and can be expected to continue indefinitely.

Plowshare, the AEC program for the peaceful use of nuclear bombs, was once the AEC's *Wunderkind*, hailed by Dr. Edward Teller. "Success in Plowshare," he said, "will bring as rich a harvest as man's ingenuity ever produced."

But success has been slow to come, and today the Plowshare program is reduced in scope and budget. Only \$8 million of the operating budget was allocated to Plowshare last year. Of all the grandiose schemes to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes hardly a handful remain, and even these are in trouble, endangered by the opposition to them from conservationists and groups fearful of radiation dangers. Meanwhile, the AEC now expends about 20 percent of its budget on the reactor program, under which the AEC has the sole right to license the building of reactors and complete control over the sale of the fissionable material used in them. The program will continue to expand unless the AEC receives a serious setback in the controversies about nuclear reactors now raging all over the country.

The AEC—along with its congressional ally, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the nuclear power industry—is committed to the widest possible utilization of nuclear energy. One of the proponents, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, believes that "not only do we need nuclear power, but this source of energy has, historically speaking, been discovered just in the nick of time. . . . In view of the world's growth and human expectations, to depend for our energy on the remaining supply of fossil fuels—as optimistic as we might be about their reserves—would be environmentally, economically and humanely disastrous."

The AEC's perpetual optimism leads inevitably to a situation in which the agency is uncomfortable presenting anything less than the most jovial view of nuclear energy. Such a posture is characteristic, of course, of most public and private institutions as they seek to present themselves in the most favorable light. But in the case of the AEC, maintaining its image has sometimes meant risking the public's health: I was concerned over the Commission's record in 1957, and this past summer I found fresh cause for alarm.

In August, 1970, I asked the Atomic Energy Commission Public Information Officers at AEC headquarters in Germantown, Maryland, for several documents, including the "Official Use Only" report which I had first obtained in 1957. It is now declassified, together with reports on monitoring in earlier weapons-test programs, and was readily available. I had kept the original all these years, and now I read them side by side.

The comparison revealed, at first, only minor differences, softening in the second version the impact of the first. But when I got to the conclusion I discovered a much more serious change. A large portion of the original was deleted. Taken out was the section described as "probably the most significant summary in this report." The now-absent summary dealt with the fact that certain areas of Nevada and Utah were exposed to radiation far in excess of the standards set by the National Committee on Radiation Protection Standards. The deleted section said further that: ". . . in future tests, within such areas, blood changes in man might be demonstrable if systematic observations are made. It is possible also that the immunities of the population might be sufficiently reduced that measurable increased incidences of selected communicable diseases would be discerned by epidemiolog-

ical investigations. The long-term implications of yearly exposure of a cross-section of the population to levels in excess of those considered to be maximum permissible for occupational workers certainly justify continued observation and maintenance of radiation health records, even though specific consequences cannot be foreseen at this moment."

That warning, that plea for "continued observation and maintenance of radiation health records," and the statements that some areas of Nevada and Utah had received excessive exposures—all those statements are now missing.

Where did the original page go? The AEC says it does not know who made the deletion or why it was done, although, as one AEC staff member told me, "It does seem like a pretty important change."

This was not the only time that the AEC had concealed, and in some cases disregarded, information that has threatened its interests. In many of these cases, to be sure, honest scientific disputes are involved. But each of them raises grave doubts in the mind of a layman about the AEC's regard for public safety. And one need not be a physicist or a biologist to worry, at the very least, over the way in which the AEC has dealt with unpleasant news and with the messengers who deliver it.

In 1960, for example a physicist named Dr. Harold Knapp, then on the AEC staff, was investigating a phenomenon called "hot spots." Hot spots are areas of unexplained high radiation that occasionally occur throughout the country as an aftermath of aboveground weapons testing. Knapp was paying particular attention to evidence of I-131, radioactive iodine, which had been discovered in abnormal levels in milk produced near St. Louis, Missouri. In human beings I-131, like ordinary iodine, concentrates in the thyroid gland, where it may cause cancer. Knapp was anxious to compare the levels in Missouri with those in milk-producing areas near the Nevada test sites. But he discovered that the AEC had failed to monitor the milk in those areas. In 1953, for example, a test had deposited an unpredicted amount of fallout on the dairy region near St. George, Utah. A monitoring team sent there reported that "no standard procedures existed for preparing milk samples"; as a result "no details were obtained on time of milking, milking techniques, individual producers, etc." But it was decided to forgo attempting to collect such data because "extensive inquiry into such details would indicate the concern of the test program's rad-safe ["radiation safety"] group with the possibility of milk contamination and alarm an already worried community."

Knapp was able partially to overcome the lack of data from the early tests when milk monitoring procedures were set up to follow a weapons test in 1962. The purpose of collecting the data was to permit a calculation of how large the iodine 131 burden was to the thyroids of persons drinking milk after a nuclear detonation and to provide a standard for estimating the iodine 131 doses to children's thyroids from past nuclear tests. Knapp's report horrified his superiors. Not only did he point out that, until 1962, "no systematic effort had been made to obtain fallout levels and milk levels at the same time," but also he concluded that, on the basis of the 1962 data, heavy doses of iodine 131 had been ingested by children in Utah from at least one earlier test and perhaps from others as well.

Pressure was applied to Knapp to keep him from publishing his report. Its technical validity was questioned, and in addition, its potential bad effect upon the AEC's public image was pointed out. One AEC official who opposed publishing Knapp's report worried at the time about "what reaction may we expect from the press and the public"; and

Dr. Gordon Dunning one of Knapp's superiors, told me in 1970 that the Commission believed that publication of Knapp's report "would lead to substantially larger numbers [of thyroid doses] than had been published from the various monitoring programs. . . . How did one explain this? Would it look like the Atomic Energy Commission and Public Health Service had not been doing their job?"

But Knapp insisted on the publication of his report; finally, the AEC convened a committee of scientists to review the report, pointing out to them that if the report were published, it "would make the Commission out to have been liars." The committee refused to block publication, and finally Knapp's report appeared, prefaced by an analysis of it by the committee members. But the AEC version did not include Knapp's conclusion that following a 1953 weapons test, the doses to the thyroid glands of infants in the St. George, Utah, area "would be in the range of 120-440 rads," doses which would have been very high indeed. Subsequently, Knapp published the full report, including his conclusions about St. George, in *Nature* magazine.

It is, of course, possible that Knapp's conclusions were inaccurate, but he was correct in at least one respect: the AEC does not know how much radioactive iodine it visited on St. George, Utah, and elsewhere in the country. And this, clearly, is information the Commission sought, unsuccessfully, to keep private.

Nuclear explosions—weapons tests and huge cratering experiments—are the most awesome and frightening aspect of the AEC's operations; but almost everything associated with atomic energy is full of risk. The disposal of radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors and plants providing fissionable materials poses problems on a scale far greater than the Army's difficulties in ridding itself of nerve gas. The handling of these wastes has been the focus of yet another muffled controversy between worried scientists and the AEC.

In 1966, a special committee of earth scientists (from the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council) severely criticized AEC waste-disposal procedures and suggested alternative methods. The committee charged that the AEC was putting economic considerations ahead of safety, and that in some cases the Commission's officials were vastly overconfident of the ability of local environments to absorb wastes. Specifically, the committee members cited burial of radioactive material in places where too little was known about the shifting of the earth or about subterranean movement of water. And they were alarmed at the use of containers subject to erosion and fracture.

The Atomic Energy Commission "had a lot of problems with the report," said John Erlewine, an AEC official. In fact, the AEC tried for a time to suppress it. Erlewine justified the suppression to me by saying the report was "in house" and "outside the competence" of the scientists involved, and, he added, "we didn't think much of it."

It was not until a member of the scientists' committee charged publicly late in 1969 that the AEC had "persistently refused" to release the report, arousing senatorial pressure, that the Commission relented.

By that time, evidence had already been uncovered that confirmed the scientists' fears. The Dow Chemical Company, which operates the AEC's Rocky Flats plutonium manufacturing plant in Colorado, had been burying radioactive plutonium wastes in exactly the manner which the committee had warned against—in "artificial containers subject to corrosion, fracture and other forms of damage." Dow had buried metal drums, filled with either oil-saturated plutonium wastes or uranium wastes, within the area of

the plant as far back as 1958. Drums of plutonium waste oil had also been stored on the surface of the ground inside the plant; some of these fractured and sprang leaks. In addition, the company had buried drums of uranium wastes outside the plant.

This might not have been known had it not been for another worrisome event, a disastrous \$45 million fire which broke out in the plant on May 11, 1969. Ten days later, Major General E. B. Giller, Atomic Energy Commission Assistant General Manager for Military Applications, told a congressional committee, "I am relieved to report that there is no appreciable amount of plutonium outside the building" and "no known contamination off-site as a result of the fire."

General Giller's optimistic statements about the absence of plutonium outside the plant turned out to be both premature and incorrect; in January, 1970, a Colorado conservation group issued a report that Dr. Edward Martell, a nuclear chemist working at the National Atmospheric Research Center in Boulder, Colorado, had made an independent investigation and found plutonium traces in the soil outside the plant. (Dr. Martell charges that prior to his analysis of the soil, the Atomic Energy Commission had monitored primarily the air around the plant and neglected to check for radioactivity on the ground.)

Initially, Martell believed that the plutonium traces he found in the soil after the Rocky Flats fire were the result of the fire itself. But the Atomic Energy Commission, on the basis of an investigation made for it by the Public Health Service in August, 1970, announced that the plutonium had not come from the fire of 1969 or from an earlier fire, but instead from dust blowing around the oil drums, which had been leaking plutonium wastes into the ground.

I asked General Giller a few months ago whether he was satisfied with the safety precautions being taken at Rocky Flats.

"The answer is an unqualified yes," he replied.

"Had you been satisfied with the safety precautions before the fire?"

"We had been satisfied with the safety precautions before the fire. Certainly, in hindsight, we could have operated the plant differently, in which, for instance, the drums would not have been stored outside and we would not have leaked, meaning we would not have put plutonium from that source into the soil. But we must remember, of course, we're talking about extremely small amounts, and none of this constitutes a hazard to health."

But, as General Giller said himself, plutonium is one of the most dangerous radioactive substances, and it is an undisputed scientific fact that it takes only "extremely small amounts" of plutonium to cause lung cancer. A microscopic particle of plutonium can cause death if it lodges in the lungs. And the \$45 million fire itself, which might have been catastrophic for nearby Denver, suggests that safety precautions at Rocky Flats were inadequate.

Representative Chet Holifield (Dem., Cal.), chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is aware of the dangers from plutonium, for he is one of the most knowledgeable legislators in the country on matters of nuclear energy. But at an executive session of the Joint Committee, held on April 10, 1970, Congressman Holifield decried Dr. Martell's independent investigation which turned up the plutonium traces as "scratching around in the sand."

The executive session was attended by two other congressmen, members of the Joint Committee staff, a group of high AEC officials, and two officers of the union representing the workers at the Dow Chemical plant. When it was disclosed that the company had hidden drums of radioactive wastes in the plant area, Holifield was enraged. "Maybe this is not put-

ting one milligram of radiation above ground, but you know the problems this sort of thing can create from a public relations standpoint. It can be magnified many times by these sensationalists," he told the group. The chagrined AEC officials replied that they, too, had been ignorant of the hidden wastes until just before the executive session started. And the executive director of the committee staff conceded, "It was a very poorly supervised thing." One high AEC official said, "It is clear to us that we have a considerable amount of work to do and have to undo some things that were done in the past. This may turn out to be one of those situations. We have waste in Idaho that I think the final analysis will show we should dig up. . . . We are going to have a lot of clean-up operations to do for the long pull as a result of this."

Publicly, of course, neither the AEC nor the Joint Committee admits the enormous potential danger in the AEC's present practices of radioactive waste management. That is why the AEC tried to suppress the report on waste disposal and why the true dimensions of the problem are revealed only when the minutes of an executive session are obtained; in the meantime, those who warn the public are "sensationalists."

Perhaps the most complex dispute in which the AEC is now involved concerns the total amount of "low-level" radiation in the environment resulting from all man-made sources, including nuclear reactors. Two scientists today are doing battle with the AEC over this issue: Dr. John Gofman and Dr. Arthur Tamplin of the Livermore Laboratory in California. Their present conflict with the AEC began when they were asked to investigate the alarming predictions of another physicist, Ernest Sternglass, of the University of Pittsburgh.

In 1969, Sternglass presented an analysis suggesting 400,000 possible infant and fetal deaths in the United States as a result of fallout from the weapons tests of the 1950s. Sternglass' analysis set off a furor. A short time later, a request from the Atomic Energy Commission for a critique of the Sternglass thesis came to the Livermore Lab. The assignment was given to Arthur Tamplin, who had been at the Lab since April, 1963, under Gofman, studying the effects of radiation on man and the total environment. Tamplin concluded that Sternglass' estimates of the number of deaths were far higher than they ought to have been. Having criticized Sternglass, however, Tamplin then prepared his own estimates, which were that 4000 deaths might have been caused by the fallout. That figure was considerably lower, but high enough to unsettle the Atomic Energy Commission's Division of Biology and Medicine in Washington.

Faced with this damaging opinion, the Commission (and Livermore officials) proposed that Tamplin separate his criticism of Sternglass into two portions. The attack on Sternglass' calculations was to be published in some popular journal. Tamplin's own estimates of cancer deaths were to be published in a more esoteric, less widely read scientific journal. Gofman and Tamplin had come to another conclusion, even more disturbing to the AEC than Tamplin's figure of 4000 infant and fetal deaths. On the basis of their studies, they believed that the federal standard for acceptable radiation exposures was ten times higher than it ought to be and that it should be cut back; failure to do so would result in 32,000 additional cancer and leukemia deaths, they said.

In October, 1969, they presented this data at a meeting of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers in San Francisco, attended by a few science writers. Gofman and Tamplin followed this presentation with another, more widely publicized appearance before a Senate committee on November 18, 1969.

The AEC has totally rejected the Gofman-Tamplin thesis that permissible radiation standards be lowered by at least a factor of ten. If such a decrease did go into effect, the AEC would be forced to curtail most of its nuclear power enterprises, especially the nuclear reactor program.

Gofman and Tamplin are convinced that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Lab are trying to censor them, harass them, and deprecate their scientific work. Of the censorship, there is no doubt: a paper entitled "Nuclear Reactors and the Public Health and Safety," which Tamplin was scheduled to give at a Boston meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, was so heavily edited by Dr. Roger Batzel, chief of the Laboratory's Division of Biology and Medicine, that it bore little resemblance to Tamplin's original manuscript. Typically, the fourteen-line abstract of the paper was reduced by Dr. Batzel to the sentence, "Over the past two years a number of serious objections have been raised concerning the safety of nuclear power reactors."

Although the paper was finally presented in close to its original form, Dr. Batzel's editing of the manuscript demonstrates the Laboratory's basic policy difference with Gofman and Tamplin. Dr. Batzel told me that the Lab doesn't disagree with their scientific findings, only with the policy judgments they make from the data and the manner in which they seek public support for their position. Specifically, he is against their calling for a moratorium on building additional nuclear reactors.

The fundamental difference separating the Lab officials from Gofman and Tamplin arose again when Gofman was invited to testify before the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, chaired by Senator Edmund Muskie. When the invitation became known to Dr. Michael May, the current director of the Lab, he attempted to dissuade Gofman from appearing before the Committee on the grounds that Senator Muskie didn't understand nuclear energy problems and might use Gofman's testimony politically.

When Tamplin and Gofman have made public criticisms of the AEC, the Lab has refused to pay their travel expenses, and in addition, has docked Tamplin's vacation time, in one case even deducting from his vacation a Saturday and Sunday he spent at a seminar. However, when Dr. Edward Teller and Dr. Gerald Johnson went from the Lab to Alaska in order to describe the virtues of a Plowshare project, their travel expenses were paid and their vacation periods left untouched. When these scientists went to Pennsylvania in 1968 to assure worried citizens that another proposed Plowshare project was not hazardous, their expenses were paid and they did not suffer any loss of vacation time.

Dr. John Totter, head of the AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine, has said publicly of Gofman that he "was hired to make sure Plowshare could operate in a safe manner. He is now attacking Plowshare, and I see no reason that [we] should want to continue his services."

Gofman and Tamplin have found a foe as well in Joint Committee Chairman Hollifield. The congressman used the floor of the House to say of them, "Undeterred by the rejection of their opinion by their scientific peers . . . they continue to do their own thing in the limelight of the mass media and public forums to exacerbate the public anxiety."

The two scientists argue that their scientific findings impel them to political action. In their book *'Population Control' Through Nuclear Pollution*, they conclude from their experience that groups of scientists and laymen must be established specifically for the critical examination of technological decisions taken by industry and government. "It

is evident that we are urgently in need of a mechanism for effective criticism of present day science and technology. . . . The scientists and others who compose such critical groups must be activists in the best sense of the word. They must necessarily interact effectively with members of Congress, with activists from many fields, and with pressure groups in the country."

The question of whether I was exacerbating the public anxiety troubled me when I returned to Nevada and Utah to talk with the people living in the area. I thought about it, too, as I sat and talked with the test-site pilots whom I had traced from the leads given me by Mrs. Wahler. But the issue was resolved for me when I read, late in the summer, the once "secret" and "confidential" reports on the safety precautions in effect during the 1951 and 1952 test series for the monitoring personnel.

Thus, the "secret" report on the 1951 tests, named Buster-Jangle, complains, in a minor key that "instrument repair was at times unsatisfactory because there was not always a qualified man in charge." A more serious note is struck in the statement that the weapons tests "were crowded together with inadequate time for personnel to function efficiently" and that the radiation safety personnel "were somewhat confused as to whom they were actually responsible." In addition, "On innumerable occasions a decision on some point was needed from some person in authority and it would be found that the person had departed for Las Vegas or Los Alamos without leaving a responsible alternate."

But the real impact of the 1951 report is contained in the section dealing with the radiation exposures of the personnel involved in monitoring the tests.

Page 10 states that for personnel involved in the tests, "An exposure limit of 3-r was agreed on prior to the test. . . . The Division of Biology and Medicine agreed to an unpublicized exposure of 3.9-r, which was used to give the 3-r limit added flexibility where absolutely necessary." The report then goes on to state that 75 percent of the monitors exceeded the maximum exposure limit.

The "confidential" report on the 1952 series of tests indicates that the monitoring procedures may have been even worse than in 1951. "Each test brought a new group of operators inexperienced in the proper techniques," states the report, "and little use was made of the experience gained by members of the group on succeeding tests. Personnel were not assigned to the program until a few hours before it was necessary to dispatch them to their respective stations to perform duties in which they had been only briefly indoctrinated."

New equipment was also used in the 1952 monitoring. "The lack of trained personnel to operate and observe these units resulted in little knowledge gained," states the report. And when planes were used to bring samples back to the labs for analysis, "some samples contained activity greater than the counting limits of the counting equipment." Forecasts of fallout patterns were of little use in the 1952 series, especially since "airdrops are carried out even when wind forecasts are likely to be in error." Some communities were not included in the fallout prediction and so could not be notified when the fallout hit them unexpectedly, and sometimes even when the fallout was expected. "Unfortunately, the collection trays were lost," and so no adequate measurements could be made. In one test, a reduction was made in the number of samples collected and treated; the result, according to the report, was that "unfortunately, this procedure does not permit arrival times [of the fallout] to be obtained with great accuracy. . . ."

Five thousand soldiers were brought to the Nevada Test Site in 1951 to participate in

one weapons test. The AEC says no harm done to them, but no long-term studies were made of the men. But in the light of the safety reports, how much confidence can one have in the AEC's assertion? That question may need an answer soon: the Veterans Administration has started to get claims from some of those men or their families, charging disability as a result of their exposure.

Just as no complete records exist for the military personnel, no accurate records exist for the amount of radioactive fallout to which the people of Kanab, Fredonia, Paragonah, Parawan, and Pleasant Grove have been exposed. It has been demonstrated, again and again, that it is impossible to predict accurately the drifting patterns of radioactive clouds. And as the reports of the 1951, 1952, and 1953 tests indicate, often such drifting was not monitored in any way for radioactive content.

Elmer Jackson, who was born in Fredonia, Arizona, and now lives in Kanab, Utah, a few miles away, knows lack of monitoring to be a fact. He was caught in a radioactive cloud, and burned by it: his doctor believes that the thyroid cancer Jackson later developed results from the experience.

Early in the morning of March 17, 1953, at 5:20 A.M., a 16-kiloton bomb was exploded from the top of a metal tower at the test site. On the basis of the pre-shot weather forecasts, mobile monitoring units had been sent into the communities in the area around the test site. The cloud bearing the particles of radioactive metal drifted further east than the Atomic Energy Commission had anticipated, into an area more than a hundred miles away from where any monitoring team was stationed:

"Suddenly the cloud seemed to move just a little, and it started going in a southerly direction, so I thought, 'Well, it won't come this way,' so I continued on out, about three miles out. I gathered up about fifty head of cattle that were in the area and started moving with them, when the wind changed and blew that cloud swiftly. It just came with a rush and engulfed me and the cattle in the valley, and within just minutes my eyes started burning, the water was running out of them, and my face started burning. . . ."

"I think it's taken at least ten years off my life, and I've suffered for ten or fifteen years as a result of those burns, so I'd like to go back to the days when we didn't have that kind of trouble."

Other men and women living in Fredonia and Kanab would also like to go back to the "days when we didn't have that kind of trouble." Maureen Tait's husband died of leukemia in 1965, leaving her with five children. Mr. Tait was a crane operator, who worked in areas where fallout has been recorded. Rosemary Mackelprang's husband, who was school superintendent for ten years in Fredonia, died of leukemia in 1964. He, too, was out of doors a great deal, collecting rocks. Before he died, his widow says, "He often wondered if maybe some of the rocks had radiation in them that could have caused the leukemia. And we used to watch the atomic bombs go off and see the big flare, and we often wondered if maybe radiation carried out this far, if it had any effect on us. But the people from the bomb tests told us, 'You're so far away from everything, you don't have to worry.'"

Jessie Mackelprang's son, Graham, was fourteen when he died, in 1955, of leukemia. The family was living in Kanab at the time, but went away to their ranch, also located in a fallout area, as often as possible. In the summers, Graham lived outside from early dawn till dark. Mrs. Mackelprang is convinced that the weapons tests "started the leukemia in this country, but what can we do about it? We're just helpless; we're just small people. We have no money to pay an investigator to try and find out if that was

true and if the government does it, what's the people to do? They're higher than we, so we just sit here and take it."

The government did investigate the leukemia outbreak in Fredonia, although it has never told the people the results of the investigation. The inquiry began after Dr. Richard Riley, who had been treating the cases, discussed them with a leukemia specialist in Salt Lake City, who felt the number of cases represented an epidemic. Riley, who is a radiologist, told an AEC doctor that he was convinced the cancer and leukemia cases were the result of fallout radiation. A team of specialists from the U.S. Public Health Service Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta came into the area, took blood samples from everybody in Fredonia and from a sample of the Kanab population. In January, 1970, a report on the investigation appeared in *Hospital Practice*: the Public Health Service was not able to pinpoint the cause of the leukemia and could state no more than that the leukemia epidemic was not the result of chance.

Ample evidence exists of the direct and immediate effects of large doses of radiation of the order inflicted upon the population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But only now are some important data coming to light revealing the consequences of much lower doses of radiation: a recent report published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* points out that a small group of Marshall Islands people exposed to lower doses of radiation from unexpected fallout after a Pacific weapons test are just today developing thyroid disorders. And the report concludes that now is the critical period to begin analyzing these disorders. Twenty-eight Americans were also exposed to unanticipated fallout during the test. No long-term study has been made of them. When I asked why, the doctor in charge of the Marshall Islands study replied that it would have been too difficult to keep track of the men.

Clearly there is a need for studies on a mass scale over a long period of time. And after the possible relationship between iodine 131 in milk and thyroid cancer in young people appeared in the forefront of scientific consciousness, the U.S. Public Health Service did begin a study, financed by the Atomic Energy Commission, of children's thyroids in St. George, Utah, where the heavy fallout of iodine 131 had taken place from the weapons-testing program.

Initially, the study indicated an increase in thyroid difficulties, but as the study progressed, through the high school years of the children, the data began to become very inconclusive. Now the young people involved have graduated from high school and the study is ending. But the teen-agers ought to be watched for many more years; if their expectancy of developing thyroid cancer has been increased, even slightly, because of weapons testing, they are owed a continuous appraisal of their health by the government.

The list of situations in which the Atomic Energy Commission may have endangered the public is extensive. More than one hundred uranium miners have died of lung cancer because of exposure to radioactivity in the mines. (Uranium is produced almost wholly for the AEC, although the mines are owned and operated by private companies.) The direct relationship between uranium mining and lung cancer was established many years ago in Europe and disputed by no one. The cancers are caused by radon gas which escapes into the mine's atmosphere when uranium is dug from the earth. The mines could be cleaned of the deadly radon, but at a cost so great that the mine owners are unwilling to pay it.

A revealing conflict over setting the proper standards for human exposure to radon developed a few years ago between Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Congressman Hollifield. Secretary Wirtz was convinced

that the exposure standard set by the Federal Radiation Council was too high and so ordered that it be lowered to 30 percent of the Council's recommendations. His action brought forth a heated response from Congressman Hollifield, who charged the Secretary with making his determination "on an emotional basis rather than on a scientific basis." In contrast to Congressman Hollifield's view, Dr. Walter S. Snyder, associate director of the Health Physics Division at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, testified, in 1967, at a Joint Committee hearing on the uranium mining problem, that "when human life is in the balance, it would seem that conservatism in safeguarding these lives has much to commend it."

Meanwhile, the uranium miners continue to die from lung cancer, and others are exposed to radon gas. It seeps from under the floors of many homes built in Colorado on tailings from the uranium mines. Admittedly, to move the people from their homes into new residences would be very expensive; the government insists the risks are very small and therefore no action need be taken.

The most controversial, and potentially, perhaps, the most dangerous, of the AEC's current programs is its commitments to nuclear power reactors. Seventeen nuclear reactors are operating now, fifty-four are under construction, thirty-eight more are far along in the planning, and nine additional plants have been scheduled to be built. Within the next thirty years, the AEC expects to license 950 nuclear power installations, all dependent upon radioactive materials.

The proponents of nuclear reactors as a source of energy insist that the country faces a severe power crisis. In what the AEC sees as a dangerous diminution of conventional power sources, the agency sees itself as standing between the country and disaster: thus, it rejects any serious criticisms of its enthusiasm for building nuclear reactors. But serious criticism abounds.

"In principle, nuclear reactors are dangerous," Dr. Edward Teller, no foe of atomic energy, said in 1965 and again in 1970. "They are not dangerous because they may blow up. The explosion of a nuclear reactor is not likely to be as violent as an explosion of a chemical plant. But a powerful nuclear reactor which has functioned for some time has radioactivity stored in it greatly in excess of that released from a powerful nuclear bomb. There is one difference, and this difference makes the nuclear bomb look like a relatively safe instrument. In the case of an atmospheric nuclear explosion, the radioactivity ascends into the stratosphere. . . . A gently seeping nuclear reactor can put its radioactive poison under a stable inversion layer and concentrate it onto a few hundred square miles in a truly deadly fashion. This is why we must be exceedingly careful in constructing nuclear reactors. By being careful and also by good luck, we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents. . . . Nuclear reactors do not belong on the surface of the earth. Nuclear reactors belong underground."

But reactors are being built above ground. The Enrico Fermi reactor at Lagoona Beach, Michigan, experienced difficulties from the moment it began test operations. The plant, an experimental one, had been built despite the objections of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

"There is insufficient information available at this time," warned the committee in 1956, to assure that the reactor could be operated "without public hazard." But Lewis Strauss, then Chairman of the AEC, suppressed that warning, which might never have been made public except for its disclosure by another AEC commissioner, Thomas Murray.

The AEC's decision to sanction the Fermi reactor created a tremendous controversy,

but all efforts to halt the construction failed. Then, in October, 1966, while the plant was going through a series of operating tests, a serious accident occurred. A portion of the reactor's uranium fuel source overheated and melted; radiation was released within the plant, and the reactor was immediately shut down. For a month scientists debated how to investigate the accident, fearing that any disturbance of the uranium could set off a runaway chain reaction culminating in an explosion, an event that could have released enough radioactive gas (according to one study commissioned by the AEC) to kill as many as 133,000 people living in the Detroit area.

After the accident, an official of the company operating the reactor said, "It's one of those accidents the consequences [of which] are so terrible, the probability has to be very, very small." But that "very, very small" probability did become a reality.

The Fermi reactor is now being tested again after being shut down for four years.

Another freakish accident occurred at the Windscale reactor in England in 1957; a large quantity of radioactivity was released, so that all milk and produce in a four-hundred-square-mile area around the plant had to be confiscated. In 1961, an accident in an experimental reactor in Idaho killed three people. And not even the AEC's own reactors are free from such accidents: on November 19, 1969, the Oak Ridge Research Reactor had a failure which occurred, according to an official report, "amazingly, from seven failures or errors in each of three identical channels, a total of 21 failures. The seven common mode failures that contributed to system failure were unpredictable or, if predicted might have been considered to be adequately monitored."

But the public health problem inherent in the operation of nuclear reactors is not limited to the possibility of an accident. There remains the persistent issue of low-level radiation.

The usual AEC response to those who seek to reduce the permissible radiation standards is to insist that only infinitesimal amounts of radiation will be emitted from the normal operations of a reactor and that these emissions will be harmlessly diffused into the atmosphere, within a few miles of the reactor's perimeter.

But that argument ignores the fact that the reactor is only one part of a total operation each component of which involves its own separate dangers. Reactors require radioactive fuel rods which must be shipped into the plant and then out of the plant to be reprocessed every few years; reactors produce radioactive wastes which must be stored or processed with all the attendant risks involved. Those two examples alone set up whole series of other dangerous operations. When to these are added the risks of food supplies being contaminated directly, and the introduction of radioactive substances into the total ecological cycle, the possible consequences of hundreds of reactors are staggering.

Dr. Paul Tompkins, the executive director of the Federal Radiation Council, dealt with the heart of the matter from the AEC viewpoint when he said that accepting the Gorman-Tamplin recommendations "might well price society out of business. To reduce radiation exposure tenfold would cost billions; it might even cost more than the Vietnam War. To comply, you'd practically rebuild all nuclear installations and the factories that use any sort of X-ray equipment. We'd have to review radiation exposure from wristwatches, TV sets and radium dials. Plus, I'm not completely sure it is now technically possible to monitor down to such a tight level."

Is it possible that nuclear energy as the cure for the power crisis may be worse than the disease itself? The risk-benefit issue in-

involved in that question needs to be debated thoroughly before the public can make a decision.

Unfortunately, in the atmosphere that now prevails within the Atomic Energy Commission, the agency's critics are characterized as "nuclear nuts" or "arch anti-nuclears" who make "doomsday forecasts" (to use the words of Howard Brown, a high-ranking AEC official). It seems unlikely that open debate will flourish—and that many actions crucial to the public safety will be taken—as long as the AEC continues in its dual role as proprietor and regulator of nuclear energy.

In May, 1957, Chet Holifield wrote the *Reporter* that he shared the "great concern about the moral and political issues" which had been raised in my article, "Clouds From Nevada." Recently Holifield refused to talk to me about "the moral and political issues." He believes that the public will "never" know enough about radiation, "because it's too complicated." However, the congressman assured a television audience, "that doesn't mean that precautions aren't being taken by those who know, to protect the person who does not know."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 25, 1971]

ATOM-AGE TRASH: FINDING PLACES TO PUT NUCLEAR WASTE PROVES A FRIGHTFUL PROBLEM—AEC, PRODDED BY CRITICS, LOOKS HARDER AT SAFETY OF RADIOACTIVE DUMPINGS—STIRRING UP A DEADLY "SOUP"

(By Dennis Farney)

LYONS, KANS.—The phrase "peaceful atom" conjures up images of cleanliness and light; Of white-gowned technicians and bright new reactors, of light and heat and power, seemingly without pollution.

The dark, dirty side of atomic energy is symbolized a half-mile east of this central Kansas town. It is an abandoned salt mine that may soon become this country's first atomic-age crypt.

There, in the perpetual darkness a thousand feet below the Kansas prairie, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to entomb all the "high level" (intensely radioactive) wastes generated by U.S. commercial atomic power plants for the rest of this century. So concentrated will be these wastes that, were they somehow evenly distributed, they could contaminate much of the nation. So fantastically long-lived are they that they will have to remain sealed away for as long as 500,000 years.

The mine also symbolizes a growing, if belated, effort by the AEC to come to grips with potentially the most devilish pollution problem of all. This is the problem of isolating from the environment the growing volume of radioactive wastes—the result of weapons-making as well as commercial operations—for the centuries, even millennia, they require to decompose.

EXPEDIENCY IS CHARGED

Finding solutions hasn't been the AEC's top priority. Democratic Sen. Frank Church of Idaho has calculated that over the last 25 years, while the agency spent billions to develop military and commercial applications of the atom, it spent only \$50 million on waste disposal research. Today the nuclear industry is growing rapidly. But one of the AEC's own scientific advisory committees has characterized some of the agency's waste disposal practices as "expedients designed to make the best use of poor location."

For example:

In southeastern Idaho, one of the AEC's four major U.S. installations routinely stores a variety of radioactive wastes about 600 feet directly above the Snake Plain Aquifer, a huge underground river whose waters ultimately reach much of the Pacific Northwest. Sen. Church and Federal water quality officials are concerned that radioactivity might leach down into the aquifer.

Near Richland, Wash., the AEC's Hanford

installation stores millions of gallons of high-level liquid wastes in huge underground tanks. The tanks have a life expectancy of 20 or 30 years, though the wastes within them will remain deadly for about 600 years. At least 11 times, the tanks have sprung relatively minor leaks.

Millions of gallons of high-level wastes rest in a similar "tank farm" at the AEC's Savannah River plant, near Alken, S.C. The AEC hopes to dispose of these wastes by pumping them into a man-made cavern below the Tuscaloosa Aquifer, already heavily used for drinking water and industry. The AEC advisory committee has called this plan—in a report that was suppressed for four years—"in its essence dangerous."

AN INSIDER URGES HALT

Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC chairman, concedes that "you could argue, in retrospect, that the AEC might have moved faster" on waste disposal. But he says such work is moving rapidly now and argues "it was logical" to build up the industry first.

One of the commission's sharpest critics disagrees. Arthur R. Tamplin of the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory argues for a moratorium on growth of the industry "until we perfect the systems all along the line." He adds: "We really don't know what to do with wastes today. We haven't devised the systems. And we're starting to produce wastes at an ever-increasing rate."

The AEC puts the great bulk of radioactive wastes in the "low-level" category, and maintains that relatively simple disposal techniques are perfectly adequate. Some four million cubic feet of contaminated materials now lie buried in the Idaho desert, for example—everything from contaminated laboratory gloves to bricks and rubble, placed in steel drums or wooden containers and buried in shallow trenches.

There is growing concern that disposal practices for even low-level and intermediate-level wastes pose serious potential hazards. "The current practices of disposing of intermediate and low-level liquid wastes and all manner of solid wastes directly into the ground above or in the fresh-water zones, although momentarily safe, will lead in the long run to a serious fouling of man's environment," warned one AEC scientific advisory committee.

DRAMATIC GROWTH SEEN

But by far the greatest concern is over "high-level" wastes, which account for more than 99% of all the radioactivity in materials on hand, though they account for a relatively small percentage of volume.

The exact volume of high-level wastes is classified because they are largely the result of AEC plutonium production for nuclear weapons. The AEC put the total at more than 80 million gallons; of this, only about 400,000 gallons are the result of commercial operations.

But this ratio is going to change dramatically as the U.S. nuclear power industry grows. Today that industry provides roughly 1% of all U.S. electric power; by 1980, the AEC estimates, it will provide 25%. By the year 2000, the industry is expected to generate some 60 million gallons of "high-level" waste (or its solidified equivalent), which will be from 10 to 30 times as radioactive as the weapons-related waste now on hand.

Nuclear reactors' uranium fuel elements, whether used to generate electricity or to produce plutonium for weapons, eventually become choked, in effect, with the radioactive fragments of split atoms. When this happens the fuel must be taken to a reprocessing plant. There, the fuel rods are dissolved in acid and the reusable uranium and plutonium are separated out.

What's left, in AEC jargon, is "the soup": A liquid laden with enough radioisotopes to make it one of the deadliest substances on earth.

Many of the radioisotopes decay to harmless levels in relatively short order. (An example is zirconium-95, with a half-life of 65 days; this means half of a given amount will decay in the first 65 days, half of the remaining half in the next 65, and so on.) At the other extreme is plutonium—some of which escapes reprocessing—with a half-life of 24,000 years.

Despite its extreme longevity, plutonium isn't considered the most dangerous component of the liquid waste. Its radiation is incapable of penetrating even a thin shield (a steel barrel, for example) and most plutonium compounds aren't readily soluble in water. Thus plutonium is considered highly dangerous only if actually ingested into the body, particularly if inhaled into the lungs.

The really troublesome radioisotopes are strontium-90 (half-life: 25 years) and cesium-137 (33 years). Unlike many radioisotopes, which are excreted by the body, strontium-90 concentrates in the bones. Cesium-137 emits gamma radiation, similar to X-rays, which can readily penetrate thick shields. In addition, both give off great amounts of heat as they decay, enough to make "the soup" boil furiously for years.

The waste liquid goes into enormous concrete-encased steel tanks, some more than a million gallons in capacity. Depending upon the tank design, the liquid is either cooled for years or simply allowed to boil (with its steam siphoned off to prevent tank rupture). Either way, the liquid loses much of its heat and radioactivity within a few years.

The problem is that the tanks wear out—to say nothing of their vulnerability to accidents—while some radioisotopes within them remain hazardous, in human terms, almost forever. (Strontium-90 and cesium-137 are considered hazardous for 600 years and plutonium for a half-million.) Already there have been 15 recorded cases of tank failure, the 11 at Hanford and four at Savannah River. In one mishap at Savannah River, about 700 gallons of intensely radioactive waste overwhelmed safety devices and soaked into the ground.

LONGER THAN HISTORY

Clearly, the AEC and its critics agree, a more permanent solution is needed. "We really can't talk about this in terms of 'waste disposal,'" says Mr. Tamplin. "It's 'waste guardianship.' . . . Somebody is going to have to watch this stuff . . . for longer than the history of our country and, in the case of plutonium, longer than the recorded history of man."

The AEC has yet to decide upon a "final" solution to its weapons-related wastes. In the interim, it is solidifying much of them in the tanks they now occupy. But the agency does have a plan for the growing volume of commercial wastes: Solidification and shipment to the salt mine here at Lyons.

Many scientists, inside and outside the AEC, endorse this plan as the safest, surest available. Salt beds are dry and extremely stable geologic formations. Rock salt approximately equals concrete as a gamma ray shield and is so plastic under heat and stress that fissures are self-healing.

Beginning in 1975, if AEC plans hold, ordinary railroad cars would start hauling in barrels and containers of "low-level" wastes for burial here. At full-scale operation, 200 to 400 carloads might be coming here each year.

DEFYING THE IMAGINATION

The "high-level" wastes would start arriving about 1976. Concentrated and solidified, they might take the form of a greenish-black glassy substance, a ceramic-like material or a granular powder. This would be packed inside steel cylinders, each containing wastes so enormously radioactive as to almost defy imagination.

The standard unit of measurement for radioactivity is the curie. One AEC official calculates it would take 10 billion gallons of water to dilute one curie of strontium-90, the deadliest of all the radioisotopes in high-level waste, to the level that current guidelines consider acceptable in drinking water. By comparison, the strontium-90 in high-level wastes may run at 50 to 100 curies per gallon. Solidification of high-level wastes before shipment here would concentrate them six-fold or more.

Altogether, including casks of other radioisotopes as well as strontium-90, each cylinder to be buried here would contain a million or more curies. By 1990, when the disposal operation would be in full swing, some 1,200 or more cylinders would be arriving here each year—shipped in enormous 50 or 100-ton lead "casks" to contain their gamma radiation.

Once here, the casks would be unloaded by remote control behind heavy shielding. The cylinders would then be lowered to the caverns below and transported by a remote-controlled vehicle to their burial tunnels, holes drilled into the tunnel floor. Eventually the entire tunnel would be filled with crushed salt.

TAKING THE LONG VIEW

The strontium and cesium within the cylinders would make them hot enough eventually to raise the temperature within the underground caverns to 200 degrees or more. This impresses laymen, but AEC engineers seem to take it in stride. Conducting a group of Lyons townsfolk through the mine, an AEC official assured them that "the heat drops off very rapidly. It would be essentially done . . . in a couple of hundred years."

None of this seems to worry many people in this town of about 4,800, who see a potential boom in the disposal project. "This is great," says Jack McClain, a local electrician. "We just couldn't get a cleaner industry." Declares C. R. "Tiny" Moorman, resplendent in his red "Lyons ambassador" boosters club jacket; "It's about the grandest thing that could happen to any place."

But father away from Lyons, concern is rising.

The Kansas affiliate of the Sierra Club is considering a court fight to block the project. Chairman Dale Safels of the state corporation commission has expressed concern about derailments when the big shipping casks start coming in. Gov. Robert Docking has said he wants more facts. But perhaps the most influential skeptic is William W. Hambleton, director of the state geological survey.

Mr. Hambleton was a member of an AEC advisory group that found salt mine disposal, with qualifications, "the safest choice now available." Nevertheless, he's worried about a number of questions and says he isn't "horribly impressed by the enthusiasm they (the AEC) show for checking out these things."

One of his worries is what's known as the "Wigner effect." The wastes will bombard the walls of rock salt with intense radiation, causing energy to be stored in the salt. Under certain conditions this energy might be released in a sudden burst of heat, perhaps shooting temperatures in the underground caverns to 800 degrees centigrade. What would happen then?

"I don't know," he says, "One would speculate on all kinds of horrible things." An extreme possibility: An explosive upheaval, which could release radioactivity to the world above.

And Mr. Hambleton has another worry. "As far as we can tell, the AEC has no contingency plans for retrieval of this stuff should something go wrong."

In reply, an AEC official cites specific studies that "have virtually ruled out" the heat burst danger. And the AEC emphasizes that nothing in the disposal plan will pre-

clude retrieval—although an official concedes the agency hasn't worked up detailed contingency plans for such an operation.

Questions about this project may seem mild, however, compared to the controversy likely to erupt if the AEC goes ahead with another proposal under evaluation. This is "Project Bedrock," the plan to pump millions of gallons of high-level liquid waste into a cavern below the Tuscaloosa Aquifer.

ECONOMY GETS PRIORITY

The project here at Lyons is only for commercially related wastes; the AEC's enormous stores of high-level weapons-related wastes still remain. It seems generally agreed—even among AEC officials—that the safest answer to these wastes, too, is solidification and salt mine burial. Nevertheless, the AEC is seriously considering the bedrock plan, which another of its own scientific advisory committees not only described as "in its essence dangerous" but also predicted would be sure to "lead to public controversy."

Economy appears to be the foremost consideration. AEC officials say admittedly inaccurate estimates indicate it might cost 10 times as much to solidify the wastes and bury them in salt mines as to dump them into bedrock caverns. Another consideration: Project Bedrock would allow onsite disposal, eliminating potentially hazardous overland shipments. Finally, AEC officials argue, if Project Bedrock proves safe enough it's simply wasting money to buy an additional margin of safety.

The big questions of course, are whether the wastes would seep upward through fissures in the bedrock into the aquifer itself—and, if so, how soon?

A majority of the AEC advisory committee—in a critical 1966 report that the AEC suppressed until 1970—concluded the risks of this happening were simply too great. In one of several projections, the committee theorized that wastes could possibly reach fresh water within 100 years; they will be hazardous for at least 600 years. A narrow committee majority recommended that the AEC abandon even attempts to study the project.

"You could never prove, even by all sorts of (exploratory) drilling, that bedrock storage would be safe as solidification and storage in a salt mine," says Earl Cook, a Texas geographer who was executive director of the committee. "The only way you could be sure is to put this stuff down and wait and see. Unfortunately, that's the way we make too many decisions these days."

Project Bedrock has at least one Senator worried. Democratic Sen. Mike Gravel of Alaska has called on the President's Council on Environmental Quality to "immediately appoint a committee of independent and credible investigators" to look into it. Council member Gordon J. MacDonald says he's inclined to agree.

Nevertheless, the project is "still feasible; so far the feeling is that it looks quite good," says one AEC official close to the matter. The AEC feels confident at this stage of investigation that several barriers—including a layer of clay between the bedrock and the aquifer—would bottle up the wastes long enough to allow them to decay to harmless levels before reaching fresh water.

The agency says it plans to spend \$1.3 million for preliminary work and at least \$10 million to sink an exploratory shaft and tunnels. If tests prove favorable, routine pumping of the wastes into the cavern probably would start in the late 1970s. The agency might then go ahead with a similar project for the Hanford wastes. "We won't go ahead with (Project Bedrock) until we're sure it's absolutely safe," pledges Chairman Seaborg.

But, as AEC officials themselves testify, few problems in the arcane world of radioac-

tive waste lends themselves to "absolute" answers.

"I'm often asked, 'Can you be absolutely sure this or that is safe,'" says John A. Erlewine, the AEC's assistant general manager for operations. "My invariable answer is, 'No, I'm not absolutely sure of anything on this earth.'"

RODINO URGES ENACTMENT OF PLAN FOR ALL-OUT WAR ON NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I formulated a comprehensive plan for an all-out war against narcotics addiction. Now that the new 92d Congress has commenced its work, I believe it is imperative that we give full consideration to this plan and enact it as soon as possible.

Almost a year ago I pointed out the devastating effects that such hard narcotics drugs as heroin, cocaine, and morphine are having on our youth. At that time the narcotics epidemic had already reached critical proportions. In the last 6 months the situation has grown even worse. According to official estimates of the Department of Justice, there are now between 140,000 to 200,000 narcotics addicts in our country. As alarming as are these official estimates, some other authorities estimate that the true number of addicts is many times greater.

Recently, the chairman of a Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics pointed out on the floor of the Senate that some authorities have estimated the number of addicts to be closer to 600,000. He also pointed out that although there is no reliable estimate of the total number of people who have tried heroin at least once, it has been suggested that up to 7 percent of the schoolchildren in the New York public schools have experimented with it. In addition, a recently completed study of narcotics deaths in New York City reveals that from January 1, 1970, to September 9, 1970, 740 persons died from narcotics-related causes, of which a substantial number were teenagers.

Also, various congressional committees recently considering the problem of drug abuse in the armed services have received startling testimony from Defense Department witnesses indicating appalling increases in the use of hard narcotics by servicemen. For example, in Southeast Asia in the period from January through October of this year, there were at least 26 proven deaths due to heroin—with the number of undetermined deaths due to heroin obviously much greater. It is also now unquestioned that there are large quantities of heroin readily available to our servicemen in Vietnam which is 90 percent pure and can be bought at a price many times lower than the illegal price in the United States. At the same time, Defense Department witnesses now indicate that marihuana is used by more than 50 percent of our servicemen in Southeast Asia.

This fact in itself is appalling, but when coupled with the growing practice on the part of drug pushers in Vietnam to include opium in marihuana cigarettes it should give us cause for the gravest possible concern.

Mr. Speaker, if our youth is to be preserved, our society to remain healthy, and our streets to be made safe, then I am convinced that an all-out war against hard narcotics must be waged. For that reason, I have been doing everything in my power to generate support for this plan, not only from my colleagues in Congress but also from the administration, national organizations, and local community groups. Within the next few days I shall be writing personally to each of my colleagues in the House of Representatives urging them to cosponsor the two bills embodying my plan.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to briefly review these proposals.

The Rodino plan calls for a vigorous three-pronged attack on all hard narcotics such as heroin and cocaine. First, under my bill H.R. 1540 any person known to be an addict would be placed under medical supervision and control by public health officials. Such treatment would be mandatory and could involve confinement of the addict if and when medical officials consider it necessary. This proposal has already received the support of the American Medical Association as well as a number of State and local narcotics officials.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the compulsory medical treatment of narcotics addicts is not only sound social philosophy, in terms of preventing lives from being destroyed and families ruined—it is also sound economics. Statistics released recently in the District of Columbia indicate that the crime rate in this city has decreased by 19 percent since an extensive addict-treatment program was instituted. The economics of this program are highly significant. An untreated addict steals at least \$50,000 worth of property per year. Even if we assume that there are only 100,000 addicts in the United States, this amounts to an economic loss of \$11 billion per year.

To incarcerate an addict in prison for 1 year costs between \$5,000 and \$10,000 at present. To provide the same addict with the kind of treatment that is being administered in the District of Columbia, and which is being used effectively to reduce crime, costs only \$2,000 per year.

Under the circumstances, the medical treatment of the addict is not only something that we must do for moral reasons, it is also something that should be done for economic reasons.

Obviously, the treatment of narcotics addicts is in itself not enough. The second prong of our attack must be directed at the most heinous criminals of our times—the narcotics pushers who peddle their horrors on the streets; the organized drug rings; and international narcotics entrepreneurs who operate on a worldwide scale. Under my plan, law en-

forcement officials would be freed to conduct vigorous crackdowns in these areas. My bill would make it possible for more law enforcement officials to use other measures that have been developed in the last Congress by the House Judiciary Committee on which I serve. In particular, they could concentrate on the strong powers provided in the Organized Crime Control Act, which we passed last year in the form of Public Law 91-452. With enactment of my bill, H.R. 1540, the administration would also be enabled to make greater use of provisions of the Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, which the 91st Congress enacted in the form of Public Law 91-513.

The third thrust of my attack is in an area which has been too long neglected by both the administration and the Congress—the area of international control over narcotics. It is shocking to realize that almost all of the illegal narcotics in the United States come from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective ways to reduce the narcotics epidemic both in the United States and among our servicemen in Southeast Asia is to eliminate the supply of hard narcotics drugs at their source. Important as it is for us to provide effective programs for the treatment and prevention of narcotics addiction here in the United States, there is little doubt among students of this problem that the epidemic will not be substantially abated until the flow of these hideous drugs into our country is cut off. My bill, H.R. 1539, introduced on January 21, is directed to attaining that objective.

As many of the Members of the House will recall, in the last Congress I, together with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, introduced a similar proposal, H.R. 18397, which was cosponsored by more than 140 Members of the House from both sides of the aisle. Subsequently, on December 9, 1970, when the House considered the foreign assistance supplemental authorization bill, I offered my proposal in the form of a floor amendment to that bill. I was gratified that this amendment had overwhelming support and was adopted by us. Unfortunately, however, the Senate version of the foreign assistance supplemental authorization bill did not contain my amendment and the provisions relating to international narcotics control were not enacted into law.

Under the circumstances, I believe it is imperative that this problem be thoroughly aired by this Congress as soon as possible. As I pointed out here in December, our Government has for many years been attempting to persuade foreign governments to curb the illegal growing of opium poppies and the illegal production of heroin, morphine, and cocaine. These efforts have been conducted largely through our State Department and severe as the problem has been, little progress has been made. Recently, Mr. John Ingersoll, the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, pointed out to the United Nations Com-

mission on Narcotics Drugs that the information published by the International Narcotics Control Board suggests:

We seem to be making no progress at all. We are not even standing still! We are dropping further and further behind.

In considering my bill, H.R. 1539, it is important to note that about 80 percent of the illegal narcotics used in the United States originates from opium which is grown in Turkey and processed in France. This problem was discussed at length in an excellent article in the December 7, 1970, issue of U.S. News & World Report. As pointed out in that article, 200 kilos of raw opium that cost \$4,000 where it is grown have a street-market value in the United States of more than \$2 million when converted into heroin. So plentiful is the supply and so lucrative the illegal profits that to date our Government has failed to stop heroin from pouring into our country.

Recently, the Governments of both Turkey and France have agreed to cooperate more extensively with us in wiping out the scourge of heroin. Also, our Government is sponsoring and strongly supporting a proposal in the United Nations calling for a concerted action against drug abuse and the establishment of a United Nations fund for drug control. This proposal has the support of the Turkish Government as well as the governments of a number of other NATO countries. In addition, the North Atlantic Assembly has adopted a proposal establishing a working party of legislators from NATO countries to evaluate the narcotics problem and to recommend effective controls within the NATO area. This proposal was originally sponsored by me in the Assembly's Scientific and Technical Committee, of which I am Vice Chairman.

I am, of course, gratified by these developments both in the United Nations and in NATO. However, I recognize that mere agreements among nations will not solve this problem unless every government involved exerts an all-out effort to cooperate. My bill, H.R. 1539, will, I believe, help to contribute to those efforts.

Recently, in a statement to the North Atlantic Assembly, I discussed this proposal and pointed out to the legislators of the NATO countries that the proposal had strong support here in the House of Representatives from each of the two major political parties. I acknowledged candidly to that group that I was aware of the fact that the proposal had created some amount of controversy in international circles. Unfortunately, it has received more publicity abroad because of the sanctions that it provides than because of the affirmative offer of assistance that it contains.

I would like to reiterate again today that my proposal is not a vindictive one. It would penalize no country for failing to solve the problem, but, instead, calls on all countries which receive foreign aid from the United States to exert a good faith effort to stamp out the illegal production, distribution, and sale of narcotic drugs. Any suspension of foreign aid would have to be based on a determina-

tion by our President that the foreign government was not cooperating. Such suspension could be only partial if the President determines that to be desirable. At the same time, the President would be authorized to increase the assistance to any country whose government is making a good faith effort to cooperate with us.

I believe that a three-pronged attack against narcotics addiction of the type embodied in my two bills, H.R. 1539 and H.R. 1540, is essential. These are times when our Nation is divided—there are disagreements among young and old, blacks and whites, management and labor. But the narcotics contamination affects all of our institutions. As a result, every responsible member of our society should be willing to unite in such a war against narcotics. I, for one, have pledged to the people of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey that, as their Representative, I will do my utmost to muster the full resources of the Federal Government in this fight. I intend to keep that pledge, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me. The enactment of either of my bills will be a major step forward. The enactment of both would bring about a truly effective national anti-narcotics program.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my two bills, H.R. 1539 and H.R. 1540 in the RECORD at this point. In addition, following the two bills I also include in the RECORD three current comments on the narcotics problem which I believe will be of considerable interest to Members: an editorial from today's Washington Post supporting my proposal for international narcotics controls; an excellent article written by Stewart Alsop which appeared in the February 1, 1971, issue of Newsweek; and a highly constructive and timely editorial comment from television station WPIX in New York which was presented on January 18, 1971.

The material follows:

H.R. 1539

A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(v) The President shall suspend (in whole or in part) economic and military assistance provided under this or any other Act, and shall suspend (in whole or in part) sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and sales under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (as defined by section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines

that the government of such country has taken appropriate steps to carry out the purpose of this subsection. In implementing the provisions of this subsection, the President is authorized to utilize such agencies and facilities of the Federal Government as he may deem appropriate to assist foreign countries in their efforts to prevent the unlawful entry of narcotic drugs into the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed with respect to any action taken by him under this subsection. Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

H.R. 1540

A bill to provide for the mandatory civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts, to provide for more facilities for treating, supervising, and controlling narcotic addicts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1971".

Sec. 2. The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 is amended by striking out the second paragraph of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"In addition, it is the policy of the Congress to establish a procedure under which certain persons charged with violating criminal laws, who are determined to be addicted to narcotic drugs, and who are not civilly committed for confinement and treatment in lieu of prosecution, may be civilly committed for confinement and treatment of their addiction during the period of their criminal proceedings, and at other times.

"It is the further policy of the Congress that certain persons addicted to narcotic drugs (including those under prosecution for the commission of criminal offenses) should be civilly committed for treatment in order that (A) they may receive medical treatment and their addiction may be controlled, (B) society may be protected more effectively from the crime and delinquency which results from narcotic addiction, and (C) when they are returned to society they may serve as useful members."

Sec. 3. Title III of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 is amended as follows:

(1) The title heading is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—CIVIL COMMITMENT".

(2) Section 302 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in section 311 of this title, proceedings for the commitment of a narcotic addict under this title may be initiated in accordance with this title by:

- "(1) A narcotic addict.
- "(2) A related individual.
- "(3) The Surgeon General.
- "(4) A United States attorney.
- "(5) A United States district court.

"(b) Whenever any narcotic addict desires to obtain treatment for his addiction, or whenever a related individual has reason to believe that any person is a narcotic addict, such addict or related individual may file a petition with the Surgeon General requesting that such addict or person be admitted to a hospital of the Service for treatment of his addiction. Any such petition filed by a narcotic addict shall set forth his name and address and the facts relating to his addiction. Any such petition filed by a related individual with respect to a person believed by such individual to be a narcotic addict shall set forth the name and address of the alleged

narcotic addict and the facts or other data on which the petitioner bases his belief that the person with respect to whom the petition is filed is a narcotic addict.

"(c) (1) Whenever—

"(A) the Surgeon General determines that there is reasonable cause to believe that any person is a narcotic addict (whether or not such person is named in a petition filed with him under this section) and that appropriate State or other facilities are not available to such person, or

"(B) a United States attorney has reason to believe that any person charged with an offense against the United States (other than a person who is civilly committed under section 2902 of title 28 of the United States Code) is a narcotic addict,

he may file a petition with the United States district court to commit such person to a hospital of the Service for treatment as provided in this title. In the case of the Surgeon General, in making his determination with respect to the nonavailability of appropriate State or other facilities, he shall consult with appropriate State and local officials.

"(2) Whenever a United States district court has reason to believe that any person charged with an offense against the United States (other than a person who is civilly committed under section 2902 of title 28 of the United States Code) is a narcotic addict, such court may, on its own motion, initiate commitment proceedings under this title.

"(d) Upon the filing of any such petition by the Surgeon General or a United States attorney, or acting on its own motion, a United States district court may order the patient to appear before it for an examination by physicians as provided under section 303 of this title and for a hearing, if required, under section 304 of this title. The court shall cause a copy of such petition, if any, and a copy of the order to be served personally upon the patient by a United States marshal."

"(3) Section 301(b) is amended by inserting after "and ending" the following: "or controlling and reducing".

(4) Section 301(e) is amended by striking out "a United States attorney" and all that follows thereafter and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Surgeon General or a United States attorney as provided under subsection (c) of section 302 of this title, or with respect to whom a United States district court has initiated commitment proceedings under such subsection."

(5) The second sentence of section 303 is amended by striking out "who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment" and inserting in lieu thereof "who requires medical treatment", and by striking out "that for a period of three years following his release" and inserting in lieu thereof "that, except as otherwise ordered by the court imposing sentence in the case of a patient who is convicted of a criminal offense, for a period of three years following his release".

(6) Section 304(a) is amended by striking out "or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment" and inserting in lieu thereof "or is an addict who does not require medical treatment".

(7) Section 304(a) is further amended by striking out "who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment" and inserting in lieu thereof "who requires medical treatment".

(8) Section 305 is amended by striking out "is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment" and inserting in lieu thereof "requires medical treatment".

(9) Section 306 is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof "for the medical treatment of his addiction."

(10) The second sentence of section 307 (a) is amended by striking out ", after considering the recommendations of the Surgeon

General with respect to posthospitalization treatment for any such patient so returned, may" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall".

(11) Section 307(a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "During the first year of such posthospitalization program, such patient shall report for care and examination as the Surgeon General shall direct, but in no event less than once every week, and after the first year such patient shall report as the Surgeon General shall direct. If a patient fails to report under this section, such failure shall be reported to the committing court."

(12) Section 311 is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any person who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on a criminal charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served, except that such provision shall be applicable to any such person on probation, parole, or mandatory release if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment."

(13) Section 312 is repealed.

(14) Section 316 is amended by striking out "United States attorney" and inserting in lieu thereof "Surgeon General" and by striking out "section 302(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 302(b)".

Sec. 4. Section 2902(c) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The court shall thereupon resume the criminal proceeding, and the individual shall remain committed under this title pending the outcome of the criminal proceeding."

Sec. 5. Title IV of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 is amended by—

(A) inserting after "LOCALITIES" in the chapter heading the following: "; FACILITIES"; and

(B) inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Sec. 403. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to establish and maintain inpatient and outpatient medical centers as Public Health Service facilities for the treatment of narcotic drug addiction. In addition, the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to certify such other public or private facilities or institutions, as may be made available, as inpatient or outpatient medical centers for the treatment of narcotic drug addiction. All such inpatient and outpatient medical centers for the treatment of narcotic drug addiction shall meet such standards as the Surgeon General, in his judgment, determines to be necessary to provide effective treatment and control of narcotic drug addiction.

"(b) To the extent that the Surgeon General determines that there are not adequate facilities or equipment for the purpose of establishing medical centers for the treatment of narcotic drug addiction, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized (on the recommendation of the Surgeon General) to make available by executive order for temporary or permanent use as such inpatient or outpatient medical centers any property or facilities under the jurisdiction of any executive agency or military department."

Sec. 6. Whenever the amendments made by this Act refer to the Surgeon General, such references shall be deemed to be a reference to any officers to whom the functions of the Surgeon General may have been transferred by a reorganization plan.

Sec. 7. This Act shall take effect three months after the date of its enactment.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1971]

THE DRUG PROBLEM: GETTING TO THE ROOTS
Is the time finally at hand when the United States will take what steps are neces-

sary, particularly in its foreign policy, to limit the tidal inflow of hard drugs, in particular heroin? The omens are good. Senator Mondale, a newcomer to the issue, introduced yesterday—and Representative Rodino, an old hand, last week—legislation designed to encourage the foreign producers and processors of opium (from which heroin is derived) to stop growing it. Their approaches are substantially similar: governments willing to implement police, crop-substitution and other measures to control opium growing would get American help for the job; governments found to have failed to take such measures would be subjected to economic sanctions, in national and international forms.

In the past the Congress has been strangely reluctant to address this issue. It has generally been willing to accept the State Department's contention that controlling drugs at the source means intervening in the domestic affairs of another state and must be done carefully and discretely. The department is entirely right, of course, in noting the aspect of domestic intervention. The trouble is that care and discretion, while necessary to maintain good relations with such an important American ally and drug source as Turkey, have failed to shut off the flow of heroin. The Turkish government has worked hard to limit opium-growing but so far it has been no match for smugglers. Whether the offer of further aid—and the parallel threat of sanctions—would induce Turkey to move faster and harder, or whether that approach would merely provoke a nationalistic uproar, is difficult to predict with assurance. Our own judgment is, however, that those in Turkey who realize the importance of opium control would be strengthened considerably by a tougher American approach.

At one point the Nixon administration seemed to be deadly serious about cutting off drugs at the source, no matter what the consequences. It proclaimed itself to be the first administration that had adopted international drug-control as a goal of American foreign policy. In the clutch, however, it faltered: a statement last July by Attorney General Mitchell that he would support any methods needed to do the job was followed by an outburst of rage in Turkey and then by a State Department-White House back-down. Later, the principal internal White House advocate of a foreign-policy attack on drugs, Daniel Moynihan, left Washington. If Mr. Nixon remains serious about mobilizing all available resources against the drug trade, he can now expect strong support from the Hill.

[From the Newsweek magazine, Feb. 1, 1971]

THE SMELL OF DEATH

(By Stewart Alsop)

NEW YORK.—Once, many years ago, 9 West 102nd Street certainly housed a respectable family, probably with a maid to open the door. Even now, it looks rather shabbily respectable from the outside. Inside, it is probably the closest thing to hell to be found in New York City, where there are a lot of hellish places.

For 9 West 102nd Street is known throughout the East as a place where a desperate man can get a sure heroin fix. According to Deputy Inspector Richard Di Roma, the able, quick-spoken chief of uniformed police in the 24th Precinct, there were 366 narcotics arrests at 9 West 102nd Street in the last nine months. But the house still operates full blast as a heroin supermarket.

Inspector Di Roma had agreed to give urbanologist Pete Young and myself a look at the place. As we drove up in a police car, a big limousine driven by a huge black—which had been double-parked beside the house—whisked away. "Pusher, probably," said Di Roma laconically.

THE BOSS

Outside the front door a black was cleaning up a puddle of vomit. Di Roma unbuttoned his overcoat, hooked his right thumb over his belt beside his service revolver and led us briskly inside. To the left of the entrance, behind a cubicle covered with heavy steel wire, a very thin Negro sat—the nails on his right hand were at least 3 inches long. Di Roma identified himself, and the thin Negro went to find "the boss."

A pretty black girl with matchstick-thin legs brushed past us. A dog barked incessantly. There was gurgling laughter, and a girl yelled, and then, except for the barking, there was sudden silence. The word had spread fast that there was a cop in the house.

The boss appeared—a white man with a Uriah Heep manner—and he led us up the stairs. A huge, angry-looking Negro lurched down the second floor hall at us, mumbling loudly but incoherently, and another big black appeared from nowhere, and led him away, still mumbling.

Doors opened off the hall, into tiny, slatternly bedrooms and a couple of closet toilets, littered with cigarette stubs. The paint, an electric blue, was crumbling off the walls. On one door was a neatly lettered sign: Please do not knock on this door looking for drugs. Please cooperate. Thank you.

Upstairs there was a sudden crash. The manager explained that "somebody" had hidden "something" in a bathroom, and the something had fallen behind a partition, and now the somebody was tearing the wall down. "He's strong, I can't stop him." The somebody, of course, was a heroin bag.

WHATYA GONNA DO?

A mangy police dog lunged out of a bedroom, snarling—a black pulled it back with a rope. At the back, beneath a fire escape, there was a knee-deep accumulation of filth—old mattresses, bottles, boxes. "Whatya gonna do?" asked the manager plaintively. "They just throw everything out the window."

Outside, the air of New York, not famous for its purity, suddenly smelt sweet. Inside, there had been an omnipresent stench of vomit—addicts who need a fix vomit often. But there had been another smell as well, the smell of death. The people inside will be dead soon—heroin kills most people in a few years. But the smell was not only of the death of people, but of the death of a city.

New York City is dying of a malignancy that originates in such places as 9 West 102nd Street. The city is being killed by heroin. Other American cities are on the death list. But New York may be terminal. What Inspector Di Roma had to say about his 24th Precinct left little doubt about that.

The 24th Precinct, between north Central Park and the Hudson, includes some 160,000 people, about 40 per cent non-white. It ranges in income level from the very poor who live in the welfare fleabags to the upper-middle class in high-rise luxury apartments. Almost all the people in the 24th Precinct—but especially the old and lonely—are scared a great deal of the time. Inspector Di Roma explains why.

When a person first gets hooked on heroin—most of the addicts are young and black—he can get by for a few weeks on one "\$3 bag" a day. (Di Roma showed us the "bags"—they are glassine envelopes half-filled with a small helping of what looks like soft sugar.) But the addict soon moves up to the \$5 bags, and after a year or so, he needs four or more double bags, at \$10 apiece, every day.

For most addicts, the only way to support a \$40-a-day addiction is to steal. As heroin addiction has become epidemic—narcotics arrests have climbed 600 per cent in a year in the 24th Precinct—robbery complaints have climbed to an all-time high, and the complaints represent a fraction of the actual

thefts. About two-thirds of the crime in the precinct is now "drug-connected." "It's outta hand now," says Ken Sauer, chief detective of the precinct. "It's desperate. They're stealing the city blind."

Some addicts become "car boosters," and a great many are muggers. Some specialize in mugging single women in elevators, and others in breaking into apartments. Di Roma has distributed a flyer entitled "Hints For Personal Safety," which tells its own story:

"Walk with your head up and your eyes open! If you look like a victim, you may become one!" "Walk in well-lighted areas, away from doorways." "Don't resist and don't panic." "Organize a building-buddy system to patrol lobbies." And so on.

\$1.5 BILLION A YEAR

New York is, in short, a city under siege. New York has at least 100,000 heroin addicts, the number is growing all the time, and these people *must* get their \$40 or so a day. That means that the addicts must steal more than \$1.5 billion from the people of New York every year. But that sum is a tiny fraction of the real cost.

The real cost is the death of New York as a city in which people who have any choice at all will be willing to leave. Rather than live out their lives in fear those who can afford it are leaving the city. In time, unless the malignancy can be brought under control, New York will be a shell, its tax base wholly eroded, inhabited only by the very poor, and a tiny handful of those rich enough to insulate themselves from the surrounding sea of fear.

Thus the meaning of 9 West 102nd Street is this: *any* measure, no matter how radical, which holds out *any* promise of controlling the heroin malignancy must be taken, and soon. It must become an overriding first priority of American policy—and especially foreign policy—to control the production and distribution of this city-killing drug. Some elements of the problem will be examined in another report in this space.

WPIX EDITORIAL

The drug problem which faces our nation is not one that yields to easy solutions. It is clear that a major part of the drug abuse problems rest in social causes, and until those social problems are eased, there can be no end to drug abuse.

That is not to say that there is nothing which can be done. It may well be that one of the most important pieces of legislation in recent years is the Dangerous Substance Act, which passed the last Congress, and which will drastically limit the production and prescription of amphetamines, known as speed in the drug culture.

But there is another part of the drug abuse situation which is harder to fight. Illicit heroin, which begins in the opium poppy fields of Turkey, and continues through the underground processing plants in the Marseilles area constitutes a major problem to the future of this nation. For this reason, stern measures are called for.

We are told by the State Department that the governments of Turkey and France are cooperating with the United States in reducing the flow of illicit heroin into this country. While this is true, and while we are grateful for the cooperation of these nations, which are responsible for some 80% of the illicit heroin which is available on our streets, we still believe that the President needs some additional muscle to make it effective.

In the past Congress, there was an attempt to add an amendment to the Supplemental Foreign Assistance Act which would have barred economic and military aid to nations which have failed to take steps to prevent the production of illicit drugs. The amendment died in the last minute rush of the last session.

After considering the issue, the Manage-

ment of WPIX believes that similar legislation should be passed forthwith. Our country has demonstrated that it will take action against the problem internally. What is needed now is some means of insuring that other nations will do the same. We believe that economic and military aid should be withheld from nations which do not, in the President's view, do enough to combat the worldwide problem of drug abuse. What's your opinion? We'd like to know.

FRAUD, SPECULATION AND BANKING—III

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it seems clear, if the recently revealed banking practices of the Sharpstown Bank and the Bank of the Southwest, both in Houston, Tex., are any indication, banks today are investing in very large speculative ventures.

In the case of the Bank of the Southwest, large loans are made to enable people to buy up smaller banks, and these loans are large enough to enable the purchasers to offer three times the normal price of the stocks they want.

In the case of the Sharpstown State Bank, now closed, millions of dollars were spent in immensely complicated stock deals mostly to benefit companies owned by the bank's principal owner and to finance stock manipulations that he indulged in to dazzle and befriend a wide range of people. The only ones hurt by the collapse of the Sharpstown Bank were the innocents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that banks must use depositor funds with the care and caution expected by the depositors, who have no way of knowing how a bank is managing their funds.

Fortunately depositor insurance helps people save themselves from speculations and speculations of unscrupulous bank officials. But who is to protect the Massachusetts credit union depositors whose \$2 million were on deposit at the Sharpstown bank? How were they to know, and how were their officers to know, that this was an institution dedicated not to banking, but to playing financial con games? Who is to protect the innocent depositor from the players of financial shell games?

There is no reason why we should permit banks either to speculate or support speculation of the sort I have described here. There is no reason why a depositor should place his money in an account not knowing whether it will be used in sound and productive loans, or used as cards by bankers who like to think that high finance is three-card monte. Nor should depositor money be used merely to finance the acquisition of other banks; that is not productive, it is counter to the letter and intent of banking laws and regulations, and it ought to be stopped.

I have introduced today a bill that would prohibit federally insured banks from using their resources as loans to finance purchase of stocks in other banks. This is legislation that I supported 7 years ago, and which was needed then, and is much more needed today.

There are not many bankers who are dishonest, but it is the few who are not who can also wreck the entire system. We cannot stand idly by.

I have asked that the Committee on Banking and Currency move forward on my bill as soon as possible, and I am confident that my friend and colleague WRIGHT PATMAN will lend his full energies to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I make part of the RECORD a letter I have just sent to Chairman PATMAN:

FEBRUARY 2, 1971.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to my concern about banks making large stock loans to finance the acquisition of other banks, I have introduced a bill to prohibit banks from making loans for such a purpose; a copy of the bill is enclosed.

As you will recall the Committee studied bank acquisitions for a 27 month period from 1964 to 1966, and found that more than half the bank acquisitions in that period were financed by stock loans. The result of this was that people who invested only \$30 million of their own money wound up controlling assets of \$3 billion.

To put it another way, anyone who wants to buy a bank can apparently get ninety cents worth of stock loans for every ten cents he invests. The lending bank naturally gets the acquired stock as collateral, and further protects its investment by having one or more representatives on the board of the acquired bank.

This practice diverts huge sums of otherwise useful bank credit into speculative purchases of bank stock loans. In the Texas case I wrote about last week, the Bank of the Southwest loaned between \$5.5 and \$6 million to purchasers of stock of the Groos National Bank of San Antonio. The purchasers, thanks to this loan, were able to offer up to three times the current price of Groos stock. Needless to say, the Bank of the Southwest will have its representatives on the board of the Groos Bank, when and if this stock raid succeeds.

Thus, banks in Texas are not only diverting large amounts of credit from useful purposes into questionable adventures but are also controlling other banks by proxy, contrary to the spirit and intent of Texas banking law, and very likely contrary to the intent of Federal laws and regulation.

I hope that you will seek an early departmental report on the attached bill, and that you will make available the full resources of the Committee to investigate this growing practice of bank stock loans, with a view toward taking early action on appropriate legislation. I believe that the attached bill represents fairly the intent you expressed in 1964 to seek remedial legislation. I hope that this year the effort will not again be frustrated.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WIGGINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for January 28 through February 5, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey), for February 2 to February 15, 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:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 60 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of dropping charges against General Koster.

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

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, February 17.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. FORSYTHE in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

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

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. KEITH in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUNNELS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY in two instances.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN, and to include tables.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. ADAMS in two instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 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:

179. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on Department of Defense working capital funds as of June 30, 1970, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2208; to the Committee on Armed Services.

180. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

181. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish and govern the Federal Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

182. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, during 1970, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

183. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the potential for improvements in Department of Defense maintenance activities through better cost accounting systems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

184. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ways to reduce payments for physician and X-ray services to nursing home patients under Medicare and Medicaid, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; 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. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 3228. A bill to provide for regulation of public exposure to sonic booms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3229. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3230. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3231. A bill to make the Federal Reserve System responsive to the best interests of the people of the United States, to improve the coordination of monetary, fiscal, and economic policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3232. A bill to establish a National Economic Equity Board to protect the public interest in price stability and the control of inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. BETTS):

H.R. 3233. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives packed in certain airtight containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 3234. A bill to provide benefits for sufferers from byssinosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3235. A bill to provide benefits for sufferers from byssinosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 3236. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 3237. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 3238. A bill to establish the Juan Manuel de Ayala National Recreation Area at the Golden Gate headlands in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3240. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for increased penalties for certain illegal use or possession of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3241. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 3242. A bill to prohibit brokered deposits in banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3243. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporate management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3246. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 3249. A bill to amend section 4491 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the weight portion of the excise tax on the use of civil aircraft shall apply to piston-engined aircraft only if they have a maximum certificated takeoff weight of more than 6,000 pounds, and to restrict expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund to the purposes for which it was established; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3250. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORDOVA:

H.R. 3252. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to maintain for navigation purposes Port Las Mareas, Puerto Rico, and the channel thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDOVA (for himself, Mr.

BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3253. A bill to provide that the social security benefits provided by the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 for certain uninsured individuals at age 72 shall apply in the case of residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make certain widows of veterans of periods of war and certain children of such veterans who are deceased eligible for care in Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3256. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize direct admission to community nursing homes of those veterans needing such care for a service-connected condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to \$100 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3258. A bill to provide for the granting of National Service Life Insurance to Vietnam conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3259. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a paraplegia rehabilitation allowance of \$100 per month for veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean or Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3260. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3262. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10 percent across-the-board benefit increase, with a minimum primary benefit of \$100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3266. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BELL, Mr. PELLY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WINN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROUSH and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 3269. A bill to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. POFF, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. FISH, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ZION, Mr. MYERS, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MANN, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. BRAY):

H.R. 3270. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. ZION, and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 3271. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges in Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3273. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for the children of police officers who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in the line of duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama):

H.R. 3274. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require that the containers in which distilled spirits, wine, and beer are sold shall be reusable containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 3276. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3278. A bill to restore persons having claims against the United States their right to be represented by legal counsel of their own choosing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 3280. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3281. A bill to authorize the erection of a statue of Queen Isabella of Spain in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANLEY, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. KYL, Mr. LINK, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROY, and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 3282. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to encourage physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other medical personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZEK, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRADMAS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DOW, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. O'NEILL, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to encourage physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other medical personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3284. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide under the retirement test a substantial increase in the amount of outside income permitted without loss of benefits, but with a requirement that income of all types and from all sources be included in determining the amount of an individual's income for purposes of such test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 3285. A bill to provide compensation for work injuries for certain criminal of-

fenders who perform service in national forests in lieu of other punishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3286. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide time off to employees of executive agencies to vote in Federal, State, and local elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3287. A bill to prohibit federally insured banks from making loans to provide for the purchase of bank stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of regular widower's insurance benefits (actuarially reduced the same as widow's benefits) at age 60, and to eliminate the special dependency requirement for entitlement to widower's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3289. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate the special dependency requirement for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 3290. A bill to prohibit the licensing of hydroelectric projects on the Middle Snake River below Heils Canyon Dam at any time before September 30, 1978; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3291. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code to make the killing, assaulting, or intimidating of any officer or employee of the Federal Communications Commission performing investigative, inspection, or law enforcement functions a Federal criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3292. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide in certain cases for exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3293. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 3294. A bill to preserve feed grain history on farms with feed grain bases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LENNON (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 3295. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3296. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement of all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits sufficient, in the absence of any other resource, to assure elderly persons freedom from poverty and also to assure elderly persons generally full participation in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for physically, mentally, or vocationally disabled persons aged 18 and over, and to provide

benefits for certain full-time students aged 18 to 25, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children, and to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3297. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. MCFALL):

H.R. 3298. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize the Government National Mortgage Association to guarantee obligations issued by State agencies to finance low- and moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 3299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate within the Department of the Interior an officer to establish, coordinate, and administer programs authorized by this act, for the reclamation, acquisition, and conservation of lands and water adversely affected by subsurface, strip or surface coal mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 3300. A bill to eliminate jeopardy to tax status of sponsoring school because of editorial policies or activities of student newspapers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 3301. A bill: Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the transfer, assignment, or other dispositions of a construction permit granted under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WYATT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LENNON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. STEELE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. CLARK):

H.R. 3304. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin; to the committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mr. HICKS, of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. REES, Mr. LENT, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for the cost of ptosis bars under the supplementary medical insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 3309. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3310. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3311. A bill to provide that the President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, an item for not less than \$2 billion to be applied toward reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3312. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with States, local agencies, and individuals in the planning and carrying out of practices for water yield improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3314. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3317. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on stainless steel sheets and on articles made from such sheets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3318. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (by request):

H.R. 3319. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that the procurement of certain transportation and public utility services shall be in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations governing carriers and public utilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3320. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to strengthen and improve the enforcement of Federal and State economic laws and regulations concerning highway transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3321. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide assistance to States

in establishing, developing, and administering State motor carrier programs to enforce the economic laws and regulations of the States and the United States concerning highway transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3322. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide assistance to the States in establishing, developing, and administering State motor carrier safety programs to insure the safe operation of commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3323. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to establish a Federal-State joint board to prescribe uniform procedures for determining what part of the property and expenses of communication common carriers shall be considered as used in interstate or foreign communication toll service, and what part of such property and expenses shall be considered as used in intrastate and exchange service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 to establish a formula for the division of Federal grants among State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3325. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to redefine State and local governmental authority over communications primarily of local concern; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3326. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3327. A bill to provide for the establishment of a consumer education program designed to inform and give more adequate warning to elderly persons and others concerning the widespread existence, techniques, and dangers of home repair rackets and other forms of consumer fraud; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in the case of certain uses of tread rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3329. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 3331. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of State-imposed restrictions on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3332. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits, to improve computation methods, and to raise the earnings base under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis upon improvements in the operating effectiveness of such programs, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 3333. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgments, when appropriated, recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraphs 7 and 10, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3334. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project (California); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 3335. A bill to promote the advancement of biological research in aging through a comprehensive and intensive 5-year program for the systematic study of the basic origins of the aging process in human beings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3336. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 3337. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 3338. A bill to designate the Pine Mountain Wilderness, Prescott and Tonto National Forests, in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3339. A bill to designate the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3340. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize increased benefits for veterans requiring regularly scheduled hemodialysis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3341. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide medical and hospital care to the widows and children of persons who died of service-connected disabilities and to wives and children of persons who have service-connected disabilities rated as total; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3342. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services, of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3343. A bill to provide that compensation received by an individual from the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disability shall not be taken into account as income so as to prevent his occupancy of Government-sponsored housing (or so as to increase the rent which he would otherwise be required to pay); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3344. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3345. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to assist veterans with a permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss or loss of use of one upper and one lower extremity to acquire

specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3346. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3347. A bill to repeal the savings provision of Public Law 90-493 protecting veterans entitled to disability compensation from arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3348. A bill to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate certain duplications in Federal benefits now payable for the same, or similar, purpose; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator to make advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3350. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to require that certain veterans receiving hospital care from the Veterans' Administration for non-service-connected disabilities be charged for such care to the extent that they have health insurance or similar contracts with respect to such care; to prohibit the future exclusion of such coverage from insurance policies or contracts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3351. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to require that more emphasis be given to supervised work experience in the farm cooperative training program; to increase the educational assistance allowance rates for such program; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3352. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an annual clothing allowance to certain veterans who, because of a service-connected disability, wear a prosthetic appliance or appliances which tends to wear out or tear their clothing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3353. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3354. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide mustering-out payments for military service after August 5, 1964; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3355. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3356. 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 protect the public from the offensive intrusion into their homes of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3357. A bill to provide that veterans be provided employment opportunities after discharge at certain minimum salary rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey):

H.R. 3358. 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. ULLMAN:

H.R. 3359. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products,

medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 3360. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$100, and to increase to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. HAYS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. YATSON, Mr. BURLISON of Texas, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3361. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KOCH, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 3362. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 3363. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3364. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3365. A bill to assist in combating crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism, providing improved Federal, State, and local correctional facilities and services, strengthening administration of Federal corrections, strengthening control over probationers, parolees, and persons found not guilty by reason of insanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3366. 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.

H.R. 3367. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men

and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 253. 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. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the last Thursday in November of each year as Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to extend the right to vote to persons 18 years of age and older and to require that they be treated as adults for the purposes of all law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide the right of persons lawfully assembled to participate in nondenominational prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution urging the President of the United States not to send any U.S. Armed Forces to Vietnam after March 1, 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to prayer and Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate 1 week each year as "National Cystic Fibrosis Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS,

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the continued operation of Public Health Service facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to utilize more effectively the expertise and abilities of the scientists and engineers associated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the fight against environmental pollution; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 183. Resolution relative to the sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Res. 184. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself and Mr. RARICK):

H. Res. 185. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 186. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Attempted Defection by Lithuanian Seaman, Simas Kudirka"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 188. Resolution relating to the operation of the House restaurant and other food services facilities of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 189. Resolution relating to the minimum per annum gross rate of pay which may be paid from the clerk hire allowances of Members of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H. Res. 190. Resolution to retain U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3368. A bill for the relief of Francesco Blondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Gilda and Arturo Canestraro and minor children, Sandro and Mirena Canestraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3370. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Cefalu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3371. A bill for the relief of Teresa Carratello Cefalu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Giusto Farinella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Mayo Goff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3374. A bill for the relief of Alfredo

and Caterina Iannitelli and minor son, Riccardo Jose Iannitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Licatini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3376. A bill for the relief of Thomas McHugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3377. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Mazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3378. A bill for the relief of Aurora Matia Moranta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3379. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Nardulli, also known as Juan Nardulli, and his wife, Antonia Nardulli, and their minor child, Anna Nardulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3380. A bill for the relief of Geuseppe and Virgilia Poppalardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3381. A bill for the relief of Mario and Rita Pelmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3382. A bill for the relief of Alberto Scuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 3383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia A. Buensalido and her minor children, Raymond A. Buensalido and Jacqueline A. Buensalido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3384. A bill for the relief of Maj. Boyd L. Schultz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3385. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Campobasso and Maria Campobasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Linford Escalante, Yvonne Marie Escalante, and Jacqueline Elizabeth Escalante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Grace Marie Gladden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3388. A bill for the relief of Vallan Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Youghaper Derderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Alberigo Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Anna Giovine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Gerard Lecomte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Manuel Vieira Andrade, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3394. A bill for the relief of Franco and Ida Angelucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3395. A bill for the relief of Antonio Balsamo and Maria Balsamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3396. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alberto Gomes Barbosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3397. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Berardinelli and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3398. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Colarusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3399. A bill for the relief of Silverio Conte, his wife, Lucia Conte, their son, Aniello Conte, and their daughter, Silvana Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3400. A bill for the relief of Gaetano D'Antona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3401. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Guarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3402. A bill for the relief of Constantinos and Anna Kritikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3403. A bill for the relief of Caterina Leto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3404. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Matorano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3405. A bill for the relief of Ubalda Mazzacani and Giorgio Mazzacani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Calogero Palermo and Adelina Turco Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Guido Paribello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Mario Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3409. A bill for the relief of Franseco Spadaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tarara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3411. A bill for the relief of Vasil and Anthoula Thanasis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3412. A bill for the relief of Arnaldo M. Xavier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 3413. A bill for the relief of Dr. David G. Simons, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3414. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Archangeletti and daughter, Antonella Archangeletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3415. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3416. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelina Persello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3417. A bill for the relief of Filomena Quaranta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3418. A bill for the relief of Abou Samir Semaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 3419. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo S. Guadiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3420. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Barone, Domitilla Barone, and Josephine Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3421. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Coico, Vincenza Coico, Francesca Coico, and Luigi Coico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3422. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Parisi, Carmine Parisi, Rita Leanor Parisi, and Franco Nicholas Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3423. A bill for the relief of Carmela Pitruzzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3424. A bill for the relief of Jamie Chuntianlay Siy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3425. A bill for the relief of Helen Tziminadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 3426. A bill for the relief of Dady Balansay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Modica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3428. A bill for the relief of Irene Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 3429. A bill for the relief of Mary Margaret Threadgill (Tran-Thi Hong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Anna

Maria Ciaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Libera Scrocca de Girolamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3432. A bill for the relief of Tong Li Fat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3433. A bill for the relief of Santi Fiumara and his wife, Concetta Fiumara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Mario Guerriero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3435. A bill for the relief of Angelo Pellegrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 3436. A bill for the relief of Dominic Colamonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3437. A bill for the relief of William E. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3438. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. George C. Lee, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3439. A bill for the relief of Capt. Willie Paul Sims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Albert Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3441. A bill for the relief of Fernando Leano del Fierro, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3442. A bill for the relief of Josefina del Fierro Hizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Jesus Calapatia Leano and Bayani Calapatia Leano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3444. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Galec Mactangay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3445. A bill for the relief of Magtibay Perez Pedro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3446. A bill for the relief of Fernando Vega Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3447. A bill for the relief of Manuel Paredes Santiangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3448. A bill for the relief of Salvado Francisco Sugui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 3449. A bill for the relief of Pio De Flavili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aprus Eshoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Joseph Giardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3452. A bill for the relief of Houser C. Godje; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Incorvala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Benito Mirmina, his wife, Nunziata Mirmina, and their children, Franca Mirmina, Guiseppina Mirmina, and Francesco Mirmina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Pizzimenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3456. A bill for the relief of Rocco and Lucia Pocetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3457. A bill for the relief of Luis Barabato Alvarado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Antonio de Leonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3459. A bill for the relief of Herminia Dulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3460. A bill for the relief of Antonio Papulino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scatigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Seaview Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Maria Kovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Oreiro Romeo Pagaduan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Hazel Alberta (Flanders) Kirkendoll, Sheila Darlene (Kirkendoll) McFarland, Lydia Ellen (Flanders) Smith, Wilma Elizabeth (Flanders) Bainter, Temple Lucile (Flanders) Schulz Wells, William Edward Schulz, Genevieve Bell (Flanders) Iiams, John Calvin Iiams, David Eugene Iiams, Pamela Sue Iiams, Florence Garnell (Flanders) Bergerhofer, Richard Albert Bergerhofer, Debra Ann Bergerhofer, Finis Marion (Flanders) McFarland, Mari Kathleen (McFarland) Palmer, and Gary Lee McFarland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3466. A bill for the relief of Anton Sobonja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Vladko Dimitrov Denev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3468. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sebastiano Saglimbeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Altobello and Francesco Vincenzo, and Pino Altobello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Nicola and Maria Lerario, and Vincenza Lerario Favia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3471. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Laceras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3472. A bill for the relief of Antonino Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3473. A bill for the relief of Jovito Lucas Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3476. A bill for the relief of Guy Lubroth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Samuel Woletsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 3478. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Colbert, colonel, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3479. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land located in the State of Georgia to the record owner of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 3480. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Sandor, and his wife, Klara, and their son, Rudolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 3481. A bill for the relief of Victoria E. Doles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.