15 minutes: Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, and SYMINGTON.

At the conclusion of the remarks of the able Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, the period not to exceed 30 minutes, following which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 382, a bill to promote fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I have the attention of the Senate? I think that the Senate should be informed that the joint leadership have taken it upon themselves to try to work out a time limitation on the pending business, and if that time limitation can be achieved, we hope that the Senate will go along with the joint leadership. Otherwise, I think we are going to be in quite a mess.

The Senate will recall that the joint leadership last week and earlier this week stated that the next order of business, following the disposal of the business today, would be S. 2308, a bill to authorize emergency loan guarantees to major business enterprises. The Senate will go out very shortly. In the meantime, we are trying to work out an agreement. I would hope that the Senate would exercise restraint, especially on the Democratic side, to give us a chance to work out of the impasse in which we find ourselves, because if there is going to be a stalling operation on either side, it will be the Senate that will suffer, and legislation which should be passed will perhaps not even be considered.

Remember, we are not going out definitely on August 6. We are going to come back; and I would hope that no one would take advantage of that month's vacation, recess, or absence to unduly delay legislation at this time.

I do not believe in filibustering, but if others want to speak, that is their business. As far as I am concerned, I ordinarily believe in cloture—not always—but I do think that we do have responsibilities affecting other pieces of legislation. The HEW appropriation bill will be reported shortly; the public works appropriation bill will be reported shortly; the Sugar Act extension will be reported shortly; and there will be other important legislation to consider.

So I plead with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to use restraint and to look at the situation in which the leadership finds itself in trying to expedite legislation without impinging on the rights of any Member of this body. That is all I have to say.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 1971, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20 (legislative day of July 19), 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Frank P. Sanders, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Rush Moody, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1976, vice Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., term expired.

U.S. TAX COURT

William A. Goffe, of Oklahoma, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office, vice Norman O. Tietjens, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 20, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Right Reverend Bishop Papken, Armenian Orthodox Church of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all, make this glorious House of our Nation Your House.

Lead, enlighten, and strengthen the leaders of our country, and make them tools of Your divine will.

Giver of wisdom, plant in their hearts and minds not the love of power, but the power of love.

Put in their hands the sword of Your righteousness to fight the good fight as champions of peace and justice.

Save us from our external enemies as well as from internal killers such as disunity, racial hatred, from calamities of crimes and drugs and every kind of seen and unseen evils.

Thanks and glory to Thee forever. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 9272. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9272) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. FONG, and Mr. YOUNG to the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 635. An act to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP PAPKEN, ARMENIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OF AMERICA

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are indeed favored today to have as our acting Chaplain, the Right Reverend Bishop Papken.

The bishop has been in the United States since 1946 and has been a citizen since 1951. Following his arrival in the United States, he served for several years in various parishes throughout the United States. He was head of the California diocese and the Armenian Church from 1957 to 1963. He was then head of the Pennsylvania diocese from 1963 to 1969, when he came to Washington and entered into his present duties.

He has made more than 10 trips to the Holy Land, and to Armenia, in furtherance of his ministry, and I am grateful that he can be with us here today.

"FISHBAIT" DAY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is "Fishbait" Day, the gentleman whose stentorian tones and commanding appearance so often thrill the galleries and stir the House from its routine endeavors, is having a birthday. On today, the Honorable William M. Miller, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, is 62. For most people, that would be considered a lot of years, but not for the gentleman known by the remarkable sobriquet of "Fishbait." He is perennially young.

"Fishbait" has been a fixture of the Congress longer than just about anybody. He came in 1933, and that makes him about as permanent as anything around here except the Capitol Building itself. When I arrived as a new Member of the 77th Congress, he was already established

as the man whose counsel was most important to all Members, and essential for freshmen. I knew that it was important to cultivate his friendship for business reasons at that time, but I am very proud that we now share a deep and close friendship that has grown and matured through the years. Among all the people I have had the pleasure in knowing on the Hill, none can be said to exceed "Fishbait" Miller in kindliness, generosity, warmth, and good spirit. He is one of those outstanding individuals who is tireless in the discharge of his duties and who in some way finds the time to be good to everyone.

His remarkable nickname was bestowed upon him by admiring friends in his native Pascagoula, Miss., many years ago. As a boy he was very small for his age. In fact, he had little resemblance to the well-kept, well-fed, well-paid gentleman we know. In those early days his friends said he was not big enough for anything except fishbait, and the nickname stuck.

As Doorkeeper, he commands around 300 employees on a payroll of $1.3 million. His domain includes all the other doormen, the pages while on the floor, the document room, the folding room, the cloakroom, snackbars, the several barbershops, and what he describes as a number of "ladies' retiring rooms."

Mr. Miller has many responsibilities of special nature, including a trash collection service and care and protection of the prayer room in the Capitol. His most dazzling duty, however, concerns the arrival in this Chamber of the President of the United States, for delivery of the annual message on the state of the Union or for other very special occasions. Whenever this occurs, the Doorkeeper is required to shepherd to their seats a vast array of foreign dignitaries, Supreme Court Justices, and members of the Cabinet, after which, as a grand climax, he is privileged to introduce to those assembled, the President himself. These always are memorable events, carried out in the presence of crowded galleries, and "Fishbait" does a great job, year after year. Distinguished visitors have to stay on their toes to keep from being outshone when they are introduced by "Fishbait."

"Fishbait" was first elected Doorkeeper in the 81st Congress by the Democratic majority. He was minority Doorkeeper in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, and then got his old job back. He has held it ever since. In Congress after Congress, this remarkable man has won reelection to his post by an appreciative and admiring House of Representatives.

His endeavors and his interests are not limited to his work on Capitol Hill. He is well known for his church, civic, and fraternal contributions and he has achieved distinction in each of these important fields.

We are proud to have him as the Doorkeeper of the House and I, very personally, am proud to have him as a close and warm friend.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's yielding. I would like to associate myself with his remarks on the subject of "Fishbait." I believe that "Fishbait" Miller is a friend of every Member of this Congress on both sides of the aisle. He is perpetually accommodating, friendly, and helpful. I agree with the gentleman from Florida that it would be very difficult to conceive of this body without "Fishbait" Miller. It is good to wish him happy birthday.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From our side we certainly extend to "Fishbait" our very best wishes on this anniversary and the wish for him many more in the years ahead. We also thank him for his many kindnesses and accommodations to us, and know from past performance they will continue in the future.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I join with the gentlemen in paying tribute to "Fishbait" Miller, who has done a wonderful job for all of us over the years. I suppose there is no champion of the seniority system like "Fishbait." I have been here 19 years, and I would like to say that it has been a delight to work for a ticket for my wife from way up in the far corner of the gallery to the area to my right. This is real progress that I have been making. So I repeat that here is a real champion of the seniority system who does a great job for us.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of our minutes.

MISSISSIPPI OPERATES WITH A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, these days when we hear so much about State and local governments facing a financial crisis it is refreshing for me to be able to point that my home State of Mississippi is continuing to operate with a balanced budget. According to figures just released, Mississippi had an unencumbered cash balance of almost $76 million on June 30 of this year. According to projections for cash revenue during the next 12 months and based on appropriations made for the current fiscal year, the Mississippi State treasury should show a cash balance of some $8 million June 30 of next year.

I would suggest that we in Congress need to take a lesson from Mississippi on the merits of living within your means.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF MAN'S FIRST TRIP TO THE MOON

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

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the second anniversary of the historic flight of Apollo 11, when men from the planet Earth first set foot on the Moon.

The lunar landing created a wave of excitement and pride that swept rapidly throughout the world. It was evident that a new era in man's development had begun. Since that time the United States has continued its clearly established policy of willingness to share the knowledge and benefits gained from the exploration of space with other nations. This willingness was exemplified by the words "We came in peace for all mankind" inscribed in stainless steel on the lunar landing module. And who could forget the first words of man on the surface of the Moon when Neil Armstrong exclaimed "One small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind."

The lunar landing was a triumph of science and technology. The continued exploration of space, combined with a willingness to share its applications for peaceful purposes, enhances the role of the United States as world leader far beyond the areas of science and technology directly involved in the program.

I take this opportunity to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its Government-science-industry team for their tireless efforts and outstanding achievements in our Nation's space program. And I would like to express to all of the personnel and contractors connected with the Marshall Space Flight Center located in my home State of Alabama, my particular pride in their role—especially in the development of the Saturn launch vehicles which start the Apollo astronauts on their journeys to the Moon.

BUSINESS AS USUAL IN PEKING

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, although there has been, for the most part, a rather favorable reaction from the press and public officialdom in this country over the proposed visit by the President to Red China in that the invitation has shown a change of heart on the part of the Communists, I would again caution those optimists calling for a rapprochement with Red China.

Chou En-lai was quick to point out that it was President Nixon, not he or Mao, who took the initiative in proposing the visit to Peking, and that all Red China did was accede to the President's wish.

I would also like to read from the Washington Post for Sunday, July 18, what the official voice of the Red Chinese Government said over Radio Peking not more than 15 minutes after the broadcast of the news that President Nixon would be visiting that country:

> People of the world unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs.

Of course this is nothing new; it is old hat for the Red Chinese. Yet, I suppose, even in light of the above statements, we are still to believe that the Communists

have made a good faith offer in the cause of peace and that this is an indication that they have mellowed and have renounced their goals of world Communist revolution and war against the free world.

BIG BUS BILL

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will consider H.R. 4354, the big bus bill. In reviewing the report filed by the Public Works Committee—House Report 92-345—on this bill, I have discovered a number of inaccuracies. These errors are discussed in some detail at page 25935 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 19. I would urge each of you to review this material, as well as the minority ,additional, and supplemnetal views contained in the report prior to the debate tomorrow.

FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FROM WASHINGTON

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on June 11, 1971, President Nixon said:

> A municipality that does not want federally assisted housing should not have it imposed from Washington by bureaucratic fiat; this is not a proper Federal role.

He defined federally assisted housing as housing for low- and moderate-income families. He said:

> This includes the Home Ownership and Rental Housing Assistance subsidy programs ("section 235" and "section 236" housing, respectively), the rent supplement program enacted in 1965, and assistance to low-rent public housing.

Prior to this stated policy the question of issuing and approving "236" loans by FHA left no discretion with the local people and/or governments if all legal requirements were met.

The Presidential policy above was quite clear in that local governments should have such discretion.

Notwithstanding the Presidential policy, "Romney's raiders of the Treasury" are continuing to process "federally assisted" housing where it is not wanted by the local people and where there is no local sponsorship.

Carpetbaggers, intent on profiting from the hard-earned taxes of the working people are—with the approval of FHA—proceeding to institute three "236" projects in the Fourth District over the objection of the local people. The carpetbaggers have gone to court to force this unwanted subsidized housing on the local people—and in one case have won.

Apparently not only was Secretary Romney "brainwashed" by bureaucrats before becoming Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; but apparently now the bureaucrats are "brainwashed" by the carpetbaggers. If not, then why does HUD thumb its nose at President Nixon on his June 11, 1971, stated policy in this regard?

The three projects in question are: Carriage House of Florence, Ky.; Carriage House of Louisville, Ky.; and Kent Green House of Florence, Ky.

Apparently the self-proclaimed "brainwashed" Secretary of Housing and Urban Development thinks he works for Lippmann Associates and Gene Glick and company instead of for the President.

CONGRESSMAN HUNT EXPRESSES CONCERN FOR POW'S

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today marks 7 years and 116 days since the first American soldier became a prisoner of war in Southeast Asia.

Despite the most extensive and painfully persistent efforts on the part of the Government and citizens of the United States and of numerous other nations, the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong have, with excruciating regularity, repulsed all moves intended to secure compliance with the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention requiring humane treatment of prisoners of war and, ultimately, to effect their repatriation.

It is most unfortunate, indeed, that numerous public officials, listened to because of their positions of elected responsibility, have unwittingly become the allies of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong propagandists in making even the negotiations for the release of American POW's contingent upon a firm commitment for the withdrawal of our forces from Southeast Asia. This very issue is now pending before a conference of both Houses in the form of an amendment to the legislation providing for a 2-year extension of the Selective Service Act.

Regardless of the difficulties which legislation of this nature is bound to have with respect to the POW issue at the Paris negotiations, and notwithstanding the eventual outcome of the legislation, it is my fervent hope and prayer that all civilized nations will continue to prevail upon the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to release the POW's and MIA's held captive by them. Indeed, the thought might be ventured that rather than using the POW's as the pawns for a forced withdrawal, the settlement of the POW issue first might well sped the resolve of other critical, but unrelated, issues.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CLINTON M. HOOSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1824) for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the unanimous consent request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clinton M. Hoose, of Alexandria, Virginia, the sum of $3,634.64 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising in connection with a reduction in his salary for the period beginning October 1, 1962, and ending October 30, 1964, while he was a contract employee of the Central Intelligence Agency. The said Clinton M. Hoose agreed to such a reduction in salary because of certain provisions of Federal law relating to restrictions on the concurrent receipt of civilian compensation and military retired pay, which provisions were later rendered retroactively inapplicable to certain retired officers by section 201(g) of the Dual Compensation Act of 1964.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 2, line 7: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2816) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2816

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, the amount certified to him by the Administrator

of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2 of this Act. The payment of such amount shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Rose Minutillo for a pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Minutillo (Veterans' Administration claim number XC 2-935-738). No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount that Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, would have received as pension for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Minutillo, if she had filed a proper claim for such pension on December 14, 1944.

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

MRS. FERNANDE M. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5318) for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5657) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN BORBRIDGE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5900) for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JANIS ZALCMANIS, GERTRUDE JANSONS, LORENA JANSONS MURPHY, AND ASJA JANSONS LIDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6100) for the relief of Janis Zalcmanis, Gertrude Jansons, Lorena Jansons Murphy, and Asja Jansons Liders.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARIA G. ORSINI (NEE MARI)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1899) for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1899

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

MISS MARGARET GALE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1995) for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1995

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Margaret Gale may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SALMAN M. HILMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6998) for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN A. MARTINKOSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4042) for the relief of John A. Martinkosky.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ELEANOR D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7569) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROY E. CARROLL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2846) for the relief of Roy E. Carroll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2846

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Roy E. Carroll of Wellesley, Massachusetts, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,365, representing the total amount of overpayments of active duty pay received by the said Roy E. Carroll during the period from February 1963, through October 1964, as a result of administrative error on the part of the Bureau of Naval Personnel with respect to monthly allotments sent to the mother of the said Roy E. Carroll during such period. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Roy E. Carroll an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall

be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WEST FARGO PIONEER AND DALE C. NESEMEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1762) for the relief of the West Fargo Pioneer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the West Fargo Pioneer of West Fargo, North Dakota, is relieved of all liability for payment to the United States of the sum of $1,674.07, representing additional postage due on sample copies of the West Fargo Pioneer mailed during the period from January 1969, through September 1969, and additional postage due on a publication entitled "The Mirror" included as a supplement to the West Fargo Pioneer and mailed during the period from March 1969, through April 1970, such postage being due as the result of the assessment of postage at incorrect rates by officials of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the West Fargo Pioneer the sum of any amounts received on account of the postage deficiency referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No more than 10 per centum of any amount appropriated under this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this subsection is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike "is" and insert "and Dale C. Nesemeier are."

Page 1, line 5, strike "$1,674.07" and insert "$995.38".

Page 1, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike "on sample copies of the West Fargo Pioneer mailed during the period from January 1969, through September 1969, and additional postage due".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the West Fargo Pioneer and Dale C. Nesemeier."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 161) for the relief of the West Fargo Pioneer and Dale C. Nesemeier.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 161

An act for the relief of the West Fargo Pioneer and Dale C. Nesemeier

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the West Fargo Pioneer of West Fargo, North Dakota, and Dale C. Nesemeier are relieved of all liability for payment to the United States of the sum of $995.38, representing additional postage due on a publication entitled "The Mirror" included as a supplement to the West Fargo Pioneer and mailed during the period from March 1969, through April 1970, such postage being due as the result of the assessment of postage at incorrect rates by officials of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the West Fargo Pioneer the sum of any amounts received on account of the postage deficiency referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No more than 10 per centum of any amount appropriated under this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this subsection is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed $1,000.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings whereby the House bill was passed will be vacated, and the House bill (H.R. 1762) will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LOUIS A. GERBERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2408) for the relief of Louis A. Gerbert.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARY JAMES KATES, OWNER OF THE GLADEWATER DAILY MIRROR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3041) for the relief of John Harwin Parrish, postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., and for Mary James Kates, owner of the Gladewater Daily Mirror.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3041

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John Harwin Parrish, postmaster, and Mary James Kates, owner and publisher of the Gladewater Daily Mirror, both of Gladewater, Texas, are relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $746.83, the amount claimed to be due by the Post Office Department for revenue deficiencies resulting from errors in postage on second-class material at the post office at Gladewater, Texas, during the period beginning October 26, 1966, and ending on November 8, 1967.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Harwin Parrish, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary James Kates, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by her, or withheld from sum otherwise due her, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(c) No part of the amount appropriated in subsections (a) or (b) of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "John Harwin Parrish, postmaster, and".

Page 1, line 5, strike "both", and strike "are" and insert "is".

Page 1, line 6, strike "$746.83" and insert "$746.63".

Page 2, line 1, strike "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized".

Page 2, strike all of lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Page 2, line 8, strike "(b)".

Page 2, line 14, strike "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 2, line 14, strike "subsections" and insert "subsection (a)".

Page 2, line 15, strike "(a) or (b)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Mary James Kates, owner of the Gladewater Daily Mirror."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT J. BEAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7871) for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTHER CATHERINE MILNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 145) for the relief of Esther Catherine Milner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 145

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Catherine Milner may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101 (b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Lee W. Milner and Nancy Ross Milner, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the brothers and sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

MARIA GRAZIA IACCARINO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 566) for the relief of Maria Grazia Iaccarino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Grazia Iaccarino may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of such Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. John F. Newton, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

NICHOLAOS DEMITRIOS APOSTOLAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 672) for the relief of Nicholaos Demitrios Apostolakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 672

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholaos Demitrios Apostolakis may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Paul N. Apostle, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

DAH MI KIM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1962) for the relief of Dah Mi Kim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dah Mi Kim may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101 (b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Norman Gilpin, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "case." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "case: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PARK OK SOO AND NOH MI OK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2087) for the relief of Park Ok Soo and Noh Mi Ok.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2087

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Park Ok Soo and Noh Mi Ok may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, and a petition filed in their behalf by Mrs. G. B. Royal, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSE BETTENCOURT DE SIMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2107) for the relief of Jose Bettencourt de Simas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Bettencourt de Simas, may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

IN KYONG YI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2803) for the relief of In Kyong Yi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2803

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, In Kyong Yi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, In Kyong Yi may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by Mrs. Patricia Mosier, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KYUNG SOOK MIN AND KYUNG JO MIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3539) for the relief of Kyung Sook Min and Kyung Jo Min.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was not objection.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 108, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

S. 108

An act for the relief of Kyung Jo Min and Kyung Sook Min

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c) of that Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Kyung Jo Min and Kyung Sook Min by Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Buck, citizens of the United States. The natural brothers and sisters of the said Kyung Jo Min and Kyung Sook Min shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 3539) was laid on the table.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MIGUELITO YBUT BENEDICTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Miguelito Ybut Benedicto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miguelito Ybut Benedicto shall be deemed to be an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) of that Act and may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miguelito Ybut Benedicto may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gerardo Benedicto, a citizen of the United States and a lawfully resident alien, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the act: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

REA REPUBLICA RAMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2814) for the relief of Rea Republica Ramos.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PETTIS. 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. 196]

Adams	Garmatz	Mollohan
Andrews, Ala.	Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.
Baring	Goldwater	Pepper
Blanton	Gray	Ruppe
Brasco	Gude	Scheuer
Celler	Hagan	Sisk
Clark	Hanna	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	Harsha	Steele
Conyers	Hosmer	Talcott
de la Garza	Hungate	Teague, Calif.
Dellums	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kuykendall	Terry
Donohue	Kyros	Tiernan
du Pont	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Vigorito
Fish	Mayne	Wilson, Charles H.
Fisher	Melcher	Yatron
Ford, William D.	Michel	
	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9270, AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9270) making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for this opportunity to explain my position on this year's effort to reform our runaway farm program.

Despite the adoption by the House of my amendment to lower the present subsidy ceiling from $55,000 to $20,000 per crop, which passed on June 23, 1971, by a vote of 214 to 198, the other body has regrettably chosen not to go along.

I am grateful to the strong support which Senator BAYH gave to this reform last week, but, despite that effort, we must face the fact that the amendment was rejected by a margin of 56 to 29.

Mr. Speaker, any successful politician must be able to recognize defeat. I will, therefore, not move to instruct our conferees.

I am frankly at a loss to understand the Senate action in the face of the overwhelming popular demand to put an end to these giveaways, and virtually every poll I have seen indicates that the vast majority of farmers also favor a $20,000 limit.

I want to assure all of my colleagues that, while another battle has been lost, I will be back again next year. I intend to offer this same amendment again at that time, and, between now and then, will devote my time to promoting greater awareness of the need for this reform.

One part of that effort is already underway. The General Accounting Office has already begun an investigation into the administration of the present $55,000 and the methods being used to circumvent it. We should have this GAO report before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the Comptroller General, commending him for initiating this inquiry and urging him to broaden the GAO study to enable him to comment on the advantages of adopting a lower ceiling of $20,000 per crop. I include a copy of that letter at the close of these remarks.

It might be noted, Mr. Speaker, that last week the other body did adopt a resolution calling on the Department of Agriculture to conduct its own investigation—RECORD, July 15, 1971; page 25435. Having sandbagged the taxpayer's hope for ending this scandal, the other body, I presume, thought it could salve its conscience by this grand gesture.

Well, I, for one, believe that asking the Department to do this job makes as much sense as asking President Thieu to investigate charges of election fraud in South Vietnam.

The only way to get an accurate, objective look at what is happening is through the GAO investigation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that I am deeply disappointed by the action of the other body. And there can be no doubt that the American taxpayer is also disappointed, in fact, outraged. But this issue will not rest here. Perhaps it will take an election year to awaken our colleagues in the other body. But, whatever it takes, I want to assure all my colleagues I will be back again. And I will not rest until this runaway farm program is brought under control.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter which I wrote to the Comptroller General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1971.

Hon. ELMER B. STAATS,
Controller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: I am pleased to know that the General Accounting Office is currently conducting an investigation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's regulations to implement the farm subsidy ceiling of $55,000 per producer for each crop adopted by the Congress last year. I understand that your investigation is seeking answers to the following questions:

First, what has been the effect of the $55,000 payment limitation; second, how is the Department of Agriculture administering its regulations; and third, what types of measures are being used to circumvent the regulations and the payment limitation?

In addition, I would suggest that you broaden your inquiry to enable you to comment on the advantages of adopting a lower ceiling of $20,000 per crop. It is my belief that a ceiling at this level would be much more difficult to circumvent and would engender substantially greater savings. I am therefore anxious to know if your study would confirm this.

Again I commend you for undertaking this inqury and look forward to your report.

With all best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, HULL, SHIPLEY, EVANS of Colorado, MAHON, ANDREWS of North Dakota, MICHEL, SCHERLE, and BOW.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the environmental and consumer protection agencies. There are numerous amendments which must be considered in conference since the other body made increases of around $1.5 billion.

One of the major items of controversy in the House had to do with a limitation on payments. Unfairly, I think, this has been termed and frequently described as a subsidy.

Under the various laws passed by the Congress and signed by the President, a commitment was made to make payments under certain terms and conditions at not to exceed $55,000 per person or corporation. These payments—wrongly described, as I mentioned—really should be charged to the processor, for they really serve the purpose of enabling the processors to buy farm commodities, including cotton, at world prices while the producers in turn must pay American prices for all machinery, equipment, supplies, and so forth, while leaving out of production a part of his land. This I thought unsound when first passed in 1965, at which time I opposed this law.

It was apparent to me then that American agricultural producers would be dependent annually upon an appropriation from Congress for a part of their cost and all their profits. This problem, I trust, we will get resolved for the present year, but it is something that will haunt us as long as this approach is kept.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, this is a commitment at the present time; and while the House conferees go to conference with a slight vote to reduce the amount, a study of the arguments made for such reduction will not stand up. The vote on the other side, it is to be noted, was in excess of 2 to 1; so in view of the Government's commitment by law—and may I say the commitment so far as wheat and cotton is concerned is just as much a legal commitment as that which they provide for wool and sugar in a different way. With regard to sugar a processing tax is levied upon the processor and an equal amount paid out to the producer so he can maintain domestic production of sugar in competition with foreign producers, the import from which we strictly limit by law. Of course, this added cost is passed on to the people. In fact, whether it be tax or payment, it will, of course, be paid by the American people. And we have to pay if we are to obtain the production so necessary to the consumer.

That my colleagues may understand why large payments are made in some instances, I recall that I was asked some time ago why some payments were large with regard to wool, sugar, wheat or cotton. I was asked this by the manager of a motel. I told him, "I just paid you $16.50 for a room. How many rooms do you have?" He said, "Two hundred." I said, "Well, can I pay you for all of them?" He said, "Sure." I said, "Can I get the whole 200 rooms for $16.50?" He said, "Oh, no. It would be that much per unit."

Mr. Speaker, this explains the large payments. The recipients have "200 rooms." Thus, large payments go to those who have large production capacity and investment and who produce in large quantities and sell at world prices but pay American costs of production, with all the built-in labor and other costs that go into the retail price of tractors, combines, chemicals, and other expensive U.S. items.

Again, these payments whether it be wool, sugar, wheat, or cotton, come because of a law—a law passed by the Congress and signed by the President. I trust that we will be able to carry out the good faith commitment which we have made to the American agricultural producer. After all, we must—for it is the consumer for whom they produce and industry and labor which is dependent upon what they buy.

Remember, people are quitting the farms at a rate of 400,000 to 600,000 per year, and have done so for 6 straight years. Remember, too, that in 30 years farm producer income as a percentage of investment has dropped 50 percent which to a great degree explains why farmers are quitting the farm. Perhaps they need to but we consumers cannot afford to have them do so.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me at this point?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, as the agriculture appropriations bill goes to conference, I wish to commend the attention of the conferees to an important amendment passed by the Senate and now due for consideration by the conferees. It would provide $1 million to fight Venezuelan equine encephomyelitis. The scourge of Venezuelan equine encephomyelitis has risen in Texas and neighboring States since we considered the agriculture appropriations bill in the House.

Every Member has read news reports of the ravages of this disease. There have apparently been some human cases, but the scientists find VEE is rarely fatal to humans. Among horses, however, the toll is already heavy. Firm reports put the death total at about 1,000 animals. The owners of horses in Texas, whether these be blooded Arabian stock or the workhorses of ranches and farms, are deeply concerned. It now appears that the Department of Agriculture has mounted an offensive against the mosquito carriers by widespread aerial spraying, while it is building defenses through statewide vaccination and quarantine programs. These efforts are to be expanded to other States if needed.

The Senate amendment would provide $500,000 for research in three fields: First, further investigation of the live VEE vaccine; second, research into a chemically treated or dead vaccine; and third, examination of the vector, or mosquito carriers. The other half of the proposed appropriation would be used nationwide to control the present epidemic.

The threat to life and property is very real. I trust this will be recognized and that the danger will be faced by approval of the appropriation amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we appoint conferees today to reconcile differences between the two Houses on the Agricultural Appropriations Act for fiscal 1972, I rise to make two suggestions to our colleagues on the conference committee.

First, I heartily endorse the $1 million addition by the other body for the purpose of treatment and control of Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis.

I have been very gratified by the actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford Hardin, and his associates in the Department of Agriculture. I would like to express my personal gratitude to Dr. Frank Mulhern and his associates in the regulatory and control area of the Agriculture Research Service.

These men have done an excellent job in dealing with an exotic disease with an experimental vaccine. The U.S. Government has been working on a vaccine since this disease developed in epidemic proportions several years ago.

Early in March, the Department of Agriculture sent a scientist to Mexico to assist in diagnosis of suspected VEE infection in the Tampico, Mexico, area.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture met on May 12, 1971, with Mexican officials regarding the outbreak in that country.

The Department of Agriculture placed two men in Mexico shortly thereafter to work full time with Mexican authorities on diagnosis, vaccination, and spraying programs.

The Department of Agriculture furnished Mexico 200,000 doses of vaccine, assisted in travel expenses for vaccination in northern areas, added three additional veterinarians, and offered malathion for spraying.

The Department of Agriculture authorized the use of the experimental vaccine for horses in Texas, and vaccination started on June 28.

The Department of Agriculture started spraying for mosquito control in Texas on July 10 with the assistance of Department of Defense and Public Health Service.

On July 13 the Department quarantined the entire State of Texas so that horses could not move to other States unless they had been vaccinated 14 days before crossing the State line.

On July 16, Secretary Hardin announced a national emergency and directed additional action be taken in this outbreak.

In declaring a national emergency, Secretary Hardin put the full financial and technical resources of the Department of Agriculture into the battle against VEE. The $1 million provided in the Senate version of the agricultural appropriations bill would alleviate the necessity for withdrawing funds from other much needed USDA programs in order to fight this disease.

At this point, I would also like to acknowledge the excellent cooperation between USDA and Dr. E. G. Sibley and his associates at the Texas Animal Health Commission. In an emergency of this sort, there is bound to be some lack of coordination, but I believe most of the problems were overcome in a very rapid manner.

As of July 17 sufficient dosage of VEE vaccine has been released for use in Texas and adjoining States. A commercial company has been contracted with to help process the vaccine. The Department of Defense has released an additional 1 million doses to USDA for immediate use and will provide said material for another 1 million doses. In addition, USDA is working closely with the USAF and other agencies to establish a buffer zone by supplying mosquitoes in the principal breeding grounds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out what I believe would be the excellent job that has been done by all agencies concerned in fighting this decision and urge our House colleagues on the conference committee to accept this Senate amendment.

At the same time, I would strongly urge our colleagues to recede from the House amendment placing a $20 million limitation of farm payments.

I believe the Congress made a solemn pledge to the farmers in this country when a $55,000 limitation was placed in the Agricultural Act of 1970 which extends for a 3-year period. The farmers purchased equipment and leased more land. Bankers loaned these people operating money and made other arrangements on the basis of the $55,000 limitation. For the Congress to lower this limitation after only 1 year makes many Americans wonder if they can believe any laws that are passed in these Halls.

Since coming to Congress I have consistently opposed limiting Federal payments to any one farmer, farm, or commodity. Based on my life-long association with agriculture, I am of the firm conviction that payment limitations and a healthy farm economy are mutually exclusive. I still hold to this position despite the committee's action. I fear this is a false economy, one that will dislocate the farm sector in significant respects. It is, however, a cutback that will not prove disastrous to the farm program provided Federal payments are not further limited by Congress.

Perhaps a strict payment limitation could be justified in a farm economy comprised of small individual production units; but, the unadorned fact of the matter is that this Nation's agriculture sector is not so comprised, and has not been for over two decades. The United States, once a nation of small family farms, has become a nation wherein 40 percent of the farms produce over 80 percent of the country's food and fiber. The reasons for this shift may be summarized in one word; namely, "economics."

Farming, like other areas of the economy, has been beset with rising costs for land, labor, and capital, as well as shrinking profits from farm production. The extent of this condition is aptly illustrated by examining the economic changes in key areas over the last 10 or so years. Since 1959, the average value per acre of land has increased 83 percent. Land values themselves have risen 70 percent. Variable costs of farming and ranching have skyrocketed as well. During the last 7 years the investment in farm machinery required for farms and ranches has climbed 79 percent. Annual outlays for fertilizers have increased 64 percent. Feed costs have risen 33 percent.

Farming also provides significant underpinning to the economy in general. It comprises the largest single market for labor and industry—it employs 5 million individuals; which is more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, auto manufacturing, and steel industries. The agriculture sector consumes $50 billion worth of goods and services each year. Farmers pay more than $4.8 billion alone for tractors and equipment. In addition, they pay an annual transportation bill of well over $4 billion just to move their produce and livestock to market. Finally, farm transportation needs are so extensive that out of the 17 million trucks in America, more than 3 million are used in agriculture.

The conclusion is obvious. Agriculture has become a very significant component in the commercial life of the Nation. This is in addition to its historic role of producing the food and fiber necessary to fuel the dynamic growth of our country.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I hope the House conferees will recede from this amendment and restore the faith of the American farmer in his Government.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-367), on the resolution (H. Res. 457) relating to expenditure of funds from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for certain allowances to Members, officers, and standing committees of the House, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Third Annual Report on the administration of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 14 of the Act, and covers the period of January 1, 1970, through December 31, 1970.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 1971.*

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for Fiscal Year 1970, which outlines a number of positive and important steps that have been taken to supply housing for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 1971.*

ESTABLISHING A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 424 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 424

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motions except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a slightly unusual rule in that it exists in order to make available to the House and the Members of the House more time to discuss the Joint Committee on the Environment matter than would otherise have been available.

The establishment of a joint committee is a matter of original jurisdiction with the Committee on Rules, and it could have been reported and brought up under the hour rule, and debated for an hour. At the time that we issued the rule it was our thought that there might be enough controversy to take 2 hours, but apparently—and I say "apparently" because one never knows what will develop—apparently there is not that much controversy on the matter.

To briefly describe the situation, the resolution and companion resolutions creating a Joint Committee on the Environment was sponsored by 268 Members of the House, including the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader. It has broadly based support, and we received no testimony in opposition to it.

It is interesting to note that many of the committee chairmen, and all of the committee chairmen as far as I know who are most affected, or whose committees are most affected by the proposed Joint Committee on the Environment, are cosponsors of this legislation.

The usual problem confronting the Committee on Rules in its consideration of this particular matter—and the problem is one that really does not confront the Committee on Rules, it confronts the House as a whole, and in particular the distinguished Speaker of the House—is that we simply do not have enough room in the House, and its various facilities, for all the demands that are made by the committee chairmen, and even by the Members. We are very much overcrowded. That matter was given consideration by the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules decided that since this resolution was so overwhelmingly supported by the Members of the House of Representatives that it should be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into details on the composition of the committee. I expect to yield time under the rule, or under the resolution that is made in order by this rule, to the chief sponsor of the matter.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will be glad to yield now to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, some of us I believe have come to the conclusion that we must hold down the growing list of joint committees not only for the reasons that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has set forth as to the lack of space but also because of other factors.

I would ask the gentleman from Missouri this question: Does this action today mean we are probably going to open the gates for encouraging the creation of still more joint committees for which we have no adequate space?

Mr. BOLLING. I am very glad that the gentleman from Texas has asked that question. I can only speak as one member of the Committee on Rules, but I suspect that I represent a bipartisan majority of the Committee on Rules.

On the day the Committee on Rules reported out this proposition, it also reported out two others, with the understanding at the time that that would be all. The fate of one of the others was that it was overwhelmingly defeated and the other one, I think it is safe to say, although I do not want to prejudice its consideration if it should come up—I think it is safe to say it was considered by its sponsors to be in enough trouble so that it never has been brought up.

As one member of the Committee on Rules who thinks he represents the rules of the Committee on Rules accurately, I am opposed to any further select or joint committee in the absence of a most extraordinary emergency and where it is clearly the will of the House by an overwhelming majority that we do have another select committee or joint committee.

I am as opposed to having any beyond those, as I can possibly be—beyond those reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his reassuring statement.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLINGS) has explained this rather unusual procedure under House Resolution 424, I will not take time to comment further on that.

I would like, however, to make some comment about House Joint Resolution 3 which we are considering here today.

Now this resolution will provide for a joint committee of the House and Senate—11 Members from the Senate and 11 Members from the House—that is 22 Members.

Shortly before the rule was called up today, one of the Members handed me a proposed amendment with the suggestion that it would bring it into line with other joint committees. He will offer this amendment at the appropriate time to increase the membership to 12 Members from each body, seven Democrats and five Republicans, that is a total of 24 Members.

In attempting to find out something about what the staff would be, we did some checking and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who is very fair, in his letter to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) suggested that it might have to go along the same lines as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. But he suggested they probably would have one staff director, one chief counsel, three staff attorneys, three environmentalists or natural science specialists, one economist and several junior staff members and research assistants and probably 10 to 12 clerical and nonprofessional staff people. That is the suggested number of personnel.

You add those up and it comes to 24 employees. Figure out what the cost of this is going tc be—this proposition is going to cost us a considerable amount of money.

For me to oppose this resolution—and not only the rule but the resolution—I suppose will bring criticism to me that I am against motherhood and in favor of sin, which is not the truth.

I am as much for doing everything possible to clean up the environment as any other Member of the House of Representatives and I know every Member of this body wants to do everything that he or she can do in an effort to do that.

My experience goes back to the late 1940's when the smog started in Los Angeles County. In the State legislature we passed laws to set up a county organization in Los Angeles County and Orange County, the Air Pollution Control Authority. In 1950 we held hearings in the State building in Los Angeles. I well remember that there were some 400 to 500 people there, including scientists and men from California Tech, people with other experience in that field.

Prior to that time the backyard incinerator had been declared to be the main cause of smog and an ordinance was passed eliminating the backyard incinerators from all homes and apartments in Los Angeles County. This did not cure the problem.

I remember in 1950 at this meeting I suggested to those present that I wondered if maybe the automobile exhaust and truck exhaust fumes could be causing some of this smog.

Actually, they all laughed, including the scientists and the rest of the experts. They thought that was a big joke. After they had had their laugh, I suggested to them, "Why don't you check and find

out? If you look at the diesel trucks on the road you will see dark diesel smoke coming from them."

Within 6 months they came out with the conclusion that exhaust emissions were the main cause of smog in southern California. We are still trying to get exhaust control or some appropriate controls on motor vehicles to be manufactured in the future to meet the standards which we have set up, and it has taken all this time to do that.

We are faced with a similar problem in relation to fumes, exhaust, or whatever you wish to call it, from jet airplanes. You can watch at National Airport planes taking off and landing and you will see that they spew a tremendous amount of contamination into the atmosphere. I guess they have been ordered to install afterburners or whatever is necessary on jet planes to stop that contamination. I understand that all the new ones are so equipped, but it is taking a great deal of time to equip the older planes. Instead of doing it in a matter of months, or so, they say that it will cost money and take time and will take another year or two to accomplish.

The same story relates to refineries and other installations that are contaminating the air.

We are faced with some long and serious problems.

It is proposed that we in the Congress now start studying the environment. This particular joint committee in my opinion could do nothing. They would not have any legislative authority. If you will check the history of committees, you will find that very few committees without legislative authority have accomplished very much. I believe the Joint Committee on the Economic Report does a good job. One that has done an outstanding job is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has legislative authority. In that instance we have the two gentlemen from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, the chairman, and Mr. HOSMER, the ranking minority member, and a committee which has worked real hard to bring legislation before the House. But in this particular instance the committee could work for another year or two and could not have any legislative jurisdiction.

I cannot help but feel that if we are going to undertake this type of work, we would do much better to have a standing committee in the House or else a Select Committee of the House to enable us to do our own work rather than to establish a joint committee. I do not know where we are going to find space to accommodate 22 members of the proposed joint committee from both bodies and possibly 25, or more staff members.

It seems to me that we are faced with a very serious problem from that standpoint.

Furthermore, I think if you will read the resolution, you will observe that it sets forth jurisdiction that will infringe upon the jurisdiction of several other committees—the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Interior, and several other committees. There is no language in the resolution which would prohibit such infringement, which is standard language in most resolutions. That is the fault—and I will take as much blame as everybody else—of the Rules Committee. I did not even think of it when the resolution came before the Rules Committee. An amendment will be offered on the floor to add that language. But even that language in the resolution which would prohibit infringement on any standing committee will be set alongside the specific duties which will authorize infringement. In other words, it is like saying to your children, "Yes, you can go swimming, but you can't go near the water."

We would tell them that they would have certain jurisdiction, but by the same token we would tell them, "You can't do these things," most of which would infringe on the jurisdiction of other committees—with the possible exception of studying the President's report.

I rather doubt that there would be any meeting, besides the original one, at which you would get 22 members present. We will take a recess in August. Next year is an election year. Members of both bodies will be interested in that with redistricting all over the United States. That will present a problem to many of us.

In addition to that, we will have a national convention and an election of president. I cannot help but feel in all seriousness that even though we all want to do everything we can for improving the environment, the proposal is or would be a wasted effort at the present time.

The other body passed a resolution, which is pending, and that particular resolution has language in it which would change the Reorganization Act which we passed last year. One of the things we were very careful to do last year in that regard was to change the Rules of the House and make them subject to amendment by the House acting alone. The language in the Senate-passed joint resolution would change the Senate Rules so far as the selection of members is concerned. I think this is wrong. The Senate should amend their own rules by a simple Senate resolution as they traditionally have done.

Of course, it may end up in conference and we can argue it there, but if the other body is going to change its rules, they should do it by Senate resolution and not do it by a Senate or House joint resolution. If we are going to start changing House rules by joint resolution, then we could change all the rules we have.

Just as a matter of information, over the weekend I started gathering material that was going across my desk on environment and some of the things that are being done in connection with the environment. For instance, there is an article from the Los Angeles Sunday Times of July 11, which is to the effect that "responsible official commissions of the State of California and the city of Los Angeles have taken a frank and careful look at the problems of our environment." It goes on with the recommendations of the State of California Environmental Quality Study Council. There is a bill before the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, AB-1056, and there is another bill now approved by the State legislature in the State of California. It was approved on Wednesday, July 15, and was covered in another extensive article in the Times. Those particular measures were approved by the Assembly Committee of the State Legislature on July 15.

There was another extensive article covering what they are doing in California. There was another pamphlet from the State of California on "Proposed Guidelines for Preparation and Evaluation on the Environmental Impact of Statements" under the California Environmental Act of 1970. There was another booklet, received Saturday at home, on Environmental Science and Technology, and another pamphlet entitled "The Chief Executive on Environmental Management."

Mr. Ruckelshaus, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, urged last Tuesday that the Federal Government spend $2 billion a year for the next 3 years to clean up the Nation's polluted lakes and rivers and streams. The Environmental News on June 20, from the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington set forth various helps and various things they think should be done.

There have been Clean Air Act lawsuit ground rules instituted July 15, as laid out by the Environmental Protection Agency. There is a report on July 18 from the Department of the Interior, "Educators Invited To Use Public Lands for Environmental Studies." The Under Secretary of the Treasury, Paul Volcker, on July 13, testified on President Nixon's Proposal to create an Environmental Financial Authority, EFA, which would greatly assist municipalities in creating new facilities.

The Los Angeles County Rapid Transit Agency obtained 40 new buses, and these were put on the highways last week. They are all controlled from the standpoint of exhaust and environmental control.

Governor Ronald Reagan on July 8 pointed out that Dr. Raymond A. Fleck, an environmental toxicologist at the University of California at Davis, has been named to head a State pilot project to monitor pollutants in the Monterey Basin.

On July 12, Governor Reagan submitted a sweeping reorganization plan to the legislature for environmental protection that sets up "a high command to direct the war against pollution on every front." There are various other reports which Members also received. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported a bill which they are about to approve, and the chairman said:

> This committee report should have significant and long-range implictions, because it will help determine guidelines for Federal agencies that are vital to effective implementation of our national environmental policies and goals.

There is another statement by Mr. Ruckelshaus on July 15, in an appearance before the task force concerning environmental policies, which will provide the opportunity to look at some of the key issues affecting air, water, and land quality.

There is another statement from the Department of the Interior, stating, "No adverse environmental effects anticipated from Texas cloud-seeding program."

The Department of Fish and Game are supporting a bill in the State Legislature of California which is a preservation act to help the environment.

There is a book report entitled "Second Federal Aircraft Noise Abatement Plan."

Those are all gathered from materials that were stacked up from last week's collection which I had not read until last Sunday. We have all kinds of studies and laws set up on the environment now. I would think if we would enforce some of the rules and regulations, we would do better than simply to set up another joint committee which I think—at least it is doubtful in my mind—will be able to do little more than have some meetings and study. I do not know who is going to be on it, and I do not have any criticism of any individual. If they study just what is going on, it will take them 18 months, and then if they write a report, that would probably gather dust also.

So, Mr. Speaker, whether I be accused of being against motherhood and for crime, or whatever, be that as it may, let the chips fall where they may. As far as I am concerned, I think this is a waste of time and of the taxpayers' money.

I think this is a waste of the taxpayers' money and a waste of effort on behalf of the Members of both bodies. The standing committees we have can handle these problems at the present time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman has made a very effective presentation, but I want to ask some questions in connection with the points he raises.

I gather the gentleman feels that this joint committee would have a very doubtful value because it would overlap with many other committees and would do mostly survey work rather than legislative, and in any case would raise problems of space and staff.

I wonder if the gentleman feels this way about the other joint committees?

Mr. SMITH of California. I have tried to discuss that. Those which have legislative authority, like the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have done a splendid job. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report I think has done a good job. Some have done a poor job.

The SPEAKER. The time yielded by the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

I am not commenting on the effectiveness of the other joint committees. I have commented on that.

I am commenting that this is one, in my opinion, which I believe would be kidding our constitutents and kidding ourselves. We can go home and tell everybody, write letters, and say that we have set up a Joint Committee on the Environment and we are going to clean it up, and the high school and college people will think we are doing a wonderful job.

I do not like to legislate that way. That is one of the reasons why I oppose it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe a part of the gentleman's problem is that it is an unhappy characteristic of present-day Government to overpromise and underperform. This is being done by the executive branch all the time.

Would not the gentleman agree that value of the Joint Environmental Committee will depend, really, on how it would function? It seems to me if it did its job conscientiously there is a great job to perform. The environment, of course, is all around us and the problems are therefore all around us.

I suppose there is scarcely a committee in the Congress which does not have environmental problems that arise out of its functioning.

I do not see how we could establish a standing committee to look over the work of all the other standing committees. It seems to me that is what a joint committee ideally sets out to do.

Mr. SMITH of California. Obviously we could not support the creation of a standing committee for this. We would have to take authority from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and authority from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a number of other committees. We could not get the votes to do it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of California. But we could have a select committee in the House, which would be a small group of people, who might find space to work, rather than have such a large group from this body and from the other body.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would not the gentleman agree that we shall coordinate matters with the other body, on the environment?

Mr. SMITH of California. I guess we have to coordinate on everything. Both bodies are equal bodies as to the passing of laws.

This committee would have no legislative jurisdiction. Any bills introduced would have to go to the standing committees of the House.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe the gentleman basically is arguing against the whole concept of a joint committee.

Mr. SMITH of California. I am saying that I do not believe the joint committees, on a usual basis, are as effective as our own committees.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman possibly is right. If we are to have joint committees at all, it seems to me the case for this joint committee is just as good as, if not better than, that for any other joint committee because of the very pervasive and all embracing nature of the environment.

Mr. SMITH of California. The gentleman certainly is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. So far as space and staff are concerned, there is plenty of space in Washington, D.C. If the executive branch wants to move into a whole new important area, they do not have any problems of getting space and staff. It seems to me that is a matter for Congress to assert itself on. If we have a legitimate job to do, I do not see a problem on space and staff.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Maryland?

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I should like to direct a question to the gentleman from Maryland, who said that there is plenty of space available. Does the gentleman mean away from the Capitol?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. There is space all over town. Does not the executive branch do exactly that? If they want to expand, they go out and rent buildings. Why can we not do the same?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is my understanding that the executive branch does this, and we criticize them for it. Does the gentleman suggest that we should rent space?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I certainly do.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we can take care of that situation, with the gentleman's help, for he is on the Appropriations Committee, by not appropriating so much money for the expansion of the Federal Government.

It is about that simple. Simply because the executive branch expands beyond reason does not mean we have to do it.

However, I rose to ask the gentleman to yield to say that I was more than passingly interested in the colloquy which occurred earlier between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. MAHON, if I understand him correctly, asked the gentleman from Missouri if this meant we were going to have more joint committees, and the response of the gentleman from Missouri was a qualified one, with a qualification so big that you could drive one of those black-smoking semitrailer trucks through it. He said that if there was an overwhelming desire on the part of the House for another joint committee, he would be for it.

That, to me, is utterly meaningless, because you can find an overwhelming desire here to spend money without the least trouble. Everybody is perfectly willing to spend somebody else's money around here for more joint committees and commissions. There is always an overwhelming desire to spend in Congress so I do not think that ought to be taken into consideration in whether we vote this up or down.

Personally I am diametrically opposed to the establishment of another joint committee in this Government and particularly on this subject.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will comment to the gentleman that we are having a problem with the tremendous amount of pressure being placed on us by the Members for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Aging. Would the gentleman from Missouri like me to yield to him so that he can answer the gentleman from Iowa?

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have one more comment.

The Committee on Rules had an amendment which it reported with House Joint Resolution 3, which is the Joint Committee on the Environment resolution, which puts a limitation on the expenditures which may be made by the Joint Committee on the Environment of $300,000 for each fiscal year.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on House Joint Resolution 3.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resoluton.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 18, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—372

Abbitt
Abourezk
Abzug
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Baring
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McClure
McCollister
McCormack
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Mizell
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—18

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Baker
Bow
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Davis, Wis.
Gross
Hall
McFall
Martin
Michel
Powell
Schmitz
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Wiggins

NOT VOTING—43

Adams
Anderson, Tenn.
Blanton
Brasco
de la Garza
Dellums
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Garmatz
Goldwater
Gray
Gude
Hagan
Hanna
Harsha
Hawkins
Hosmer
Hungate
Kyros
Long, La.
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
Mayne
Melcher
Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Moorhead
O'Neill
Pepper
Pirnie
Ruppe
Smith, N.Y.
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Van Deerlin
Wilson, Charles H.
Yatron

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Terry.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Moorhead.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 3, with Mr. FUQUA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I have no comment to make on the resolution. I spoke on the matter on the rule making it in order. I would merely inform the House and my opposite number on the minority side that so far I have requests from three Members for time, and at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the principal proponent of the joint resolution,

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important piece of legislation. It has its genesis years ago with the Full Employment Act of 1946, which set up a Joint Committee on the Economic Report and which set up a requirement that the President have a Council of Economic Advisers and which required that the economic advisers, through the President, make an annual report to the Congress which would be reviewed, analyzed, inventoried, and to see to it that related questions would be gone into by the Con-

gress. During this period since 1946 the system has worked well with regard to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

A few years ago the first legislation to set up a Council on Environmental Quality, the National Environmental Policy Act, legislation very similar in terms of the total impact and its relationships between the Government agencies to the Full Employment Act of 1946, was introduced and ultimately became law in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and signed by President Nixon with great fanfare on the first day of 1970.

The first part analogous to the Full Employment Act relating to matters with reference to the environment have thus become law. The joint committee, however, has yet to be acted upon by the Congress.

During the past session of the Congress the House and Senate both passed pieces of legislation designed to accomplish the same things as House Joint Resolution 3.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 3 was sponsored by something like 270 Members of this body. The rule has just been overwhelmingly adopted.

The Senate has passed again a piece of legislation very similar to House Joint Resolution 3 this year, differing in only one relatively minor aspect.

The function of the legislation now pending before this body is very simple. It is to see to it that we have within this institution a committee composed of Members of the House and the Senate, reflecting all of the differing views and representing all of the great committees in the Congress having jurisdiction over this matter, and interesting themselves in the conduct and in the review of the annual environmental report with the Council on Environmental Quality and the President of the United States.

The function of this committee will be to go into that and review it and to have the kind of valuable interplay between the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Congress as well as the people of the United States, as now goes on with regard to the Full Employment Act of 1946 and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Hopefully, this legislation will have the same effect in terms of productive interplay and progress in our understanding of our relationship to the environment.

Mr. Chairman, the joint resolution is not partisan in character. It is sponsored by the leadership on both sides of the Capitol—the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; Mr. BOGGS, the distinguished majority whip and the ranking members of almost every one of our major committees as well as the chairmen of these committees.

The original version of the joint resolution was hammered out by the then majority leader and now the distinguished Speaker, Mr. ALBERT, to come to a fair and agreeable understanding with respect to what the context and content of that legislation should be.

The legislation represents to the fullest degree possible not only the consensus of the distinguished leadership of all the committees and the Members of the House of Representatives but also the consensus of views of the two parties.

The legislation, if enacted, sets up a committee which will be as nonpartisan as possible to be composed of 11 Members of the House and 11 Members of the Senate, 6 members of the majority and 5 members of the minority in each body, the idea being to avoid its being used as a political forum, but a joint committee which will have a harmonious, closely working relationship on these matters pertaining to the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled at this time to point out to my colleagues something else. We have expressly avoided the pitfall of overlapping jurisdiction as between the legislative committees which have the responsibility for environmental concerns and which concerns are so broad and encompass the responsibilities of all committees of the Congress. It is well that this should not be a standing legislative committee and, indeed, there is clear language stated in the resolution that in carrying out its duties and functions, the joint committee will avoid unnecessary duplication with any investigation undertaken by any other joint committee or standing committee of the House or of the Senate, the idea again being to have the kind of broad overview without the conflicts of jurisdiction of the legislative committees which responsibilities have to remain unimpaired.

By the enactment and passage of this piece of legislation, it is my hope that this legislation will again pass the House and it is my hope that it will again be acted upon favorably by the other body and that the legislation ultimately will arrive in the hands of the President for his signature.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated at the time the rule was presented, this is a little bit of a peculiar approach because normally the last vote we had would have either voted up or down the establishment of this particular committee, because the original jurisdiction is in the Committee on Rules. However, it was our thought that possibly a larger number of Members would like to discuss this matter than the half-hour permitted on each side of the aisle could handle, so that is why we gave it the additional hour for general debate in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Chairman, I took considerable time in presenting the rule, and in opposing this particular resolution, and I therefore see no need to repeat what I said at that time, so I will simply reserve the balance of my time, and state to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) that as of now I do not have any requests for time, but I do not know whether I will have any requests for time later.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience with the establishment of joint committees, and in creating staffs that involve the unnecessary expenditure of money. I should like to know how a committee without any legislative authority can avoid duplication when it is quite evident that in recent years, as we have become more and more aware of the problems of ecology, that we have wires crossing all over the ball park within existing agencies.

So if someone can tell me how this committee can avoid duplication, I would certainly like to know.

Mr. BOLLING. If the gentleman will yield, I assume that his request is directed at me.

Mr. COLLIER. It is directed at anyone who has the answer.

Mr. BOLLING. I can give the gentleman this answer, and that is that I have served for more than 20 years on the Joint Economic Committee. I can compare this proposal to what has occurred on the Joint Economic Committee and its utilization.

The Joint Economic Committee has jurisdiction on the overall legislation of committees such as the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Finance, and a whole range of other committees. The Joint Economic Committee was established by the Employment Act of 1946. There are a number of people, myself included, who feel that this committee, which has no legislative jurisdiction, has done useful work from time to time in taking an overview of policy matters that should be dealt with in detail and legislatively by the various legislative committees.

Mr. COLLIER. How has this committee ever shaped or imposed its views on the final legislation reported at any time by the House Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member?

Mr. BOLLING. Well, I doubt seriously if the answer to that question can be very explicit, but I would say that for a number of years the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was one of the distinguished members of the Joint Economic Committee. I would not for a moment put words in that gentleman's mouth, but I suspect that he found the reason——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER), has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue with what I was saying, I would suspect that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) found the reasons for being the senior member—he was not then the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—and also a member of

the Joint Economic Committee, to be these: There is no attempt by a joint committee to impose anything on anybody.

It takes advantage of the one opportunity it has. There are no jurisdictional conflicts and it can take a look at ideas and problems without regard to the jurisdictional conflict.

If I understand the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in his opening statement, the reason that he and many others, including the chairmen of virtually all of the committees that have a specifically environmental responsibility sponsored this legislation is that they felt that it would be a good idea in the field of ideas and problems and the identification of problems to have a committee which, in a sense, was not burdened with the problem of having to legislate.

Mr. COLLIER. May I say that since there will be certainly a substantial departure from the operation of the Joint Economic Committee, which I presume—and I use the word "presume" advisedly, will be the function of this joint commitee, then how will this committee go about correcting or consolidating that fragmentation of jurisdiction not only within the committees of the Congress, but indeed, with the various agencies of Government. How could it possibly coordinate the operations of many of these committees which are sadly uncoordinated today without legislative authority whatsoever?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman has asked a question which I must confess I am not able to answer, and because of this reason—what the committee will be able to accomplish, and I say this not facetiously at all, will be based on the way in which the committee operates and on the wisdom of the committee and its members and its staff.

The Joint Economic Committee was established by the Employment Act of 1946 which was passed just before the present minority party became the majority party in the Congress, and the man who was generally considered to be the leader of his party on domestic affairs, that very distinguished and able—and moderate gentleman whom I served with a long time was the first chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. It was Robert Taft of Ohio. He established an approach which was followed by succeeding chairmen and made a very significant contribution to pulling together the whole field of general economics from its then fragmented state.

Mr. COLLIER. Is the gentleman optimistic that this committee operating in an entirely different area will be as valuable as the Joint Economic Committee which operates under different conditions in evaluating various aspects of our fiscal and economic situation and policies?

Mr. BOLLING. It is not a more complicated area. I would like to say, if the gentleman will permit me, that I am not optimistic. But I do retain the hope.

Mr. COLLIER. I submit that I am not at all optimistic either.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3, establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment. It is my opinion that by enacting this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, the Congress will take an important new initiative in combating the destruction of America's ecosystem.

Every Member of this body must agree that it is the duty of the Congress to provide leadership and foresight in every area of national governmental importance. The Joint Committee on the Environment will help us to provide this leadership by supplying to the House and Senate the facilities and expertise necessary for innovative legislation in the environmental field.

Of course, there is no denying that the Congress has been willing to respond to the people's will in the field of environmental legislation. Important and strongly worded laws—such as the Clean Air Act and the Resource Recovery Act—which have already passed the Congress demonstrate that. But, with time, we have come to realize the vast extent of the environment issue. We have come to realize that ecology is more than just foul air and polluted water—that it is food chains, population size, public health, technological control, solid waste disposal. As we have come to this realization, it has grown more and more apparent that a coordinating committee is needed in the Congress, a single entity with the duty of taking a large, integrated view of the myriad aspects of the environmental crisis.

And, Mr. Chairman, we should never lose sight of the fact that we are in a continuing environmental crisis. Let us not be lulled by the advances we have made, and by the momentum we seem to retain. The promiscuous destruction of our environment continues at lethal proportions. We have only to think back over the past year to keep the size of the problem in perspective: oil spills, ocean dumping of poisons, the pollution of fish with mercury, the continuing furor over DDT, actual and threatened destruction of wildlife areas. We should remember, Mr. Chairman, that there are still more than 40,000 dischargers of polluting effluents in this country.

The executive branch is now constituted with a broad view on environmental matters. It certainly is time that the Congress adopted a counterpart to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality. The new joint committee will fill this role. It will not displace the jurisdiction of any current House committee; rather, it will provide the coordination and foresight necessary to prevent jurisdictional disputes, legislative infighting, and wasted, duplicated effort.

The Congress has, in the past, taken the initiative in keeping up with developing technology. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is a good example of Congress ability to adjust its internal structures in response to the realities of a changing world. It is my opinion that providing a forum for comprehensive review and analysis of broad environmental issues is a proper and timely action by this body.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the Joint Committee on the Environment will be an essential mechanism to provide unified, coordinated structuring and oversight of Federal environmental improvement programs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have some lingering doubts about the mandate we are giving this committee. I have studied the bill carefully, and I have seen no reference to the problems of the urban environment. Assuming that present population trends continue unabated, most of the U.S. population growth over the next few decades will be concentrated in the 12 largest urban regions. Already, according to the 1970 census, 73 percent of the U.S. population is located in urban areas of 50,000 or more. Twelve metropolitan areas occupying one-tenth of the Nation's land area will grow most rapidly in the future, until they alone account for over 70 percent of the total population. Moreover, at least 50 percent of the total population will be found in three great urban belts: Boston-Washington, Chicago-Pittsburgh, and San Francisco-San Diego. Despite these facts, the bill does not even contain the words "urban," "metropolitan," or "city."

I trust this omission does not mean that the committee will not be concerned with the problems of our urban manmade environment. Clearly, the bulk of this country's population will long be living in urban areas. The urban environmental problems of controlling the discharge of gases, solids, liquids, noise, heat, and perhaps radioactivity must therefore receive a great deal of attention. Urban design and the creation or preservation of open spaces must also be the focus of heightened concern.

The Joint Committee on the Environment must examine the preventive and corrective measures needed to maintain and improve the quality of the urban environment.

The committee must consider such things as urban land use policies and environmental planning and programs for metropolitan areas in order to have the impact we so desperately need in preserving and creating a more livable, and satisfying urban civilization.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 3, which would create a joint committee of Congress whose sole concern would be the quality of our environment.

As a cosponsor of this measure, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for his leadership in seeking the enactment of this legislation. This is merely one more demonstration of his acute sense of concern

for the quality of life in America. I commend also our distinguished Speaker, Mr. ALBERT, for his efforts in this and past Congresses to bring about creation of this sorely needed joint committee.

Environmental quality, Mr. Chairman, is a concern that cuts across nearly every program and policy in the country. The House Agriculture Committee, for instance, on which I have the honor to serve, has just completed comprehensive hearings on legislative proposals dealing with one of the most discussed environmental matters, pesticides. It is self-evident, however, that many factors affecting our efforts to control pollution and enhance the environment are properly the jurisdiction of other standing committees.

Therefore, Congress must provide a forum to facilitate a single comprehensive review and analysis of environmental issues.

The proposed Joint Committee on the Environment would provide just such a forum. It could identify emerging problems, and enable the standing committees to act concertedly, with a sense of coherence and priorities in this vital area.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a member of the Rules Committee, which reported favorably on House Joint Resolution 3, with an amendment which I offered limiting expenditures of the new committee to $300,000 per year.

The legislative history of this proposal indicates that nearly everyone agrees on the need for a nonlegislative joint committee focusing on the environment. For the past four Congresses, this proposal or a similar one has been considered. Last year, a similar bill actually passed both Houses, but died in conference. Earlier this year, the Senate again passed the bill by an overwhelming 76 to 4 vote.

We of this body should find no difficulty in doing likewise.

I urge the overwhelming approval of House Joint Resolution 3.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

The environment is a unity, a single whole. It is not fragmented in fact, and it seems to me that if we are going to solve this very serious problem, we do need a committee within the Congress that has an overall view of the environmental problem.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3. I was happy to cosponsor this legislation because I believe that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Environment permits the Congress—

First, to keep up to date on the environment problems that are continually arising across our Nation;

Second, to assess the effect of these problems upon the economic well-being and the quality of life of the American people; and

Third, to be in a better position to act on legislation involving environmental matters.

Mr. Chairman, the real need for a Joint Committee on the Environment was first brought to my attention 2 years ago when we were considering the National Environmental Policy Act. That act provides that the President shall transmit to the Congress annually an environmental quality report. Members will recall that when this legislation was being considered by this body I pointed out that the contents of the required report would cut across the jurisdiction of five or six standing committees of the House, and I stated at that time that it would not be appropriate for this report to be referred to a single committee. I believe that the most important duty of the proposed Joint Committee on the Environment will be to receive this annual report from the President, study the contents thereof, including the recommendations, and in turn recommend to the appropriate legislative committee any legislation that may be needed to implement the President's recommendations. I favor the provision of House Joint Resolution 3 which denies authority to the Joint Committee to consider and report on legislation for I do not believe it would be appropriate for the joint committee to have legislative authority. When the joint committee finds that legislation is needed, its responsibility should be to refer the matter to the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe that the joint committee should have general authority (in addition to its responsibility for receiving and reviewing the annual environmental quality report) to investigate, study, and recommend action in connection with the environmental changes and problems occurring across our Nation, I do not believe that the joint committee should get into specific matters that fall under the jurisdiction of one of the standing committees. Therefore, at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to House Joint Resolution 3 which prohibits the joint committee from undertaking any investigation which is being investigated, pursuant to the rules of the House, by any other committee. This is language similar to that included in the various authorizing resolutions for the standing committees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 3 to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment.

I urge also support of the amendment which I shall offer, and which I shall not take very much time to explain.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SAYLOR. First, let me commend my colleague from Colorado, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his statement in support of this legislation. I recall well his comments to the House at the time we considered the Environmental Act and his statement then was as true as it is today.

I should like to ask the chairman this question: If the joint committee is established and it refers a matter to a standing committee with recommendations that they take action, and the standing committee takes no action, do you believe that there should be something in the authorizing legislation which would compel action by the present standing committee?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will permit, I would suggest that this is something that will have to be determined as we work through the Joint Committee operations. If it is found as we go from time to time that there is to be no recognition of the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Environment, then I think at that time some kind of amendment either to the basic act or to the act creating the Joint Committee should be considered.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, because this is one of the problems I think we are faced with as we consider this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. As my colleague knows, we have worked through a fifth of a century together, and we have been treating with environmental matters since we came to the Congress in 1949, and we shall continue to do so. We are not giving up our responsibility in this particular. We are keeping it. But overall, as the environmental problems fit into some other problems, they will be taken care of by consideration by the Joint Committee.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think today we have another legislative proposal which will give some people a feeling of great accomplishment in creating a joint committee which will head in all directions but really go nowhere. Therefore, I take these few moments to make a prediction, sincerely hoping that by making that prediction I might help to prevent events from occurring in the way I prophesy.

I say first the individual who heads this committee, once it is established, will be a Presidential candidate, and as soon as he is appointed chairman of this committee, the committee will henceforth be known, not as the Joint Environmental Committee, but as Senator Blank's Committee on the Environment. That candidate, that chairman, will spend very little time except on some press release, public-hearing-type affairs. The whole operation will be primarily a staff operation.

I say again that I hope by making the prediction I may help prevent its coming true.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to one of the sponsors of this legislation, the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of this resolution,

House Joint Resolution 3, I want to express my feelings about it. One of the reasons why I became a sponsor of this resolution—and I have had some doubts about the wisdom of it, because it can create a committee which can become very mischievous. There is a great deal of appeal in the words "ecology" and "environment." Those words are running out the ears of many people, because we hear so much about them. In fact, they are being used by different agencies of the Government in conflicting ways—and, in fact, because of the legislation which I voted for along with many other Members—the overlapping environmental legislation is causing a great deal of mischief throughout the whole economic structure.

There is no doubt there are environmental problems and they do need solving. I think the mistake that may have been made in some instances is to think we can undo 150 years of pollution by next Saturday night. It has taken a long time for this country to develop its industrial capacity and its food and fiber raising capacity. In the course of doing so, we have had to use insecticides and other things which are now cursed from one end of the country to the other. Notwithstanding the fact that there is so much criticism of the polluted environment, however, we find people are living some 20 years longer than they lived 50 years ago. The average life has been extended.

My question is, if we have done such a bad job in this country why are people living an average of 20 years longer than they lived 40 or 50 years ago, when we did not have the abundant industrial production and other productive processes we have today?

There is room, however, for a joint committee to look at the overall pollution. We have so fragmented this problem in the Congress that a half dozen different committees are working on the job. When a company wants to set up a plant it has to go to five or six different agencies to get an answer.

I handled the Environmental Protection Agency plan legislation in the House. It was with the hope that it would pull together a lot of the problems and give the people who are concerned with producing in America the goods and services we need, an opportunity to go to a single agency and get answers. So far it has not worked out that way, I might say.

I am going to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) which to a certain extent will limit the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

If the committee confines itself to studying the overall problem, and if the committee makes recommendations to the committees with legislative jurisdiction, to straighten out some of the overlapping, duplication, and confusion that has been created by the various laws we have passed on pollution, it may very well do a good job.

As one of the sponsors and one of those who are going to vote for this measure, I am going to watch this pretty closely. If it does not do a good job in the field of clarification and coordination it is absolutely going to be mischievous in its operation.

I am going to support this measure, but I serve warning right now that I for one intend to watch the functioning of the joint committee. If it performs a useful and constructive function I will be for extending it. If it does not, I will be for abolishing it.

I am going to vote for it, as I said, with hope. Like the gentleman from Missouri said, he does not look on this with as much optimism as he does hope. I hope it will do a job of clarification and coordination and make recommendations to the committees, where overlapping does occur, so that these problems can be straightened out in basic legislation.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of this legislation which would create a joint Congressional Committee on the Environment.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress of the United States go on record as doing everything within its power to make certain that our air is pure and our waters clean.

This committee would be a step in that direction.

This committee, which would be made up of 11 Members of the House of Representatives and 11 Members of the Senate, would act as a coordinating body—an oversight committee to make certain that our efforts to fight pollution are coordinated correctly.

Americans must understand what all the problems are in this field.

This committee could ferret out these problems and then help communicate these to the American people. This committee can make recommendations to other committees of the Congress.

On my recent Congressional Questionnaire I asked the question—Do you support pollution control legislation if it would mean paying higher income taxes? Mr. Chairman, the great majority of those who have answered the poll thus far have answered yes.

This means that the American people take this seriously. They take it seriously enough that they are willing to spend money to correct this.

This then means that we in Congress should also take it seriously. And we should pass this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am one of the sponsors of it.

One of the very purposes of this legislation is to try to bring some direction out of the chaos which exists at the present time in the conflict of jurisdiction among committees. My hope is that it will, because this Joint Committee will have oversight jurisdiction, it will be able to allocate to each one of the committees with legislative authority those things that should be there, and thereby get rid of some of the confusion which exists among the House committees and in the executive department downtown.

There is one matter which has come to my attention, about which I should like to direct a question to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), the gentleman handling this resolution.

The rule adopted is rather unusual in the respect that it only says there shall be one motion to recommit. In view of the fact that the Senate, on the 16th day of March, by an overwhelming vote of 76 to 4, passed Senate Joint Resolution 17, is it the expectation of the gentleman from Missouri that after the House completes action that he will ask unanimous consent to take up Senate Joint Resolution 17, strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the language of House Joint Resolution 3.

Mr. BOLLING. No. It is not the expectation of the gentleman from Missouri to do that. The controversy that occurred last year when the Senate-passed resolution and the House-passed resolution were before a conference conceivably could be repeated this time. The Committee on Rules discussed the question that the gentleman from Pennsylvania raises, and the gentleman handling the resolution for the Committee on Rules is not authorized to offer that motion which would expedite the matter going to conference. That would leave the situation in this condition: assuming that the House passes House Joint Resolution 3, the other body will have two options.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Option No. 1 would be to accept the House joint resolution and its language. Option No. 2 would be to ask for a conference. The members of the Committee on Rules, I believe, hope that the Senate will accept the House joint resolution. If that is the case, that will be the end of the matter. If the Senate asks for a conference, the House will make a decision on whether it goes to conference or not. The controversy is very simple. The controversy is over some language which appears in Senate Joint Resolution 17 on page 2, line 12, thereof which reads as follows:

> The appointment of Members of the Senate during the Ninety-second Congress shall be made (and service of the initial Members so appointed shall continue thereafter) without regard to the provisions of section 132 of Public Law 91-510, Act of October 26, 1970.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes and ask him to yield further.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. That happens to be the Reorganization Act. That language to which Senate Joint Resolution 17 adverts is the language which sets up a rather

complicated way in which Senators are limited in their service on a variety of committees. Frankly, the Member from Missouri is not in a position to indicate in detail how that goes, but on certain committees they can serve for several and on others they can only serve for two. That was the issue in essence in controversy the last time, and the opinion of a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules—not this member but another member—is that it is not a good idea for the House of Representatives or the United States Senate to amend the Reorganization Act in another act. I feel that they have blundered in that, the effect perhaps might be to put before the conference, if the Senate requested it, the question as to who actually was going to be the chairman of the committee—a Member of the House or a Member of the Senate. I suspect, although I do not want to establish the destiny of my friend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), under those conditions that we might have a situation where we did not have a presidential candidate as the chairman of a committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to thank my colleague from Missouri for his frankness in answering this question, because the House did pass a similar resolution last year and the Senate passed one and we got nowhere. I sincerely hope this is not an operation in frustration again in this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON).

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 3, in the conviction that the joint committee which it would create could be of great assistance to the Congress in making a continuing balanced approach to the problems afflicting our environment.

These problems are numerous and complex. Great and growing public concern attaches to them. As we strive to improve the quality of life, we find ourselves in a struggle to overcome attrition of the quality already gained.

The Nation has become environment-conscious, and, indeed, the world must become so, if the life-support capabilities of our planet are to be equal to the requirements of our posterity.

Environmental matters have come under review, in varying degrees, by most of the Committees of the Congress. No present standing committee could presume to assert paramount jurisdiction over the environment, and it would be clearly impractical to attempt creation of a joint legislative committee to control environmental legislation.

Free from the requirement to produce legislation, therefore, the joint committee proposed by the resolution would be in position to assess environmental changes, review the environmental quality report and other recommendations of the President and measure the economic impact of both environmental damage and restorative measures.

As a cosponsor of the resolution under the number House Joint Resolution 350, I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3, to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. I am a sponsor of House Joint Resolution 349, a similar resolution.

This committee would perform a number of tasks which would help me in dealing with the environmental problems my constituents face.

First, the committee would continually study future environmental changes and their effect on population, communities, and industries, giving consideration to the effects of environmental changes on the need for public and private planning and investment in such areas as water resources, pollution control, housing, food supplies, education, fish and wildlife, forestry, mining, transportation, and power supplies. Second, this committee will study ways to use financial and technical assistance to create and maintain conditions in which man and nature can live harmoniously while fulfilling our social and economic needs.

In my Baltimore area district, I have worked to alleviate problems that might have been prevented through comprehensive environmental planning and the application of financial and technical assistance. These problems include: removing debris from Lake Conowingo caused by siltation and flooding upstream in the Pennsylvania and New York waters of the Susquehanna; eliminating excess algae growth in the Susquehanna Flats which was killing wild mustard on which geese feed; eliminating raw sewage on Herring Run caused by overflow from Baltimore City sewer mains and Baltimore County runoff; decreasing serious air and water pollution caused by major industries in the Baltimore area.

Moreover, the committee will develop policies to encourage maximum private investment in ways to improve environmental quality. This will be important in cleaning up the litter problem. I have talked with representatives of labor and business in the various industries about the need to develop equipment to recycle their products, which will alleviate litter problems without eliminating jobs or actually destroying whole industries.

I know that the studies, reviews, and other projects undertaken by the committee as well as its recommendations will be valuable in drafting legislation and in educating the public on our environmental problems.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been argued that this committee will lead to overlapping, that it will be ineffective and that it will be costly in money and space. Of course, we are introducing this legislation to set up a joint committee precisely because there is such overlapping and duplication in various committees dealing with the environmental problem.

Mr. Chairman, we need one committee to give oversight to all of these aspects of the environmental problem. Whether it will be ineffective or not will depend upon whom is put on the committee. And, as to its being costly in space and staffing, this is the question as to whether we regard this as an important problem. I think we all regard that the problem of the environment is so important as to justify renting some extra office space and employing a few extra people.

I urge the House to approve the creation of this committee.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather peculiar situation and all kinds of concerns are around here about this particular resolution. Yet most Members indicate they are going to support it and I guess I will start out by saying I will probably vote for it because my good friend from Michigan has been convincing me for the last year or two as to the merits of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to cite an experience which I had while serving as chairman of the conference on this legislation last year. It definitely had political overtones. I might say that my friend from Iowa (Mr. KYL) raised a question about it also.

I would hope that his prediction does not come true—I would not want to guarantee that it does not—but I might just say this, that here were three members of the Committee on Rules selected in that conference, and that the other side, the other body, feeling of course the great importance—and I am not discounting the importance of this—met in the Committee on Rules to conclude the conference some time shortly before Christmas, I guess it was, of last year, and nine distinguished Members of the other body, every one of them a chairman of some committee, standing committee, and otherwise, showed up. I only cite this to indicate that apparently they view this with a great deal of interest.

Just what they propose to do with it I am not entirely sure—but I do hope, and I would just take this opportunity to urge that my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others who may serve on this joint committee from our side of the Capitol, be prepared to utilize such persuasion and such influence as they have to try to keep this committee on the straight and narrow.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, in the light of what the gentleman from California has said, and as a practical matter in attempting, if it is possible, to shunt aside the political window aspect of such a joint committee, does the gentleman believe that any of these committees, in the light of his experience, would be willing to surrender any jurisdiction in their unique areas to even the whims of a joint committee?

Mr. SISK. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, having listened to these distinguished Members—nine of them, I might say—from the other body—and the fact of it is that we broke down over the fact that they could not agree just exactly how they are going

to share the spotlight, or I guess I should say the responsibility—I want to try to be kind—and as the gentleman knows we did not settle this, and the conference was unable to agree.

I would not know, and I would not want to predict, but I recognize there was some concern, and that is the only reason I am rising to speak now—I think we are all concerned about the environment. Let me say that I am increasingly concerned about some of emotionalism and some of the overemphasis that occurs on the part of some groups and individuals in this country in connection with this subject, and I now find that there are all kinds of projects being delayed from 1 year to 2 or 3 years, and we find all kinds of problems arising in connection with industry and agriculture, and others who are being affected, unfortunately, I am afraid, not favorably, by some of the new rules and regulations.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California, Mr. SISK.

Mr. SISK. So, Mr. Chairman, all I want to do is caution that I would doubt that this committee is a panacea for all the ills of our environmental problems. I would hope at the best that it does a good job. I will simply conclude by saying I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado because I think it is essential that we keep this situation on the straight and narrow, but I do not think we should look for any miracle.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 387, which is identical to House Joint Resolution 3, I urge prompt passage of this vitally needed measure creating a Joint Committee on the Environment. Such action is long overdue: The need to preserve and enhance our great natural resources is one of the greatest problems this Nation has ever faced.

The ever-increasing pollution of our air and water threatens health in communities across America. Ultimately, life itself on our planet could be in jeopardy.

Our environmental problems cross so many disciplines and areas of authority, involve nearly every aspect of our society, that they are not responding to the present fragmented attack.

We cannot nibble the problem to death; it will take a full-scale, coordinated attack.

The joint committee will help formulate such an attack, superintending environmental affairs in a more effective, coordinated fashion, without, however, intruding on the jurisdiction of the legislative committees.

In addition to conducting comprehensive studies of current problems, the joint committee would examine and anticipate future environmental problems and their effect on population, communities, industry, and other facets of our complex society.

The natural beauties we enjoy, the food we eat, the very air we breathe are all at stake in the battle to salvage our natural resources. We must get on to the task of preserving these natural resources for the use and enjoyment of this and future generations. Establishing this joint committee is a meaningful step in this direction.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the problems of our environment are myriad. Our water must be purified, our air must be cleansed. The natural beauty of our countryside and the vitality of our cities must be restored. In the entire history of our Republic there has never been such a period of environmental concern and, nowhere has this concern been more evident than in the Congress where several different committees of both the House and Senate have been intensifying their efforts in this important area of ecology. In the House the Committees on Public Works, Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce have all been considering vital legislation in their respective fields. In fact, almost every congressional committee is concerned in some way with ecology.

House Joint Resolution 3 would consolidate all these efforts by establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment. This committee would consist of 11 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and 11 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker. The resolution provides that, in the appointment of the joint committee members, due consideration shall be given to provide representation from the various committees of the House and Senate having jurisdiction over environmental matters.

The committee would have several responsibilities. It would be charged with developing policies to encourage private investment to improve the environment and would review recommendations made by the President relating to environmental policy. The joint committee would also submit an annual report on its studies and recommendations.

The eminent ecologist, Dr. Paul Ehrlich estimates that—

> Each day American cars exhaust into our atmosphere a variety of pollutants weighing more than a bumper-to-bumper line of cars stretching from Chicago to New York City.

Since 1966, there have been additions of over 5 million tons of air pollutants annually.

Nor is the problem limited to just air pollution. Americans represent only 5 percent of the world's population, yet we consume 40 percent of its resources and create 30 percent of its pollution. At current rates, we will have to double our production of everything simply to maintain our current living standards by the year 2000.

The solution to the problem, however, is clearly within our grasp. Existing technology is capable of eliminating every pollutant. What is lacking is the determination and the coordinated effort. That is why we so desperately need this joint congressional committee.

Forty-four laws relating to ecology have been enacted since 1945. In the 91st Congress alone, 28 major environmental issues were introduced. The tremendous volume of legislation already introduced in the present Congress is sufficient to justify this new joint committee.

House Joint Resolution 3 is supported by all major environmental groups and is cosponsored by over 270 Members of the House, including the majority and minority leaders and the chairman and ranking members of most House committees. As a cosponsor of the resolution, I strongly support the creation of a Joint Committee on the Environment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), and others who are sponsoring this pending resolution—Joint Resolution 3—to create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

I have also introduced and sponsored a companion bill and am a cosponsor of the resolution before the House.

I support this resolution because I recognize the need for congressional oversight in this area of growing concern and public interest.

This resolution provides that the Joint Committee on the Environment will conduct a continuing and comprehensive study and review of environmental changes and their impact on our people, our cities, our towns, our communities, and our industries.

This resolution also provides that the Joint Committee will endeavor to find ways and means of reconciling and balancing the Nation's continuing demands for progress and preservation of the environment.

Another responsibility of this committee will be to develop policies that will encourage private investment to improve the quality of our environment.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations I should point out that our committee considers the environmental effects on public works projects throughout the Nation.

Congress has created the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency because of our concern for preservation of the quality of our environment.

The Corps of Engineers has been concerned with problems of the Nation's environment for 75 years as have other departments and agencies of the Government including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Reclamation, for example.

Almost every agency of Government today with any remote connection with environmental problems is placing this matter foremost in their budgets and justifications to Congress.

The preservation of our environment is of paramount concern in the Nation today, in the executive branch as well as in the Congress.

However, there is overlapping and duplication of effort and a new forest of redtape is in a state of prolific growth as new regulations and requirements and directives are prescribed and promulgated.

We want pure air.

We want clean water.

We want to preserve as much of our natural scenic beauty as possible.

But many feel that in an effort to assure the preservation of our environment some Federal agencies and others have gone too far down the road of redtape and regulation.

Things have actually reached a point in some areas that to blacktop a country road Federal environmental approval regretfully is involved.

It is understandable that the pendulum might swing in that direction with the national emphasis on curbing pollution and preserving our environment.

But we must continue programs of progress for the Nation.

One cannot have clean air on a dusty road.

Our people cannot have clean water unless water supplies are provided.

Our people cannot enjoy the beauties of nature in a flooded house full of mud and filth.

Our people cannot have electric power unless power generation is assured.

We must achieve a balance between the preservation of our environment and the need for progress.

This Joint Committee can provide a greater service by helping to achieve this balance in a practical, commonsense way.

This committee can provide yeoman service to the Nation by its oversight function over the multiplicity of Federal agencies now involved in the environmental area.

I repeat: Many responsible leaders feel that we have gone to extremes in the matter of obstructing progress in the name of environmental purity.

Lawsuits have been filed to stop and block important and needed public works projects that have been carefully planned to meet the needs of our expanding population.

Arbitrary Executive action has stopped other projects.

The voice of the turtle must be heard in the land, but the sounds of progress must also continue.

The oversight committee provided by the pending resolution can render a distinct public service.

I strongly support the passage of this resolution.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, about a million years ago, more or less, if my memory of the earth's geologic history serves me correctly, the earth experienced the last ice age.

These periods of gigantic glacial activity have provided the world with many of its natural wonders, wonders which serve man in many ways today. Among them are counted, for instance, the Great Lakes which were scoured by glacial activity. The portion of New York State known as Long Island is today the remnants of a glacial terminal moraine of a past ice age.

But these ice ages, while they have left much in their wake that is of benefit to man, are not really very pleasant to endure. They make things mighty cold and have a tendency to exterminate whole species of animals and vegetation. They chew up the surface of the earth and, in general, are inhospitable to creatures such as man. I suppose it might be compared to a Floridian visiting the arctic tundra. It not only is not a nice place to live, but only a few folk would even want to visit there.

Now, these ice ages have come with some regularity over the course of geologic history and we might reasonably expect that within a few thousand years this natural phenomenon would again occur.

Therefore, it came somewhat as a shock and surprise when I recently read scientific warnings, from men held to be eminently qualified to make such statements, that unless we stop contaminating the atmosphere with all the pollution we are daily throwing out, we may experience the beginning of a new ice age. This would not take place in the next 10 or 15 thousand years, but within the next 10 to 15 years.

What we are doing in polluting the atmosphere, according to these scientists, is veiling the sun's rays. This threatens to lower the world's temperature. Actually, the drop may be only a few degrees but, apparently, these men warn, this will be enough to start the glaciers moving.

When things get out of hand on earth, Nature has a very effective, albeit a devastating way of putting things back in order.

It seems the warning to us today is clear. We either get moving on this problem of pollution or order snowsuits.

For nearly a decade now, we have been painfully aware of the problems besetting our environment because of our need to consume and our propensity to pollute. It has become apparent that if we do not take steps to correct the situation in a humane manner, Nature is going to step in and brutally do the job. If she does, she may decide human beings are the major problem and solve that one for good.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the resolution before us today and urge that the House give favorable consideration to it. While we have failed miserably to come to grips with the energy problem facing the country, a problem which is intricately interwoven with the environmental crisis, we have an opportunity here today to take a first and major constructive step. In the past, we have let personalities and a questionable sense of prerogative prevent us from doing our duty. Let us not make that same mistake today.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives today has the opportunity to enact a measure creating a Joint Committee on the Environment. As one of the original cosponsors of this bill, I am confident that this proposal is the result of an idea whose time has come.

We know that there is a proliferation of boards, agencies, councils, and programs within the executive branch—all committed to environmental protection. The President's 1971 environmental message alone contains more than 300 pages of new plans. Certainly the U.S. Congress is just as flooded as the executive branch with proposals which affect pollution or ecology in some way. Indeed, there are more committees in the Senate and House which consider bills relating to the environment than there are committees which do not. It is therefore gratifying that a majority of the Members of this body are seeking a way to correct this fragmented handling of the issue. I am proud to join 271 of my colleagues in urging passage of House Joint Resolution 3, which offers a workable and unified approach for coordinating legislation related to the vast spectrum of environmental planning.

This measure is formulated to bring a measure of consistency into our handling of matters that pertain to man's relationship to his environment. If we seek a commitment to help maintain the balance of nature through protection of the environment, then surely we must maintain a balance and a direction in our consideration of information on the subject. This proposal, which has Presidential and bipartisan congressional support, can provide the sound footing so necessary for the hundreds of revisions and new programs which Congress will be implementing during and beyond this environmental decade of the seventies. The joint committee created by this bill can be the focal point for building a firm structure for future legislative progress. It can provide the best avenue for honest evaluation of all interests, be they conservationist or industrialist, student or Government official, scientist, or technician.

Mr. Chairman, there is no turning back from the brave new world we are creating. As we in this country discover more and more about our environment, even as we alter it, we must demand that each step be taken with respect and caution. We in this Congress must take every opportunity to exercise our responsibility in this regard. The creation of a Joint Committee on the Environment will provide the framework necessary if this Nation is to have a practicable and rational approach toward environmental planning.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 3 establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on the Environment. The creation of this House-Senate committee fills a long-felt need for closer coordination and communication between the two bodies of the Congress on the many important and complex issues involved in the protection of our environment.

The House Public Works Committee, which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has been engaged over a period of many years—far longer than any other committee of the Congress—in environmental matters, notably water pollution control legislation; moreover, environmental considerations are an integral part of the committee's legislative efforts in the highway program, flood control, economic development, rivers and harbor improvement, watersheds, and other areas of responsibility.

In the light of the committee's long experience in, and responsibility for, environmental protection, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House will agree that its representation on the joint committee to be established by this resolution will contribute significantly to our mu-

tual efforts, and that the Committee on Public Works will be so represented.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my strong support for the creation of the proposed Joint Committee on the Environment. The establishment of the committee, already approved by the Senate by the overwhelming margin of 76 to 4, is a most necessary step.

For the successful maintenance and restoration of the environment is a key issue that Congress must face up to at this time. The unique function that this committee would serve would be one of coordinating the activities of the various House and Senate standing committees dealing with questions in the environmental arena.

Too often a crippling jurisdictional dispute arises between various well-intentioned committees, with the result that necessary action is delayed until a decision is made as to which of the many committees will consider what. Too often a distinguished witness whose time could better be spent elsewhere is forced to testify before several committees, sometimes even on the same topic.

The proposed committee could end this bickering and unnecessary duplication of activities, thereby enabling Congress to move swiftly in taking action to save our environment. It would be foolish indeed for Congress to lag far behind in dealing with environmental problems, just as these gain ever-greater attention and concern among the people of America.

I myself have long been active in the area of conservation and preservation of our environment, having introduced over 25 bills dealing with the environment in this session alone.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote for the establishment of this committee, following the example set by our colleagues in the other body.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Environment.

I was a cosponsor of this resolution in the 91st Congress, and I am again sponsoring the bill, House Joint Resolution 4, introduced by Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL on the first day of the 92d Congress. This legislation passed the House of Representatives on May 25, 1970, 285 to 7.

The quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's has grown into a large environmental emergency in the 1970's. In the 1960's the Congress wrote landmark conservation measures. The Land and Water Conservation Act and the Wilderness Act were two of the most prominent laws, and I was proud to sponsor and support these great pieces of legislation. We also developed far-reaching air and water pollution control laws and legislation dealing with solid waste and in 1969, the Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act and established the Council on Environmental Quality, which I sponsored and supported.

I believe we have come to grips with the basic problem of improving our environment through the adoption of Federal programs to combat air and water pollution and solid waste and through the legislation to preserve areas for enjoyment for future generations and protection of endangered species.

However, the laws are just language on the books if we do not ourselves seek to do away with pollutants. I believe by establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment, we can draw national attention to the continuing challenges of living in a cleaner America. This new committee will assist the legislative committees in looking ahead to solve the environmental and ecological demands of the next decades and focus attention on today's overwhelming problems of man's struggle to survive in the polluted atmosphere he has himself created. I hope the House will again approve this committee.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 3 which would establish a Joint Committee on the Environment.

I support this resolution because a Joint Committee on the Environment would give Congress a broad and continuing review both of environmental factors and the interrelationships between competing factors. Such a joint committee would have a broad perspective and would be able to minimize further the often fragmented approach in the Congress to environmental problems.

The problems of the environment cross State and international boundaries and the Congress has acted to encourage interstate and international cooperation. The problem of the environment cross departmental and agency jurisdictions in the executive department and the Congress and the President have attempted to maximize the effectiveness of the Federal program. The problems of the environment cross committee jurisdiction in the Congress and House Joint Resolution 3 will allow the Congress to reduce the fragmented approach in the various committees. Now is the time for the Congress, via this resolution, to modify its structure and to identify and solve the environmental problems in a coordinated fashion. We, through this resolution, can enhance the ability of the Congress to deal with the environmental problems that face the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is understood that the standing congressional committees having jurisdiction over environmental protection and maintenance matters such as the Committee on Public Works would have majority and minority party representation on the Joint Committee. This is as it should be. This will lead to a cross-fertilization of ideas and a thorough consideration of those various aspects of environmental protection and maintenance that cross the jurisdiction of the standing committees.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is another step toward the more effective use of the resources available to control the quality of the environment. I urge each Member to support House Joint Resolution 3.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully support House Joint Resolution 3, to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment.

Our environmental system has been stretched to the breaking point. The years of neglect, complacency, and ignorance have caught up with us; and our Nation is on the verge of becoming an ecological ruin.

To document the gravity of this crisis, we need only look around us.

We need only see the rotting slums of the ghettos; the decaying centers of cities large and small across the Nation; the industrial wastelands that disfigure our countryside.

We need only see—and smell—the foul air of New York City and Los Angeles.

We need only hear the deafening noise around every jetport in the Nation.

We need only regard the blackened and dying waters of our once great rivers and lakes.

We need only look at the junkyards, billboards, and abandoned car lots that litter our highways.

The known facts and figures grimly confirm the evidence of our senses.

Americans spew 150 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere every year, principally from the burning of fossil fuels. The resulting damage amounts to about $12 billion annually.

Much of our fresh water supply is unfit for human or animal consumption, for agricultural use, or even for industrial purposes. It has been rendered unsuitable for recreational use or as the habitat for fish and aquatic life.

Noise pollution, thermal pollution, the dangers of radioactivity are all serious threats to our environment.

In our major cities thick layers of smog overhanging the skyline, dirt particles emanating from smokestacks and falling on our clothing, shorter spans of direct sunshine all are due to this disregard for our environment; yet these conditions can be overcome by instituting adequate environmental protection measures.

The gravity of this environmental crisis demands vigorous and comprehensive governmental action now. A realistic, tough, and effective commitment to the solution of the problem today will forestall the need for far more drastic measures tomorrow.

Before us today is a proposal that can make a significant impact in the development of a comprehensive program to preserving our environment—House Joint Resolution 3, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Environment.

As Members of this body will recall, such a proposal was embodied in legislation I introduced in the 91st Congress as House Concurrent Resolution 496 and reintroduced in this Congress as House Concurrent Resolution 74.

The need for positive action to establish such a committee is commensurate to the necessity for Congress to guard against further deterioration of our fast-wilting environment.

Through the passage of House Joint Resolution 3 the Congress can establish a much-needed means to deal with our environmental crisis. This resolution would establish a Joint Committee on the Environment, consisting of 11 Members of the Senate and 11 Members of the House. This Joint Committee on the

Environment would be mandated to conduct a continuing comprehensive study of the character and effect of environmental changes that may occur in the future; study methods to foster and promote conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony; develop policies that would encourage private investment to improve environmental quality; and would review recommendations made by the President relating to environmental policy.

This joint committee would submit an annual report to the Congress on its studies and recommendations.

The resolution before us today has been endorsed by all major environmental groups and is cosponsored by over 279 Members of this House. A similar measure passed this body in May of 1970 by an overwhelming vote of 285 to 7.

The establishment of a Joint Committee on the Environment would be an important step toward preserving this world, both for ourselves and those yet to be born.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution to create a Joint Committee on the Environment. Of all the problems facing this Nation today, the need to improve our environment could be the most serious. While we have had great pronouncements from the executive branch and from Members of Congress, we as a Nation have not done enough to guarantee clean air, clean water and a balance in nature for future generations.

The Joint Committee that would be established by this resolution will perform several important functions. First, it will increase the expertise within Congress on questions dealing with the environment. At present, this body greatly relies on the executive branch for its information on pollution of the environment. This, despite the fact that we know the Federal Government is among the major polluters in our country.

Second, it will serve as a central clearinghouse for all information on the environment. This continuing study will provide all Members of Congress with a ready source of succinct, up-to-date information from which to make decisions effecting environmental policy.

The Joint Committee during the course of its deliberations also will develop policies to encourage public and private investment in improving environmental quality. It will seek out methods and promote conditions that will provide a more harmonious existence for man and his environment. And it will serve as the review panel for the annual Environmental Quality Report of the Council on Environmental Quality.

We must face the fact that if our environment is allowed to deteriorate further all other questions become moot. What good will it do if we have a strong defense policy, but a raped land to defend? Or what will an atomic bomb mean to us, if we are all dying of asphyxiation? And what will exploration of space provide us with—except a place to go to when the earth is no longer habitable?

This joint committee will not provide all the answers to our environmental problems, but it will help the legislative branch of our Government more accurately assess the ecological problems we face and find solutions to those problems.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support passage of House Joint Resolution 3 to create a new Joint Committee on the Environment, a measure I had the pleasure to cosponsor in this, and in the 91st Congress.

The importance of this new joint committee cannot be overemphasized. It is going to provide the necessary machinery for Congress to pull together the whole Federal effort in the national fight to protect our environment. While it will not have legislative jurisdiction, it will be a central focal point of the entire Federal effort. Among its varied and important duties will be the responsibility for conducting a continuing and comprehensive study of environmental changes and their cause, of methods needed to protect our environment from abuse, of new policies needed to encourage private investment in this field, and, of course, the important duty of reviewing all recommendations submitted to the Congress in the environmental control field by the President, including the environmental quality report.

Most of us who are privileged to represent urbanized areas are fully aware of the critical importance of moving forward swiftly to resolve the major pollution and environmental problems we face. And I think this body would show to the Nation our commitment to the common goal of protecting our environment from further abuse, and restoring that which can be reclaimed by creating this committee. I have high hopes that this new committee will give our efforts the coordination needed to move forward rapidly in resolving some of the major problems we face in conserving and protecting our natural environment.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for House Joint Resolution 3, which we are now considering. As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 5, an identical resolution, I wholeheartedly support the creation of a Joint Committee on the Environment and Technology.

The reduction of environmental deterioration will require a coordinated and serious effort on the part of all levels of government, as well as private industry and individual citizens. Even so, the Federal Government is in the best position to provide all segments of society with the encouragement, guidelines, technical assistance, funds, and other types of motivation to insure a coordinated and meaningful effort to surmount this problem. As a result, Congress finds itself in the position of writing legislation and guidelines. Due to the fact that at least a dozen committees handle environmental legislation, efforts are piecemeal and have resulted in duplication, omission, and contradiction. For the information of the Members, a list of those committees in the House and the Senate which handle legislation relating to the environment include the following:

SENATE COMMITTEES

Agriculture and Forestry.

Commerce.

Government Operations: Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Operations.

Interior and Insular Affairs.

Labor and Public Welfare: Subcommittee on Health.

Public Works: Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Agriculture.

Government Operations: Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources.

Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Subcommittee on Oceanography.

Public Works: Subcommittee on Flood Control, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.

Science and Astronautics: Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

JOINT COMMITTEE

Atomic energy. A comprehensive overview of the pollution problem and comparative evaluation of the seriousness of component problems are not possible with oversight spread among these several committees. Therefore, I believe one very important step that Congress must take is to reorganize itself in preparation for the task ahead.

The joint committee authorized in House Joint Resolution 3 would be a nonlegislative committee; yet it could provide the Members with a clear focus on difficult environmental problems we are facing and also provide the above committees with the necessary background to insure effective action on short-term and long-term environmental problems.

The protection of our environment is a problem of serious proportions, so it is especially regrettable that final approval of this joint committee was not given during the 91st Congress. I urge that this measure be approved so that Congress might have available as soon as possible comprehensive oversight to enable it to put all aspects of the pollution problem into proper perspective.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3, which would create a 22-member committee composed equally of Members of the House and Senate. The creation of such a committee, modeled on the very effective joint economic committee, has been long overdue. The steady deterioration of our environment and the steadily increasing public concern for the total ecology should be reflected in the structure of the Congress through a congressional committee that can review the total, wide range of issues which influence the environment.

On the opening day of this Congress, I joined with a group of other Members in cosponsoring a resolution to create a Committee on the Environment. I am glad that at last we are moving to create a committee in this vital area. I am pleased that the concept has been expanded to include Members of the other Chamber.

The proposed joint committee will:

First, conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the character and extent of environmental changes that may occur in the future and their effect on population, communities, and industries.

Second, study methods of using all practicable means and measures calculated to foster, promote, create, and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony.

Third, develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in means of improving environmental quality.

Fourth, to review any recommendations made by the President relating to environmental policy.

There are nearly an infinite number of valuable studies and contributions which the joint committee could make. For example, I have introduced a House Resolution 441 to provide a study of the effect of freight rates on the economic feasibility of using recycled materials. At the present time, for example, the rates charged for the carrying of primary materials such as iron ore are out of line with the rates charged for scrap metal. The result is that the higher rates charged for secondary or for waste materials make it nearly impossible—in many areas—to economically salvage and recycle these resources. The Joint Committee could undertake the major study required to correct this situation.

Another area in which the joint committee could provide a useful impetus through hearings involves the recycled paper purchasing policies of the Federal Government. It is my understanding that at the present time the General Services Administration is advertising for paper with a certain percentage of recycled fiber. Perhaps due to a lack of publicity, perhaps due to other factors which the committee could explore the GSA may have to weaken or back down from its new standards on recycled paper. We must not permit this to happen. An investigation is in order to determine whether the GSA has been vigorous enough in pursuing the goal of using recycled paper and whether the industry has—perhaps for tax or freight rate reasons—been less than active in this area.

Another small but important area which the committee could investigate is the destruction—about 6 years ago—of the recycled oil industry. Due to a ruling by the Federal Trade Commission which required that cans containing recycled oil bear a label to that effect, sales of this very fine and usable oil fell off drastically. This, coupled, possibly, with a change in the tax laws effecting refineries, destroyed this industry. The result is that used oil is now burned—and some of it may even find its way down drainpipes into our waterways. The committee could recommend changes in the tax law and the FTC regulations which could restore this industry, conserve our oil, and improve our environment.

In sum, it would be very important to consider tax incentives programs which would stimulate the development of recycling processes and which could be used to curb air and water pollution.

Finally, as a representative from a community dependent on Lake Erie for water supplies, I am most concerned with the early establishment of this committee and hope its attention can be focused on the Lake Erie problem which constitutes a national disaster.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, nearly two-thirds of the Members of this body have joined in cosponsoring the legislation before us today which would create a Joint Committee on the Environment. I am proud to be included in that group.

The need for such a committee is as urgent as the environmental crises we are facing. It would be charged with the responsibility of conducting a continuing, comprehensive study and review of changing environmental conditions and their effect on our national life.

The joint committee would also study the methods and measures which would most effectively allow man to live in harmony with nature as he pursues necessary social and economic development.

In addition, and of great importance, the joint committee would have the primary authority to review recommendations made by the President; and the environmental quality report, which the President is required to submit to the Congress under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, would be referred to this committee.

At the end of each calendar year, the joint committee would submit its own report and recommendations to the Congress, based on its studies, reviews, and hearings.

Mr. Chairman, you, as the original sponsor of this legislation in the last Congress and our colleague JOHN DINGELL, who introduced the resolution at your request in this session, are to be commended for the leadership you have shown on this issue.

I am hopeful that all of our colleagues will join in support of this measure. We must have effective legislative machinery to deal with the myriad problems of a threatened environment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution to create a Joint Committee on Environment, but I do so with the most serious reservations. The objectives of this legislation can be, I believe, better met by a standing committee on environment with full power to report bills to the floor than by this more than likely weak-kneed joint committee with authority merely to recommend legislation to the Congress. Unfortunately, however, there are Members of this body who will not relinquish their dividend-rich holdings on the ecology exchange for any reason, even when the best interests of the environment they are supposed to be defending are at stake. In the face of such powerful opposition, I suppose we must take whatever we can get.

In one sense, a Joint Committee on Environment will prove valuable, for it will enable us to adopt a unified approach where in the past we have seen only fragmented and overlapping efforts. In fact, had the committee been granted, at the same time, full legislative power to report bills, we might have taken a long step toward solving the intricately related problem of our environment. That power was, of course, not granted, so we will just have to wait and see whether the recommendations of the committee carry any force whatsoever within the Congress. I would have much preferred to be certain that they would.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues will keep a critical eye on the joint committee in the months ahead, remaining open to the possibility that it might not, after all, be effective. Pollution is too important a problem to be buried in a committee with no power to do anything about it.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for House Joint Resolution 3, but I am going to do so in the hope that the Joint Committee on the Environment will only be an interim solution to the problem of Congress not being sufficiently well organized to effectively consider the proliferating number of environmental bills which are introduced each day. The joint committee would represent a step toward a principle I deem necessary to an orderly, efficient resolution of interrelated environmental problems—that is to bring them under one roof. I hope this legislation is a step toward the ultimate creation of a standing Committee on the Environment, in each body, with full legislative powers.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I first proposed a permanent, standing Committee on the Environment for the House on April 28, 1969. This committee would have full legislative authority and would have jurisdiction over bills dealing with air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, acoustic problems, weather modification, pesticides, and herbicides. It would have the support of a full-time staff of experts in the problems of environmental quality.

Apparently I am not alone in believing that an approach such as this is necessary. Since reintroducing my proposal on the opening day of the 92d Congress, 182 of my distinguished colleagues have joined as cosponsors. This represents over 40 percent of the Members of this body. The sponsors are from 43 of our 50 States. They represent each of the existing standing committees of the House, including five committee chairmen and 10 ranking minority members.

Supporters of a full-time, standing committee on the environment come from both of our major political parties in large numbers. Indeed, the leadership of both parties is represented. Sponsorship runs from one side of the philosophical spectrum to the other and includes a number of Members whose names appear on House Joint Resolution 3.

I realize that the committee structure of the House cannot be revamped overnight, and that is why I plan to support the measure on the floor today. A joint committee would assist the existing standing committees in their task of sorting out environmental legislation. It would lend a sense of orderliness to the existing structure which allows related legislation to be referred to as many as

five or six unrelated standing committees for consideration.

In urging the eventual creation of a standing Committee on the Environment, I in no way mean to be critical of the efforts already underway. What I do say is that a standing committee will expedite the important goal of leaving this earth in better condition than we found it. Our fragmented approach to environmental issues makes it increasingly difficult to obtain proper consideration of the many bills being introduced. In most cases, complex environmental issues are treated as an additional chore by committees whose principal jurisdictions lie elsewhere.

While I wish it were now possible for the House to be voting to establish a standing Committee on the Environment, I do believe that the joint committee would represent progress in Congress efforts to move to the forefront in the fight for a quality environment, and I urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 3.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for House Joint Resolution 3, the establishment of a Joint Committee on Environment. Environmental quality has become a national priority of such importance that the time has come for the Congress to consider basic organization changes to better facilitate the study of environmental problems and their solutions.

This resolution would establish a joint committee composed of six majority and five minority Members from both the House and the Senate; the Senate Members to be appointed by the President of the Senate and House Members by the Speaker. The chairmanship of the committee would rotate between the House and Senate delegations every 2 years.

Although this new joint committee would have no legislative jurisdiction and would be limited to a study function, it would provide a much-needed focus for the study and investigation of the Nation's environmental problems. The committee would be authorized to conduct continuing studies of environmental matters and to develop policies encouraging private investment as means of improving environmental quality. It would review Presidential recommendations on environmental policy and report annually on its activities. In addition, the committee would furnish a single congressional body to work with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency established by the 91st Congress.

At the present time, the machinery of Congress is not conducive to a broad overview of environmental policy and legislation. Traditional committee jurisdiction tends to divide environmental bills among many committees. For instance, water pollution measures are considered in the Public Works Committee, while air pollution bills fall under the authority of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Any measure to provide tax incentives for companies or municipalities to reduce pollution is considered by the Ways and Means Committee. This results in a lack of coordination and the failure to develop national policy in this important field. The joint committee would provide a forum to coordinate, but not change, traditional committee jurisdictions between the various committees with interests in environmental legislation and make recommendations for the committees to consider.

In view of this lack of congressional direction, I feel that this measure is a much needed step toward better coordination of environmental policy and legislation in the legislative branch and I heartily support its passage.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3, to create a Joint Congressional Committee on the Environment. This measure passed the House during the 91st Congress, but unfortunately was not considered by the Senate prior to adjournment.

As a cosponsor of both the pending resolution and another to establish a standing Committee on the Environment, I personally would assign higher priority to the latter under which the new committee would possess full legislative powers and would be able to coordinate all environmental matters before the House.

Nonetheless, I urge approval of the joint committee as a worthwhile step toward developing the information and expertise so essential if Congress is to deal effectively with our environmental crisis.

As reported, House Joint Resolution 3 provides for a Joint Committee on the Environment, consisting of 11 Members of the Senate to be chosen by the President of the Senate and 11 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker. The chairman and vice chairman would be elected by the members of the joint committee at the beginning of each Congress, and the chairmanship would alternate between the House and the Senate.

The joint committee would be charged with conducting a continuing study of the type and effect of potential environmental changes. More specifically, it would search for methods to foster conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony; develop policies to encourage private investment to improve environmental quality; and review recommendations made by the President relating to environmental policy. The committee is directed to submit an annual report on its work to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, government at all levels must assume a more active role in the battle for environmental quality if we are to curtail pollution and assure a clean and healthy environment for the future. Developing an independent and reliable source of information, such as a Joint Environmental Committee, is one essential ingredient of the Congress' attack on every type of pollution.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, along with nearly 300 Members of the House, I cosponsored House Joint Resolution 3, providing for a Joint Committee on the Environment.

The establishment of such a joint committee is long overdue. A similar measure passed the House a year ago by a vote of 285 to 7. Unfortunately, Senate action came too late to permit a House-Senate conference committee to reach a compromise before adjournment of the 91st Congress.

The Joint Committee would be a nonlegislative committee organized to provide a clear focus on many of the difficult environmental decisions which must be made in the years ahead.

It would also provide the legislative committees with the necessary background to insure effective action on short-term and long-term environmental problems and needs.

All of us are aware of the problems today in dealing with our environment and the deterioration of our natural resources, and I am happy that the House overwhelmingly approved this resolution today.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 3, to create a Joint Committee on the Environment. No problem facing our Nation today is more serious than that of pollution and the preservation of our natural resources and environment. In the past several years a number of our most beautiful and well-known rivers and lakes have become little more than convenient dumping grounds for large industries and sewage treatment plants in certain urban areas. The air in many of our Nation's cities has become literally unfit to breathe. Very often, many of my constituents who commute to work in New York City during the week hear, on certain radio stations, the disheartening but indisputable news that pollution levels in the city are so high as to be termed "unacceptable." Needless to say, the average commuter cannot afford to stay home at such times.

With the public's growing awareness of the gravity of the problem this Nation faces in attempting to protect the environment, the Congress and the President have responded with programs of legislation that are beginning to attack the problems of air and water pollution. The House Committees on Public Works, Interior, and Commerce each deal with aspects of environmental protection in parts of their legislative activities. They have all held numerous hearings in the past on pollution problems and, along with the rest of Congress, have given the President wide powers to deal effectively with the problems of air and water pollution in this country.

However, Mr. Chairman, I believe that there has not been enough feeling of urgency among those people who are in positions of authority to solve the problems that plague our environment. Steps have certainly been taken to control some types of water and air pollution, but it cannot be denied that pollution still exists in serious and increasingly dangerous situations. Not only are people constantly being turned away from more and more polluted beaches and lakes, but the air in many of our major cities has become unpleasant and unhealthy to breathe. A recent article in the New York Times revealed that over 150 people were hospitalized last year in Houston after inhaling the noxious sulfur fumes and other gases released into the air by local petrochemical refineries.

While there are certain committees in Congress that deal with different types

of pollution legislation, I firmly believe that the problem of pollution and the destruction of our Nation's natural resources has truly reached crisis proportions. I feel that Congress should create a joint committee whose sole concern would be the problems relating to pollution and the protection and preservation of our environment.

For that reason, I cosponsored a bill in February, House Joint Resolution 351, which would create such a joint committee. My bill is a companion bill and identical to House Joint Resolution 3, the bill under consideration today. This committee, if formed, could not simply repeat the antipollution activities of other committees already in existence, but could take innovative and effective steps to protect the environment and the natural resources of this country.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the passage of House Joint Resolution 3.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment, of which I am a cosponsor.

For too long, our country failed to realize the consequences the technology of an advanced society could have for natural resources. Slowly, however, it became apparent that if America wanted to continue to enjoy the benefits of her environment, she must act quickly to preserve the bountiful resources with which she was blessed.

The efforts of many agencies and departments of government have been commendable as they have made strides toward correcting the environmental situation with which we are faced today. However, it is now time for the Congress, as the chief legislative body of the country, to recognize the important role which this subject will play in the seventies by establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment.

The benefits of such a committee would be many. By coordinating legislative efforts, our activities on behalf of the environment could be more effective. Until now, work in this field has been delegated to a number of committees, each making its own contribution. A single, investigative committee could help assure a greater degree of coordination among various proposals approved by the Congress.

All over the United States, concern for this situation is growing, and this new awareness is an important factor in the overall situation. Citizens of all age groups and interests are banding together in a national effort to make our country a more pleasant place in which to live. Girl scouts, housewives, business groups, college students and individual families are working on a smaller scale to do what they can to help. However, a more massive effort is needed. Through the proposed Committee, Congress can turn those intentions to action.

Until now, Mr. Chairman, our work in the field of environmental concern has been of a remedial nature. I would hope that the establishment of a Joint Committee would enable us to begin preventive measures as well. Let us mobilize the knowledge of scientists, economists, and other experts to help us foresee the latent problems and cure them before they reach a crisis stage, as well as treating the crises with which we are already faced.

The smog will not disappear from the cities in a day. But this first step of organization and coordination will be an important one if we are ever going to guarantee future generations a healthy environment.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, in a field which is a centerpoint of national concern, and a field that by its very nature covers an incredibly broad range of topics and jurisdictions, two of the hardest items to maintain are perspective oversight and innovation.

Innovation is often regrettably replaced by reaction to crises of the moment and long-range overviews lost in the jumble of problems.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the resolution before us to create a Joint Committee on the Environment. A joint committee offers this Congress a chance to stand back, to assimilate, organize, afford background on, and look into the future of the whole environmental field.

A joint committee, facing the whole of the environmental problem, will have a tendency to sort through the many smaller crises and focus attention on major turning points in our fight to save our environment. It would also be able to furnish legislative committees with background information to help insure effective action on short as well as long term problems which come under their jurisdictions.

The joint committee we consider here today does not have legislative powers, but it does have important contributions to make toward the legislative process. And in so doing it has important contributions to make toward the wellbeing of this planet.

Time is definitely not on our side in the environmental fight. We have been playing catchup ever since the environmental effort began. But I do not think all is lost—if we are innovative enough and work with enough knowledge to avoid wasting our energies along the way. This committee will be a help in directing those energies, in directing them where they will do the most good. And by so doing, this committee will help the Congress and the country toward the goal of leaving our planet to our children a little better off than we found it.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is established a joint congressional committee which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the Environment (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "committee") consisting of eleven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and eleven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the eleven Members of the Senate appointed under this subsection, six Members shall be from the majority party, and five Members shall be from the minority party. Of the eleven Members of the House of Representatives appointed under this subsection, six Members shall be from the majority party, and five Members shall be from the minority party. In the appointment of members of the committee under this subsection, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall give due consideration to providing representation on the committee from the various committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over matters relating to the environment.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by Members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members of that House. The committee may establish such subcommittees as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made.

(d) A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

(e) The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the committee and shall be kept in the offices of the committee or such other places as the committee may direct.

(f) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the character and extent of environmental changes that may occur in the future and their effect on population, communities, and industries, including but not limited to the effects of such changes on the need for public and private planning and investment in housing, water resources (including oceanography), pollution control, food supplies, education, automation affecting interstate commerce, fish and wildlife, forestry, mining, communications, transportation, power supplies, welfare, and other services and facilities;

(2) to study methods of using all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster, promote, create, and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans;

(3) to develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in means of improving environmental quality; and

(4) to review any recommendations made by the President (including the environmental quality report required to be submitted pursuant to section 201 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969) relating to environmental policy.

(b) The environmental quality report required to be submitted pursuant to section

201 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the committee, which shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, hold hearings with respect to such report.

(c) On or before the last day of December of each year, the committee shall submit to the Senate and to the House of Representatives for reference to the appropriate standing committees an annual report on the studies, reviews, and other projects undertaken by it, together with its recommendations. The committee may make such interim reports to the appropriate standing committees of the Congress prior to such annual report as it deems advisable.

(d) In carrying out its functions and duties the committee shall avoid unnecessary duplication with any investigation undertaken by any other joint committee, or by any standing committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this joint resolution, the committee is authorized, as it deems advisable (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings; (3) to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and (4) to employ and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants. Persons employed under authority of this subsection shall be employed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties for which employed.

(b) The committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 4. To enable the committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this joint resolution, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. On page 6, strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert "authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $300,000 for each fiscal year to be disbursed by the Clerk of the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 3, after line 17, insert:

"(g) The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) is recognized in support of his amendment.

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know the Committee on Rules would be happy to accept this amendment since it is language that the Committee on Rules often inserts in investigative resolutions; is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. I concur in that. As I stated when I spoke on the rule, that was neglected. I would like to repeat the statement I made at that time. It is like saying to children—to go swimming but not to go near the water. When you check this and when you read down the list what is authorized—one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven on pages 3, 4, and 5, you will find there that they are pretty specific and many of them will actually interfere. So it is saying one thing on one hand and another thing on the other. I am pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment and, in fact, would have been happy to have offered it myself.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement. I explained my amendment during the course of my remarks I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 3, after line 17, insert a new subsection to read:

"(h) Members serving on this Commission shall remain ineligible for the Office of President of the United States until the issuance of the Commission's last press release."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself and the reception with which it has been greeted indicates that no further explanation is needed. In view of the political complexion of the joint committee and the political atmosphere that pervades Congress and the country these days, I urge enactment of the amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and do so only because this is after all a House joint resolution and I really, honestly, do not believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is applicable to a House joint resolution.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 25, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS), having assumed the chair, Mr. FUQUA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment, pursuant to House Resolution 424, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

EGG PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT EXEMPTION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 547 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 547

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9020) to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such Act for a certain period of time. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9020, the Egg Products Inspection Act exemption.

The purpose of H.R. 9020 is simply to

extend for 6 months—to December 31, 1971—the time within which egg processors in Hawaii and Puerto Rico must meet the requirements of the Egg Products Inspection Act.

At the time the act was enacted—December 29, 1970—egg processors in Hawaii and Puerto Rico were given 6 months within which to comply with it. Although they have tried in good faith to comply, they have been unable to do so within the time allotted. This legislation would simply give them another 6 months.

H.R. 9020 is endorsed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It entails no additional expense to the United States; in fact, it is expected to decrease expenditures in fiscal year 1971 by $30,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 547 in order that the bill, H.R. 9020, may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 makes in order consideration of H.R. 9020 with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend for 6 months—through December 31, 1971—the period which egg producers in Hawaii and Puerto Rico have to meet the requirements of the Egg Products Inspection Act.

In both areas egg producers have made efforts to comply with the act but have been unable to reach a state of compliance by the effective date of the act, which was June 29, 1971. In order to meet the provisions of the act, egg producers must acquire additional pasteurization equipment for their plants. Producers in Puerto Rico and Hawaii have not yet acquired and installed such equipment.

The bill provides that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that a good faith effort to comply with the act has been made, he may permit an additional period of 6 months for such producer to reach full compliance with the act.

No additional cost will be incurred by the passage of this legislation. Actually, during fiscal 1972 the cost to the Department would be reduced by approximately $30,000.

The Department of Agriculture supports the bill as reported.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9020) to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such act for a certain period of time.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9020, with Mr. FUQUA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD) will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9020 is designed to relieve an emergency situation which has arisen in some specific areas as a result of certain requirements imposed under Public Law 91–597, the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 9020, introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is straightforward. It seeks to extend for 6 months, until the end of 1971, the time by which qualified egg producers in noncontiguous areas of the United States must meet all the requirements of the Egg Products Inspection Act, Public Law 91–597.

When that act was signed into law, on December 29, 1970, egg processors were given 6 months to acquire and install necessary equipment to process undergrade shell eggs in compliance with the act.

On the U.S. mainland, the July 1, 1971, deadline was generally met by all plants that made diligent efforts to comply. But in noncontiguous areas of the country, such as Puerto Rico and Hawaii, processors, for a variety of reasons, have met with considerable difficulty in bringing their plants into compliance with the egg processing requirements of the act despite their best efforts made in all good faith.

The situation in Hawaii highlights those difficulties.

First, there was difficulty in obtaining the necessary pasteurizing equipment. In the entire State of Hawaii, there was no such equipment when the law went into effect. Attempts to order equipment from equipment manufacturers were unsuccessful, partly because of the heavy demand created by the act itself.

Second, because of the relative smallness and insularity of the Hawaii market, the State could support only one processing facility. This necessitated a delay so that a proper cooperative structure could be arranged.

Third, financing assistance for the common facility from the Small Business Administration, as explicitly mentioned in the act, has been difficult to secure.

Similar problems have been encountered in Puerto Rico.

As a result of these difficulties, no plant in Puerto Rico or Hawaii was able to comply with the act's processing requirements by the July 1, 1971 deadline. Producers have been forced to destroy all undergrade eggs except "checks" and "dirties" which have been washed. The potential economic loss in Hawaii alone has been estimated by the industry at $100,000 per annum. The impact of such losses on the small operators, many of them marginal, would be significant, and in some cases disastrous.

The purpose of H.R. 9020 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture is to give egg producers in these specifically affected areas, who have made good faith efforts to comply with the act, the opportunity to bring their plants into full compliance.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has recognized the unique problems encountered by producers in noncontiguous areas, and has endorsed the bill as reported. The Department's position is set forth more fully in the Agriculture Committee's report on H.R. 9020.

Although the scope of this bill is not wide, it will avert a major economic disaster to egg producers in the affected areas in a manner assuring respect for the intent of the Egg Products Inspection Act, that is, to provide wholesome, safe egg products for the American consumer.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of H.R. 9020.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, this is relatively minor legislation. It is represented to be—and we have no reason to doubt it—as in the nature of emergency legislation. It has been explained in detail. As far as I know, there was only one member of the committee who had any reservations about the bill at all.

That is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING); and I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to ask the sponsor of the bill a question.

I believe the gentleman said, when he was discussing the rule, that this bill would save the taxpayers $30,000. Can the gentleman elaborate on that?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It will save for the reason that for a 6-month period the Federal Government will not need to conduct any supervisory activities in the noncontiguous areas. For that reason the Federal Government will save $30,000.

Mr. GOODLING. If that is a good and legitimate reason, probably we should do away with the egg inspection bill entirely and save the taxpayers still more money.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Well, some people would feel that way. As one who champions the cause of the consumer in many respects I would say only in cases of emergencies such as this should we take this procedure of saving the taxpayers dollars.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill first came to the Agriculture Committee I objected to it. I assume I must have been wrong, because nobody else on the Agriculture Committee objected to it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am sure

the gentleman would be the first to say it is very seldom he and I disagree.

Mr. GOODLING. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. This is one of those very rare occasions.

Mr. GOODLING. My objection stems from the fact that originally the gentleman who introduced the bill stated that all this equipment would be bought without the United States. With our balance of trade as it is today, I do not believe we can afford to buy all this equipment out of the United States.

For that reason I wrote some minority views, and, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD. I will not take the time to read them.

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

There was no objection.

The separate views are as follows:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

While I do not object to the purpose of H.R. 9020 to extend for 6 months the effective date of certain provisions of the Egg Products Inspection Act, I do want to express my concern that this extension might further aggravate an already unhealthy economic problem.

I refer to our Nation's chronic problem caused by ever-increasing imports of foreign-made equipment. Every Member of this House is aware of the growing number of imported items that continue to threaten the livelihoods of American business and labor. In my congressional district we have seen that result all too clearly.

Therefore, when it was explained to me that H.R. 9020 was necessary in order to permit Hawaiian egg processing firms to purchase equipment from Japan, I expressed my opposition to the bill. It seems to me that in return for the special exemption given to Hawaii and Puerto Rico by this bill, that at the very least a requirement to "buy American" should be included in the bill, even if additional time is required.

GEO. A. GOODLING.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose the bill any longer, because at 10:30 a.m. this morning I received a call from the office of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) saying they had just received a teletext from Fred Erskine, chairman of the State board of agriculture—apparently comparable to our Secretary of Agriculture in the United States—advising that of the $75,000 which is to be spent only $3,000 will now be spent outside the United States.

This was added—and I am sure all those from California will be interested in it—"Hawaiian technicians presently are in California looking at equipment."

I am happy to know they are doing that.

Since the gentleman has given me this information this morning, I can assure him I will not oppose the bill any further, and I advise all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman in the well. What the gentleman really is saying is that only $3,000 would be spent outside the United States, and $72,000 will be spent within the United States. I am happy to know that this removes the objections of the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note in the report on page 3 this statement from the Department of Agriculture:

Neither H.R. 9020 nor the recommended change would have any significant impact on the quality of the environment.

Is the Department of Agriculture saying that continuation of the sale and use of eggs, not processed under the standards established elsewhere in the United States, will have no effect on the environment? I wonder how under the circumstances, the environment got into this report?

Mr. GOODLING. I believe I should like to have the gentleman from Hawaii answer that question.

Of course, the gentleman knows we are now required to have that statement in all of our reports.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean reference to environment must be in every report?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is the requirement in the law today.

Mr. GROSS. Even though it might be egg on the face, there would still have to be a reference to environment?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Of course, the gentleman may have had in mind that the environment will not be affected because Hawaiian eggs—and I am sure Puerto Rican eggs, too—will not be emitting sulfur dioxide or whatever it is in rotten eggs, because we feel only fresh eggs will be processed in Hawaii and there will be no stink eggs.

Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) the author of the pending bill.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I wish to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Poultry of the Committee on Agriculture, for the expeditious and most competent handling of the matter now pending before the House. In behalf of the people of Hawaii, I thank the distinguished gentleman (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD) for the major role he played in bringing H.R. 9020 to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9020 would extend the time by which qualified egg producers in noncontiguous areas of the United States must bring their plants under full compliance of the provisions of Public Law 91-597, the Egg Products Inspection Act.

Specifically, if an egg processor can demonstrate to the Secretary of Agriculture that he has made good faith but unsuccessful efforts to comply with the act, he would be granted a limited extension of time in which to do so. The compliance deadline would be extended from July 1, 1971, to December 31, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Department of Agriculture contacted most known egg processors by letter during February 1971 to inform them of the new law. Tentative regulations were issued by the Department on March 17, 1971; final regulations were promulgated on May 28, 1971. The deadline for full compliance with the act was July 1, 1971.

The net result of this timetable was that egg processors had only a short time in which to acquire, finance, and install necessary equipment to process undergrade shell eggs in compliance with the act.

In the mainland United States, the overwhelming majority of approximately 700 plants affected had little difficulty in meeting the act's requirements because of the ready availability of the necessary equipment. However, in certain noncontiguous areas of the United States, particularly Hawaii and Puerto Rico, processors, despite their best good faith efforts, encountered serious difficulties in bringing their plants into full compliance.

These operators found an acute shortage both of the equipment needed and the expertise to install it properly. Consequently in my own State of Hawaii there are still no egg pasteurization facilities whatsoever.

Effective July 1, 1971, therefore, the producers in these noncontiguous areas have had to begin destroying all of their undergrade eggs, except "checks" and "dirties" which have been washed.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the new law is imposing a severe economic hardship on egg processors in these areas. In Hawaii alone the loss is estimated at $100,000 per annum. Because in Hawaii those affected are all relatively small operators, many of them marginal, a loss such as this could be disastrous.

The passage of H.R. 9020 will not jeopardize the health of the American consumer, the principal beneficiary of the Egg Products Inspection Act. In Hawaii the State Department of Agriculture has agreed to monitor and supervise all liquid egg processing in the State during any extension period granted by the Federal Government. This would be in addition to the normal sanitation inspections conducted by the State department of health.

This is an emergency measure, Mr. Chairman. For the past 3 weeks, egg producers covered by the pending bill have been forced to destroy substantial quantities of undergrade eggs. Each day without relief means greater economic loss to these producers.

I therefore urge the passage of H.R. 9020.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9020. The bill seeks to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide relief for certain plants located in noncontiguous areas of the United States from certain provisions requiring pasteurization of liquid eggs.

First of all, I wish to state my support of the Egg Products Inspection Act and its intended purposes to protect the American consumer.

However, certain provisions of this act work to inflict hardship on certain producers of egg products in my State. The relief sought by this bill is temporary in nature and limited in scope. It seeks not to circumvent the provisions of the act,

but only to expand them in a very limited fashion to take into account difficulties in compliance by July 1, 1971. The Department of Agriculture has recognized, as stated in the committee report on this bill, that certain noncontiguous areas of the United States are having difficulty in obtaining the necessary equipment for pasteurizing egg products. My State had no such equipment available when the regulations governing administration of this act were issued at the beginning of this year. It still has no such equipment available. The egg producers have been unable to obtain appropriate equipment because of the demand created by the enactment of this law. Equipment that was available was too large for our local demands and was therefore impractical. Problems have also arisen in the matter of financing the purchase of such equipment. It is felt, however, that these difficulties can be overcome given the 6-month extension this bill proposes.

I call to the attention of my colleagues to the temporary nature of the relief sought by this bill, and the provision that the proposed extension of the deadline for compliance be granted by the Secretary of Agriculture only in the case of a plant which has demonstrated "good faith" in attempting to comply with the regulations. The Secretary would be authorized to grant extension only until December 31, 1971.

To deny this amendment would be to inflict severe hardship on several producers of egg products in my State. I, therefore, urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have not further requests for time.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for the splendid service he has rendered by taking the position and influencing us in having some of this industrial equipment purchased in the United States of America rather than from foreign sources. We ought to be grateful to him for that.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9020

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (84 Stat. 1629) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall, by regulation and under such procedures as he may prescribe, exempt any plant from specific provisions of this Act where, despite good faith efforts by the owner of such plant, such owner has not been able to acquire pasteurization equipment for such plant. No exemption under this subsection shall be granted for a period extending beyond December 31, 1971."

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, line 8, after the words "any plant" insert the words "located within noncontiguous areas of the United States"; and

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "acquire pasteurization equipment for such plant." and insert in lieu thereof the words "bring his plant into full compliance with this Act"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 2, at line 3, strike the period after the word "Act", and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That in order to provide at least minimum standards for the protection of the public health, whenever processing operations are being conducted at any such plant, continuous inspection shall be maintained to assure that it is operated in a sanitary manner and that it complies with the other requirements of this act not related to the pasteurization of egg products."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have some reservations about this bill. It seemed to me that the least we could do would be to limit it to the express purpose, the express purpose having been to provide extra time for them to secure pasteurization equipment. However, the bill as written goes further than that and includes a complete exemption from all provisions of the act. I understand that the principal sponsor of the bill does not object to this tightening up of the bill so as to coincide with his expressed purpose; is that correct?

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

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

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. The committee on this side has no objection to the gentleman's amendment and would be glad to accept it.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. As the introducer of the measure, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. We accept the amendment on this side also.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FUQUA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9020) to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such act for a certain period of time, pursuant to House Resolution 547, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 197 of today I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present on the floor, I would have voted "yea."

JOURNALISTIC ATTEMPT TO DEFEAT PROPOSED LOCKHEED LOAN

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues what is at best a piece of journalistic balderdash, and at worst a concerted effort on the part of a well-known Washington newspaper to employ subterfuge and misrepresentation to bring about the defeat of the proposed Lockheed loan.

I am referring to two articles recently published in the Washington Post. The first article bears the title "Vast Lockheed Waste Charged by Former Manager," and was featured on the front page of last Sunday's edition. This article cited charges of Lockheed mismanagement made by Mr. Henry M. Durham, a former Lockheed employee, whom the article implies was a top level company official. In truth, Mr. Durham was far removed from policymaking.

At best Mr. Durham's motives are highly questionable in bringing his

charges to light at this particular time, at least 2 years after he says he discovered mismanagement, and at a time when Lockheed is known to be facing a difficult fight for survival in both Houses of Congress. Furthermore, I cannot help but wonder why Mr. Durham felt compelled to take his case to the Washington Post instead of to one of the many local newspapers which serve the Lockheed-Georgia/Marietta area.

Finally, I would like to point out to my colleagues that Mr. R. A. Fuhrman, president of the Lockheed-Georgia Co., yesterday replied to Mr. Durham's charges, and the Washington Post very graciously condescended to print Mr. Fuhrman's rebuttal on page 6 under a headline reading "Aide Denies C-5A Waste at Lockheed."

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has long maintained a reputation for fairness and accuracy in its reporting, but in this instance I am hard put to find anything fair in representing Mr. Durham, who at the peak of his Lockheed career was responsible for only 300 employees, as a top company official with access to an accurate overview of the Lockheed-Georgia complex, and misrepresenting Mr. Fuhrman, who is responsible for the some 20,000 Lockheed-Georgia employees and many corporate decisions, as an "aide."

I am also dismayed that the Post featured Mr. Durham's attack on the front page, and denied Mr. Fuhrman equal coverage by burying his rebuttal on page 6.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Washington Post to repudiate this sort of journalistic dissimulation and to offer equal coverage in the future to each side in this sensitive and crucial issue.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XVII

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the National Bankers Life Insurance Co. was among the entities in the empire of Frank Sharp. The man who made it possible for Sharp to buy the company was Will Wilson, now the Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

As soon as Sharp gained control of National Bankers Life, he rewarded Wilson with his usual post in Sharp companies—the post of general counsel. Wilson had, of course, acted as the negotiator for the purchase of the company.

Wilson, of course, acquired stock in National Bankers Life and eventually bought more than 7,500 shares.

All of this is known.

It is also known that Sharp and his pals systematically looted the insurance company. They manipulated its stock to drive the price up; they made self-dealing loans; they doctored up its books, and so on and so on. But among the most interesting practices of the insurance company's big shots was that they had a propensity to buy and sell its stocks at opportune moments. It is possible and even likely that the insiders at National Bankers Life used their positions to enrich themselves. One wonders if Will Wilson himself might have been among these.

Wilson, of course, says that he sold all his stock in National Bankers Life Insurance Co. after he came to Washington. However, there are some interesting discrepancies between what he says he did and what stock transaction record sheets show he did.

Wilson tells the world that he disposed of his National Bankers Life stock by March 1969. Stock transaction records show that he was selling big blocks of National Bankers Life stock long after that—perhaps as late as November 1969. In fact, Wilson's transactions even included a purchase of 1,000 shares of this stock as late as March 31, 1969—though he curiously sold 500 shares on that same day. Then, in mid-June he sold 1,400 shares, and late in July he sold another 1,000, and in November he sold another 1,200. I am quite certain that Mr. Wilson sold this stock for a handsome profit.

Now we know from the past record that Will Wilson likes to take small liberties with the truth. Thus, while he would freely admit that he had been a lawyer for Frank Sharp, he never said anything at all about being general counsel for no less than three Sharp companies, at the rate of $3,500 a month plus other considerations. And he says nothing at all of what he knew or did not know of the mysterious and frequently illegal deals that were going on in Sharp's various companies, all of which Wilson served as chief legal adviser. So it really does not surprise me too much that Wilson says he sold his National Bankers Life Insurance stock, but does not say exactly when and how or for what price or profit. No wonder—he was dealing in the stock long after he would like to have us think that he had sold it all. He sold his stock not to free himself of entanglements with Sharp so much as to make the most he could.

There is no excusing what the insiders did to the National Bankers Life Insurance Co. And the records available now show that Wilson was one of them.

KANSAS WILL GO TO COURT TO STOP AEC

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, last week this House approved funds to buy land in Kansas in which to bury highly lethal nuclear wastes. This unusual action was taken despite the pleas of the Governor, the Kansas scientific community, and the entire Kansas congressional delegation to halt this land purchase until after this form of nuclear waste disposal could be proven safe. When this House ignored those pleas, it invited an open confrontation in court between the State of Kansas and an agency of the Federal Government.

Governor Docking promised, Mr. Speaker, he will use all the legal power of the governorship and the facilities of the State to prevent the AEC from establishing a facility strongly opposed by a large majority of Kansas people.

The Kansas City Star in its July 12 issue now reports the Governor is preparing to go into court. The El Dorado Times of July 12 in an editorial says:

> If the AEC attempts to continue its high-handed way regardless of the attitude Kansas might hold against this measure, it will be delaying its own program.

I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

[From Kansas City Times, July 12, 1971]

KANSAS STILL LOOKING FOR WAY TO HALT AEC

TOPEKA.—Edward Collister, assistant attorney general, said yesterday a legal study is continuing on how the state of Kansas might proceed with a lawsuit to challenge location of a national nuclear waste repository in abandoned salt mines at Lyons, Kan.

Collister was assigned by Kansas attorney general, Vern Miller, to study the state's legal avenues after Gov. Robert Docking asked the attorney general to determine if the state had a legal basis for fighting the repository's location in Kansas.

Docking and other state and congressional officials are embroiled in a controversy with the Atomic Energy Commission over placing the repository in Kansas. The state officials contend the AEC has not performed adequate tests to assure the repository will be safe.

Collister said he has no personal opinion at this point as to whether the state will have a legal basis to challenge the AEC.

Miller said last week the state will bring a suit if it determines one is possible.

Collister confirmed the state is studying possible legal avenues in consultation with representatives of the Kansas chapter of the Sierra Club, the conservationist group which also has been outspoken in opposition to locating the repository in Kansas.

[From El Dorado Times, July 12, 1971]

MAY SUE THE AEC

The argument over the proposal to bury atomic wastes in salt beds at Lyons has just about flared into open warfare. The Atomic Energy Commission has gone ahead with its program apparently indifferent to the protesting groups within the state—and this has made some of them positively angry.

There's the Sierra Club, which always takes itself seriously, and which is so angry over the prevailing situation, it may file a lawsuit against the AEC. "We're mad, and we're going into court," said Ronald Baxter, Topeka attorney and chairman of the club after word came from Washington that the Senate-House AEC committee had recommended that $3.5 million be authorized to allow the commission to proceed with its plans at Lyons.

The governor says he will fight the AEC's move until, and unless, Kansas scientists find that the procedure is safe. Attorney General Vern Miller says "if we find a basis for a suit, we will file it."

The $3.5 million in the measure expected to be considered by the congressional House at Washington by July 15 is merely an opening wedge. It would permit acquisition of the land, performance of architect-engineering services and accomplishment of detailed design related to construction. The full amount to be asked for the Lyons project is $25 million, which leaves $21.5 million to be appropriated at a later date.

If the AEC attempts to continue its high-handed way regardless of the attitude Kansas might hold against this measure, it will be delaying its own program.

TAX CUTS NEEDED TO BOOST ECONOMY

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the British Government has taken a bold step to help that nation's sluggish economy back on its feet, a step which should be taken for the very same reason right here in the United States.

In line with a voluntary incomes policy announced last week by the Confederation of British Industries to hold price increases over the next year to less than 5 percent, the Government yesterday announced large tax cuts and other incentives to stimulate investment and consumer buying.

This Government could certainly take a lesson from the British. Consumer buying is down, investment spending lags, wholesale prices are rising at a 4.8-percent annual rate with no hint of a slackening in inflation, 53 of the Nation's major labor areas are suffering substantial unemployment, and some 724 smaller labor markets are characterized by substantial or persistent joblessness. Unemployment is still well above 5 percent.

The administration still clings to its so-called economic game plan which when understood simply means that if we wait long enough things may eventually work themselves out.

This is a patently ridiculously and callously harsh approach to our economic ills. While the administration looks months ahead for a hoped-for recovery, millions of Americans and millions more will be without jobs; millions of Americans on fixed incomes are seeing the purchasing power of their dollar erode with every passing week; millions of families are discovering that their periodic increases in take-home pay do not provide extra income because inflation has robbed them. Mr. Speaker, the economy and the people of the Nation can no longer afford the administration the luxury of waiting this matter out. We, the Congress, need to act.

Simple tax legislation is needed; legislation to restore the investment tax credit and lower personal and corporate tax rates. This approach worked in the 1960's and is needed in the 1970's.

THE FLIGHT OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY ABROAD

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my special order, I intend to insert into the RECORD a series of five articles prepared by Mr. Sterling F. Green of the Associated Press appearing in the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa.

Mr. Green has turned the public spotlight on the threat of multinational firms that pack up and leave this country for dollar-greener pastures overseas. He points out in his article that some 230 corporations have migrated to a zone in Mexico 12.5 miles wide and 2,000 miles long from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean.

From this garden patch the Mexican economy reaps a harvest of $50 million worth of products assembled there by American firms. This is a drop in the bucket, however, when you consider the $2 billion worth of American goods being assembled by the 1,200 American firms operating under the same tariff agreement elsewhere throughout the world.

As Mr. Green so properly points out, the total production of oversea subsidiaries of U.S. companies is unknown, but is estimated in the neighborhood of $200 billion. He hits the nail on the head in his observation that if this figure is anywhere near accurate American industry in absentia now rivals Japan as the third greatest economic power in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues take the time to read these articles which point out very explicitly a new and dangerous threat to the American production worker.

The background of world trade is quite simple, and has not changed much in 150 years. The concept generally accepted by economists and those actively engaged in world trade was as follows:

> A number of backward nations, endowed with natural resources but without technology or a skilled labor force, could best build their economies around agriculture or mining. And a number of moderately developed nations could only accommodate themselves to a few rudimentary manufacturing processes, such as basic textiles or metals. Finally, a few advanced nations, endowed with both technology and a skilled labor force, could handle the more complex fabricating processes. The higher wage levels of the advanced nations were protected naturally, by technological and capital strength.
>
> For more than 100 years, this formula for free trade made considerable economic sense and, although many nations refused to accept it in practice, in theory it was hard to refute.
>
> For the past several decades, however, the conditions which gave rise to the theory of comparative advantage have been steadily eroding—until today the world economic picture has been so drastically altered that the theory is almost meaningless.
>
> The main factor which has changed has been the world-wide spread of technology. Although many countries still must be classified as under-developed, technological processes have been so rationalized and refined that almost any country can produce almost anything it wants to—so long as it has the necessary capital.
>
> The unschooled girls of Taiwan can do just as well assembling complex TV components as the high school graduates of New Jersey. The untrained workers of African or Asian nations can be taught to produce complex products, ranging from tiny transistors to giant turbines, as readily as the skilled workers of Pennsylvania or the West Coast. And the depressed inhabitants of the most squalid slums of the Far East can be taught to make specialty steel products just as well as the experienced workers of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months, I have made it a point to visit the steel production facilities of my 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania, where more than 25 percent of the steel is manufactured in this country.

I thought it essential that I personally speak to management and the production workers in order to obtain firsthand information on the impact of foreign imports on our domestic steel industry.

This past Friday, I toured the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. in Pittsburgh, which employs 9,000 workers.

There I had an opportunity to discuss the import problem with the superintendent in charge of production and ascertain recent employment figures and prospects for the future of the plant. He expressed deep concern about the possible loss of 50 percent of their business with one customer on certain bar steel products which the Japanese are offering at $70 to $80 below American prices.

A similar situation exists at the U.S. Steel Irvin Works where 30 to 40 percent of their market for galvanized sheet steel has been captured by foreign competitors. Prices on these products range from 15 to 20 percent under those on the American market.

In the city of McKeesport, I visited the Artcraft Co., which employs 400 to 500 people and processes aluminum and steel. Heretofore they have been relatively immune from the unfair competition of the bandits from abroad. However, in recent months they have become aware of a greater influx of their product from foreign sources, particularly on the West Coast markets.

I also went down to the U.S. Steel National Works at McKeesport where seamless pipe is the principal product. We all know of the Alaskan oil discovery where the pipeline contract involving hundreds of millions of dollars was let to Japan. The steel in this pipe contract, incidentally, was not chargeable to the voluntary quota limitation. The Japanese argued that since American steel producers were not geared to produce a 42-inch pipe at that time, this order should be excluded from their self-imposed restraints.

When I toured the U.S. Steel Homestead Works, I suggested to the superintendent that the forging operation was the largest I had ever seen. He acknowledged it was. But no longer. Japan now has that distinction.

I know as an established fact that 50 percent of Japan's steelmaking capability is 25 years old or younger. We made the money available to the Japanese to produce that capability in restoring them from a devastated nation. The reverse situation exists as far as American technology and ability are concerned. Fifty percent of our industrial capacity and productivity, machinery and everything that is classified with it, is 25 years old or older—just the opposite.

Infant industries in Japan are being encouraged by "no tax" incentives covering the first 4 years. There are allowances for reserves to meet price fluctuations and tax deductions to meet the cost of repairs, water projects, export development, and depreciation incentives.

It is true that Japan is not at war today. It is also true that Japan has the American marketplace in an export-import nightmare. Japan is not running scared over the world as we are, pouring out its substance to people as we are

doing, thus heaping taxes on this and the the next generation which you and I and our children will have to take care of.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the time I reserved run concurrently with the time of this gentleman, since we had planned to work together during the full hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman would have to wait under the established procedure until the gentleman's name is called on his special order.

Mr. DENT. I had asked that the time run concurrently when I asked for the special order last week, because I had a meeting on minimum wage and I knew I would be late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed on his special order?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity at this particular time to defer to my good friend JOHN DENT from Westmoreland County, who has been actively pursuing this subject matter for the last 10 to 12 years.

I have before me an article from Iron Age that quotes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) in uttering his warning last year when he said that GM was contemplating the purchase of 1 million tons of Japanese steel and to negotiate for another million tons in the European market. That was bitterly denied in the news media. However, in a subsequent release on December 30, the position of my good friend, who is such a dedicated man in this field, Congressman DENT, was vindicated. I quote from the New York article:

> Foreign competition is squeezing domestic steel workers and makers in several directions. As evidence of that *Iron Age* points to the recent development of General Motors Corporation buying foreign steel for 1971 production. This on-again off-again rumor is now all too frequent. According to domestic steel officials, there is no information on the tonnage involved except it will be large and perhaps as much as 800,000 tons.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is taking part in this special order. I want to compliment him on his ability to ferret out the truth and to sound the alarm in a time of this Nation's economic distress.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter dated July 9, addressed to me, sent by Mr. Lee R. Muth of Harrisburg, which says:

HARRISBURG, PA., *July 9, 1971.*

Hon. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Hazardous Materials Regulations Board of the Department of Transportation has just issued a proposed rule which would allow foreign gas cylinders to be imported. Until now, the United States has had an unparalleled safety record in the handling of cylinders because of the requirement that tests and analysis as specified be conducted in this Country. The proposed change would remove this barrier that has kept out unsafe foreign cylinders.

Since the selling price of cylinders from Japan and other low labor cost countries is well below the cost to produce cylinders here, the proposed rule will probably mean the end of cylinder manufacturing in the United States. This would mean the loss of as many as five thousand jobs by those employed directly and indirectly in the cylinder manufacturing industry and in supporting industries. I urge you to do everything possible to persuade the Department of Transportation to withdraw this Notice of Proposed Rule Making.

Very truly yours,

LEE R. MUTH.

P.S.—The above letter was also sent to Mr. Alan I. Roberts, Secretary, Hazardous Materials Regulation Board, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

While touring our chemical corporation located in Clairton, Pa., I was informed that there were more shenanigans in the offing by the Japanese to entwine themselves in the American market with particular respect to foreign imports. I asked the gentleman to verify his observations, and he did.

I insert this letter from the Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp. in the RECORD at this point:

PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIAL CHEMICAL CORP., *Clairton, Pa., July 6, 1971.*

Subject: Arkon Resins, Japan.

Arakawa Forest Chemical Industries Ltd., located in Osaka, Japan, has been offering a series of hydrogenated petroleum resins designated "Arkon P-85," "Arkon P-100," "Arkon P-115" and "Arkon P-125." These resins are being promoted primarily in the pressure sensitive and hot melt application areas as replacements for the beta-pinene resins such as our Piccolyte S-grade resins.

Due to the disparity of pricing policy in Japan and quotations given to U.S.A. prospects on Arkon resins, they are "dumping" either to purchase their way into an established industry or moving excess production.

Attached are duplicate copies of the following:

1. A Japanese quotation to a Japanese potential customer in quantity purchase of ten metric tons (22,050 pounds) at a price of 290 yen per kilo which is equivalent to 36.53 U.S.A. cents per pound FOB Japanese plant. Exchange rate used to calculate price is 360 Japanese yen to one U.S.A. dollar.

2. Quotation to U.S.A. prospective customer (E. I. DuPont) depicts 27.50 U.S.A. cents per pound CIF cost New York, but indicates 24.50 U.S.A. cents per pound FOB Kobe, Japan, a Japanese shipping port basis upon which U.S.A. tariff is based.

3. Above mentioned invoices indicate more than a 12.00 U.S.A. cent per pound difference using Japan as a base pricing point for a customer in Japan versus a customer in the U.S.A.

ERNEST A. FLAIG.

ARAKAWA FOREST CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES, LTD., *April 28, 1971.*

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO., INC.,
Wilmington, Del.

QUOTATION

We are pleased to inform you the latest price of the following products:

Description: Arkon P-85, P-100; P-115, P-125.

Price: CIF New York, net: US$0.275 per lb.; US$0.245 per lb., FOB Kobe.

Quantity: Minimum, 1 M/Ton.

Packing: In light gaged galvanized steel drums containing 200 kilos net.

Quality: As per our specification.

Shipment: Prompt against your L/C.

Payment: At sight draft drawn under irrevocable letters of credit to be opened in favor of us.

Destination: New York, U.S.A.

Remarks: Import duty: Tariff code: 405.25; Item: Plastic materials. Tariff rate: ———.

They are dumping for two reasons: First, either to prepare their way into an established chemical market industry as we know it today, or, second, to move their excess production into this country. Regardless of their reasons, they are still doing it. Here is what the Japanese quotation calls for: The Japanese quotation to the potential Japanese customer in quantities of 10 metric tons—22,050 pounds—calls for a price of 290 yen per kilo, or $2.53 U.S. currency f.o.b. Japanese plant. At the exchange rate used to calculate the price, it is 360 Japanese yen equal 1 U.S. dollar. The Japanese quotation to the prospective U.S. customer—and in this instance it was E. I. du Pont—is $27.50 U.S. currency c.i.f. New York. But it indicates $24.50 U.S.A. money in Kobe, Japan. Kobe is a Japanese shipping port. Based upon that the U.S.A. tariff is figured. It is quite obvious the above-mentioned invoices I am speaking of indicate there is over a $12 U.S.A. money per pound differential, using Japan as a base pricing point for a Japanese customer versus a U.S. purchaser.

This brings me to a point which I would like to emphasize for my colleagues. Last week I introduced a bill which would require the U.S. Department of Commerce to change its statistical procedure. Presently, the value of every export item leaving this country includes the c.i.f.—cost, insurance, and freight—or f.a.s.—free alongside ship—computations. The difference between that and f.o.b. is 10 percent. So our Commerce Department figures are misleading, because c.i.f. costs are included in export statistics, but f.o.b. is used for the computation of import statistics. Thus, there is an undeniable 10-percent differential, causing a net loss of $1 billion in our balance of trade as of last month.

We are talking about a 10-percent differential that is included and becomes a part of the statistics upon which we base all our evaluations—monetary value, trade, the health of the country, and so on.

I believe the United States, Canada, and three European countries are the only ones who use this procedure, making a distinction between what we send out of the country—cost, insurance, and freight—and bring into the country—free on board. It does not sound reasonable. It should be thoroughly examined. If five of the 56 major industrialized countries do this, I believe something is amiss; we are not being realistic. We should change with the changing times.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing into the RECORD today a series of five articles prepared by Mr. Sterling F. Green of the Associated Press and appearing in the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa.

Mr. Green has turned the public spot-

light on the trend to multinational firms which pack up and leave the United States for greener—dollar greener—pastures overseas. He points out in his articles today that 230 American corporations have migrated to a spot in Mexico which measures 12½ miles wide and 2,000 miles long.

From this garden patch, the Mexican economy reaps a harvest of $50 million a year from the $150 million worth of products assembled there by American firms. This is a drop in the bucket, however, when you consider the $2 billion worth of American goods being assembled by 1,200 American firms operating under the same tariff agreements elsewhere in the world. As Mr. Green points out, the total production of overseas subsidiaries of U.S. companies is not known but is estimated in the neighborhood of $200 million.

Mr. Green hits the nail on the head in his observation that if this figure is anywhere near accurate, "American industry-in-absentia now rivals Japan as the third greatest economic power in the world."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will take the time to follow this series of articles which points out a new and dangerous threat to the American productive worker.

The articles follow:

MULTI-NATIONAL FIRM TREND SWEEPING U.S. BUSINESS

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—American business is going multi-national with a rush that matches the stampede to "go conglomerate" in the 1960s.

As the corporations go global, they carry American capital, technology and managerial skill to the earth's far corners.

And leave alarm bells ringing back home.

Complaints are piling up that American jobs, and possibly some vital portions of the nation's industrial base for defense and economic stability are going overseas.

Organized labor which formerly carried the banner of free trade has taken alarm at vanishing jobs and shrinking memberships, and has joined some major industries in the drive on Congress for import quotas.

The unions, led by the AFL-CIO, also are bracketing the multinationals in their barrage of criticism, as "runaway employers" who move plants to Europe, the Orient, or the Caribbean where labor is cheaper.

Ironically, competition from imported goods is the main reason many corporations have gone global. They are simply trying to stay competitive with foreign products by becoming importers themselves—of components, of semi-finished goods, or of entire products which come back to the U.S. consumer with only one American part, the brand name.

There are, however, many other reasons why U.S. industry is deploying subsidiaries overseas—to gain growth by reaching new customers, to get behind trade barriers that American exports cannot pierce, to cut costs and improve profits, to compete on even terms with foreign firms in world markets.

For the American consumer these are among the signs of the changing times:

—Dodge Colt, one of the new American "answers" to the small-car imports, is 100 percent made-in-Japan, by Mitsubishi.

—If you buy Ford's Pinto, another of the U.S. industry's answers, you may get a car with an English-made engine and German-made transmission, assembled either in Canada or the United States.

—Ninety per cent of all radio sets, tape recorders and cassettes sold in this country are made abroad. So are more than half the black-and-white **television sets, nearly** one-fourth of all color TV sets, two-thirds of the sewing machines and most of the typewriters.

The very concepts of "exports and imports" and "protectionists vs. free traders" are becoming blurred. Some conglomerates are schizophrenic. They have divisions that want protection, others that favor free trade. One union official, in testimony to Congress on imports, recalled the words of Pogo that "We have met the enemy and them is us."

A major industrialist, Board Chairman Fred J. Borch of General Electric, told The Associated Press:

"I don't know any American manufacturer who would not prefer to make his product in this country for this market."

But in cases where the choice became either going out of business on a product line or "moving offshore," GE and others have gone offshore. That way, Borch estimates, at least half the American employes are kept on the job—designers, engineers, sales force, research and development people and others.

The AFL-CIO industrial unions which once took pride in their liberal free-trade stance—along with the American steel industry, now being jostled for world leadership by Japan—have almost apologetically lined up with such long-time protectionists as the textile and shoe industries.

Their combined push for import quotas in the 91st Congress blocked President Nixon's trade expansion bill by plastering it with import quota amendments, and come within inches of reversing this country's 35-year policy of liberalizing tariff and trade.

Only a major defensive stand organized on a crash basis by the foreign trade community, including the heads of many multinational corporations stopped them.

There will be no trade legislation at all this year. Nixon's supporters dare not push his bill to a vote, they now admit privately, because Congress would turn it into a restrictionist bill curbing imports.

Some day the issue must be faced. In the meantime, the administration is moving in three areas to blunt the quota drive.

—It is pressing for negotiated restrictions by Japan and other countries—"voluntary" quotas which doctrinaire free traders abhor just as much as they deplore quotas imposed by law.

—It has launched a jawboning offensive calling on Europe and Japan to drop their protectionist laws and pick up a fair share of defense costs. Secretary of the Treasury John B. Connally bluntly spelled it out to the International Banking Conference last month when he said Europe's easy assumption that the United States will be willing indefinitely "to bear disproportionate economic costs does not fit the facts of today."

—It is enforcing, promptly and vigorously, for the first time ever as a deliberate policy, long-standing curbs on unfair trade. Such crackdowns as Treasury's March 10 ruling against Japanese TV sets, sold here at far less than the Japanese home price, are considered certain to discourage cut-rate foreign competition at relatively small risk of retaliatory action against American products.

There will be less heat for quotas next year if, as the administration confidently predicts, the economy has picked up steam and unemployment has declined below 6 per cent.

But labor is impatient. The three major unions in the consumer electronic and electrical goods industries have told Congress that more than 50,000 of their members' jobs have disappeared in three years.

"The types of jobs exported are precisely the unskilled and semiskilled jobs needed here if we are to win the war against poverty and provide dignified and gainful employment for our disadvantaged poor," said the unions' joint statement.

President Paul Jennings of the International Union of Electrical Workers, suggested the phenomenon "portends a mass exodus."

"INDUSTRY-IN-ABSENTIA" FINDS HAVEN SOUTH OF BORDER

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—There is a curious new kind of industrial zone in Mexico.

It is 12½ miles wide and 2,000 miles long, stretching the length of the United States border from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific.

It exists to serve a growing exodus of American business from American soil in search of ways to cut costs and compete on better terms, at home and abroad, with cheaper goods from Europe and Japan.

Inside this narrow strip of Mexico territory, U.S. corporations have set up 230 plants. More are coming. The factories take in U.S. materials, turn them into U.S. products, and sell them to U.S. consumers.

Two lures have sent great and small American corporations flocking down Mexico way: cheap labor and a bargain-basement tariff arrangement in both directions.

Mexico waives tariff and taxes on the materials, machinery and parts brought in. The United States, under "Item 807" of the Tariff Code, requires payment of duty only on the value added in Mexico—meaning, in many cases, little more than the cost of low-wage labor.

Mexico beams on the arrangement because it pumps $50 million a year into the Mexican economy, mostly in wages to impoverished peons. American border cities like it, because the workers from Matamoros, Juarez, Nueva Laredo and other Mexican cities spend much of their pay this side of the border.

American corporations like it; the number participating rises every year.

Everybody likes it, in fact, except American workers whose jobs have gone south of the border—and the towns in New England and the Middle West which find themselves with empty factories, rising welfare loads and shrinking tax rolls.

Unions call the arrangement "a tariff loophole you can drive an industry through."

But the Mexican program, at $150 million a year, is small potatoes in the wide, wide world of "offshore processing," less than a tenth of the $2 billion worth of "American" products being assembled, by 1,200 U.S. companies under the same tariff rules from Taiwan to Haiti, from Hong Kong to Italy.

And the total value of the output under Item 807 and related rules is but a small fraction—perhaps one-100th—of the production of the overseas subsidiaries of American companies.

Even the government does not know the real total. The 1970 guess was somewhere around $200 billion.

If so, American industry-in-absentia now rivals Japan as the third greatest economic power in the world, after the United States and Russia.

At the very least, what Sen. Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., has called "concealed exports"—products that are both made and sold abroad by American companies—have reached a volume several times that of goods exported by the United States.

A few examples suffice to illustrate the extent, and the rapid growth, of overseas production for consumption at home and abroad by this country's multinational corporations.

Last year, foreign subsidiaries and affiliates of American companies increased outlays for new plants and equipment by 22 per cent. At home, the increase was 1.2 per cent.

IBM is France's biggest exporter. Ford is among England's biggest employers. The third largest exporters of automobiles from

Europe to the United States is General Motors.

The multinationals pose unprecedented problems for the U.S. and other governments. Does going multinational provide a firm with means for legal avoidance of taxes? Do U.S. antitrust laws still apply? Do the multinationals contribute to monetary crisis by shifting their money from country to country in anticipation of currency revaluations?

These are among the questions confronting President Nixon's new Council on International Economic Policy, and they are problems which far exceed in complexity the old-fashioned arguments between free trade and protection.

There are some of the others:

Will the European Common Market raise further tariff barriers to U.S. exports?

And by its busy writing of preferential trading agreements with the former African colonies will the Market create a new trade bloc?

Would this country be obliged in self-defense to fashion a bloc of its own? And Japan another? Then, with the Communists comprising a fourth, would there be trade warfare among the blocs?

And how can this country take the initiative in new trade negotiations when it cannot even press enactment of President Nixon's trade expansion bill for fear that Congress will transform it into a protectionist statute, as it very nearly did last year?

Free trade supporters, winners of every legislative battle since the early 1930s, hastily organized the Emergency Committees for American Trade and blocked the Nixon bill after protectionists loaded it with import quotas the President didn't want.

In beating back the bill, the free traders pitched their case on the argument that reversal of liberal policies would invite a disastrous, retaliatory trade war.

Speaking for them, Arthur K. Watson, board chairman of the multinational IBM World Trade Corp., told Congress:

"We in this country can trace more than 3 million jobs to exports and this year we will repatriate almost $7 billion to these shores, the earnings of our investments abroad and the royalties the world pays us for the use of our technology."

Sales of U.S. subsidies abroad already exceeded U.S. export sales, Watson added, and contributed 10 times as much to the payments balance as did the surplus of merchandise exports over imports.

These financial facts did not conflict with AFL-CIO testimony in favor of protection; union critics simply did not view the trend as totally beneficial. Exports make jobs in the U.S., they argued, while foreign subsidiaries make jobs overseas.

The IBM executive disputed the complaint.

In general, Watson said, American exports have expanded in high-technology industries, which are the high wages, high profit industries, whereas the great surge in imports has tended to be in the older lower wage and lower technology industries.

"It would be absurd, I believe, to predicate future policy on the idea that we are raising another generation of millhands in America.

"We have not lost jobs nor exported them. The U.S. employment rate in 1959 was 5.5 per cent and today it is less than 4 per cent."

That testimony was in December, 1969. Later, with the unemployment rate hovering around 6 per cent, the "millhands" remark drew a caustic footnote from Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mills wondered aloud whether the country was destined to become a nation of insurance salesmen.

INDUSTRY EXODUS RAISES QUESTIONS ON U.S. SECURITY

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—Does the United States' traditional policy of encouraging free trade weaken the nation's industrial base for defense and economic growth?

That question is being asked insistently by industry and labor alike in complaints to Congress over displacement of U.S. production by imports of increasingly sophisticated products.

And while it is hardly a novel issue in American political debate, the question is being asked in a new and unique atmosphere, complicated by American corporations themselves.

In an attempt to compete on equal terms in the marketplace with cheaper foreign products, American corporations are going multinational—establishing production facilities abroad to capitalize on lower wages and operating costs.

Union spokesmen complain that the multinational corporation also are exporting American technology, much of it acquired at taxpayer expense, through licensing arrangements and joint-venture partnerships with foreign producers. Technology developed with government funds under research and development contracts is "literally peddled abroad" at a fraction of its cost, contends the AFL-CIO, a bitter foe of the multinational movement which it sees as a threat to jobs, and union memberships, at home.

The Nixon administration scoffs at the charge that the country's industrial base is being impaired. A White House aide suggested the idea was "naive." A spokesman for the Commerce Department said U.S. industry might have lost its competitive position in some fields "but not our skills or ability."

The Senate-House Economic Committee has inquired into the issue. It heard from the steel industry, on the verge of losing its world leadership to the Japanese, that some limits are needed on imports of high-capital, high-technology, defense-essential products.

SEES U.S. WEAKENED

American industries could be so weakened as to "critically impair the ability of our own industry to meet national needs in time of national emergency," testified George A. Stinson of the National Steel Corp.

By the time voluntary limits were imposed in 1968, steel imports had reached a record 18 million tons, occupied 13 per cent of the U.S. market, and were consuming virtually the entire normal growth of that market, he said.

If prolonged, such a trend could impair the ability of American producers to continue modernizing and expanding facilities, Stinson said, adding:

"The United States would have to depend largely on foreign steel which might well become unavailable in time of military emergency or during other usual peak periods of demand in the producing countries."

Free trade advocates discount the threat and argue that access to lower cost foreign steel helps to keep other strategic U.S. industries competitive. They claim the steel industry, by price increases which have been criticized by Democratic and Republican presidents, has helped to bring upon itself the import competition it deplores.

MORE IMPORTS HINTED

In fact, when the makers boosted the price of construction types of steel by 12 per cent early in January, the Nixon administration hinted it might allow even greater imports unless the price advance was trimmed.

That struck dismay to the hearts of a particular segment of the steel industry which hadn't even been involved in the price increase—the makers of stainless and other special alloy steels.

An inpouring of special steels at bargain-basement prices already has taken one-fourth of the American market for stainless sheets.

"We are perilously close to pricing ourselves out of world markets," said Edward J. Hanley, board chairman of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, a major producer of special steels.

Hanley's firm and two others filed anti-dumping charges against eight Japanese companies, charging them with selling steel in the United States at prices below the fair market value in Japan. The Treasury began an investigation in March. If the charges are upheld, a special tariff could be levied to equalize the price.

A three-year steel agreement, due to expire Dec. 31, binds European Common Market companies to over-all ceilings on their steel shipments to the United States. In a letter of intent to the secretary of state, Japan also agreed not to change markedly its past pattern of shipments. But it did so.

Japan increased steeply its shipments of higher-cost, higher-profit special steels, which sell for as much as $2,000 a ton, compared with about $160 for basic steels.

"We've been socked right in the eyeballs," said one alloy steel producer. Other countries, not party to any agreement, helped with the socking.

Sweden doubled its U.S. sales of tool steels and now holds 34 per cent of the U.S. market. Imports hold 67 per cent of the stainless wire rod markets against 42 per cent five years ago, and 53 per cent of the stainless wire market, up from 22 per cent in 1966.

"We (the steel industry) believe that from time to time there will arise situations where it will be in the U.S. interest to consider temporary limitations on imports as a possible strategy," Stinson told Congress.

His view is supported by the United Steelworkers, once a pillar of support for free trade. Union Vice President Joseph P. Molony told an emergency meeting of steel management and labor in March that Japan's concentration on specialty steels eliminates the jobs of "six to eight times more steelworkers than (would be displaced) by a comparable ton of imported basic steel."

The U.S. cannot penetrate the protective wall erected by Japan around its own steel industry. "We couldn't sell steel in Japan for a dollar a ton if we gave green stamps to boot," said Molony.

President Nixon's trade bill, long stalled in Congress, would impose duties or other penalties on the products of any country which unjustifiably bars goods from the United States.

Steel industry and labor endorsed that provision, but they have not been supported by their longtime best customers, the auto manufacturers. While stocking up inventories against a possible steel strike this summer, the auto industry bought heavily from Japan and Europe.

And some steelmen haven't been complaining loudly about imports because they too have one foot overseas. One acknowledged: "My company sells iron ore to Japan."

TAIWAN CHECKED

Further, some of the old steel corporations are going multinational in a cautious way. U.S. Steel has done a feasibility study of a mill in Taiwan and is pressing ahead with an ultramodern facility in Venezuela. Armco and Kaiser jointly plan a mill in Australia.

Government officials who are charged with watchdog responsibilities over the industrial base for defense mobilization show no alarm over steel or any other segment of industry.

"I don't believe the industrial base is being dissipated," said Anthony Bertsch, director of the Office of Mobilization Readiness, in the Commerce Department.

"We may have lost our economic competitiveness in some areas of production, but not our skills or ability," he said in an interview.

As for the export of American technology, some industry and government officials see the possibility of future problems in the possible leakage of such technology through the network of multinational corporations, the licensing of foreign firms to make U.S. prod-

ucts, or the entering of joint ventures or mergers with overseas companies.

The White House is more concerned with seeing that the United States stays ahead in developing new technology.

Here, federal facilities such as Bonneville and TVA award 95 per cent of their contracts for power transformers to foreign producers. The agencies are required by law to accept the low bidder; foreign bids run 20 to 30 per cent below those of American manufacturers.

Foreign manufacturers are able to cut prices this low because their own governments permit them to charge twice as much, or more, at home for the same equipment in a market closed to all outside competition. "We could deliver electrical gear in England at far lower prices than British buyers pay, but we don't even know when the orders are being taken," said one American manufacturer.

MULTINATIONALS GAIN STATUS AS WORLD POLITICAL FORCE

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—The United States faces an eventual prospect of being home-base for hundreds of super-companies with higher financial stakes and greater production outside the country than in it.

These are the multinational corporations, American companies which moved production facilities outside the United States in search of cheaper labor and other costs to meet the competition of cheaper foreign goods.

They are flourishing. One authority predicts that by 1988 most of the non-Communist world trade will be dominated by 300 companies, 200 of them American.

They also are posing totally new problems for this and other governments; problems for which the old rules of foreign trade provide no guidelines.

Some experts use the term "supranational"—above or beyond the nation—to describe the sprawling empires.

Did some of the multinationals worsen the dollar crisis in May by shifting overseas funds into marks and other currencies likely to be increased in value?

The Commerce Department says no, the multinationals were "not a major speculative force."

But to find that out, the department had to send questionnaires to 21 multinationals—after the crisis was over and after the dollar had been devalued in relation to the strong European moneys.

The more markets a corporation operates in, the more opportunities it has to buy in low-price countries, sell in high-price countries; to borrow through subsidiaries in low-interest countries, lend to subsidiaries in high-interest countries; to manufacture where wages are low and sell where prices are high; to move cash from weak-currency areas to strong-currency countries.

International buying and selling which once would have been "foreign trade" are often nothing more than intracorporate transfers to the multinationals.

The traditional concept of foreign economic policy similarly is changing. Goods are still exchanged between producing countries, but increasingly the production itself is being internationalized.

Sixty-two of the top 100 American firms have plants in at least six other countries. PepsiCo operates in 114. "We at Ford Motor Co. look at a world map without any boundaries," said Executive Vice President Robert Stevenson.

Unions complain that management bargainers have sometimes held out the threat: "We'll close down the plant and go overseas." Now the unions are talking about creating international bargaining fronts, in alliance with trade unions in other industrial nations.

While problems of outright illegality seldom have surfaced, problems in areas of legal and accepted business procedures are plentiful enough.

The flap over alleged currency speculation makes the point. In reporting that the multinationals did not engage in massive shifting of funds, the Commerce Department concedes that they could have done so. Further it has only their word that they didn't.

21 FIRMS QUESTIONED

The 21 companies queried by the department reported they were holding $400 million worth of liquid assets outside the United States and Canada, mostly in Eurodollars—U.S. dollars on deposit in Europe. Possibly much of it could have been unloaded speculatively. Only one-twentieth of it actually was shifted in the final critical week.

Experts say, however, that the biggest multinationals try to protect themselves, not to speculate. Their subsidiaries abroad obviously acquire large sums in various currencies. Prudence requires that these be held in the stronger currencies to the extent possible, and not in currencies which are in danger of being devalued.

But the ease with which money now flows in private channels between nations can do more than merely affect the money market; it can blunt national policy.

It did so two years ago, when the Nixon administration was trying to keep credit tight in the United States as an anti-inflation measure. Large American banks simply drew home huge sums of dollars from their European branches.

National revenue, here and elsewhere, also is vulnerable. New techniques of avoidance are available to multinationals.

For example, a corporate subsidiary in Country A, where taxes are low, can raise its prices steeply on parts or materials sold to the subsidiary in Country B, where taxes have been increased. The latter subsidiary then might show no taxable profit, or even a tax loss, because of its high costs; the profits are taken in County A, and taxed that country's low rates.

ANTITRUST SEPARATE

Antitrust issues pose still another problem for the United States. Can it prevent an allegedly monopolistic merger, for instance, between a foreign corporation and an overseas subsidiary of an American company? How far can the U.S. antitrust laws reach into the sovereignty of a foreign nation?

It is a ticklish problem for which, so far, there are no answers. Foreign governments have made diplomatic protests from time to time when American-owned firms followed U.S. law instead of the host country's policy—as, for example, by refusing to make sales to Communist countries.

Governments, especially those in less-developed countries, fear loss of control over their own economic policies to American enterprises. Resentment of foreign domination has at times developed into a political issue, particularly in Latin America, leading to government seizures of American plants.

But generally the fear of domination is balanced by fear that any attempt to discipline an American company would send it in search of a friendlier climate. Even in Europe, most countries have considered actions to discourage or restrict U.S. plant investment. So far each has decided that to do so would serve only to retard its own development.

EVEN FRENCH BID

And all of them, even the chip-on-the-shoulder French still bid for U.S. companies with various subsidies including bargain plant sites, tax advantages, special gas and power rates.

The host countries hold some trump cards, too. Few governments are content to let a foreign firm simply set up a plant to assemble foreign-made parts.

To develop its own auto industry, for example, a country is likely to insist that in each year a larger percentage of the automobile, by weight, be home-manufactured. And to improve its own trade and payments balance, the host country is likely to insist that a specified, rising percentage of the output of the U.S.-owned plant be exported.

Small countries are more apprehensive than big ones over the fact that traditional regulations governing foreign trade—tariffs, devaluations and the like—have less effect when goods and money is just being transferred within corporate family networks.

CREDIT FROM ABROAD

Yet even the U.S. has its misgivings, as by Harvard economist Raymond Vernon, who testified before the Senate-House Economic Committee 18 months ago. Dr. Vernon, former director of the Harvard Development Adcisory Service, summarized:

"U.S. Treasury officials view with concern the ease with which some banks can offset the official efforts to tighten credit at home by importing credit from other national money markets.

"Another arm of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue apparatus, is increasingly absorbed in questions of how to determine which affiliate in the multinational system can be construed to have made the profit that has been generated inside the system.

"And while I have not yet seen the signs of its occurring, I rather anticipate that U.S. officials of all sorts will become a trifle uncertain about the primary national affiliation of some large multinational enterprises over the next decade, as the foreign interests of these enterprises begin to match their U.S. commitments in terms of magnitude and executive involvement."

CALLED PEACE FORCE

Industry spokesmen tend to see the multinational as a force for peace because, they argue, it cannot survive in a warring world.

"It must have peace and it must have international cooperation," Eldridge Haynes, president of Business International Corp., told the Joint Economic Committee. "It must have open trade routes . . .

"Now this, I think, is all to the good. It is influencing government policy all over the world."

While there are some exceptions, the overseas earnings experience of American companies has been good; so good, in many cases, as to make even the risk of expropriation or seizure by unfriendly governments a matter of secondary concern.

International Business Machines, Inc., for example, reported record net income last year, but only because a 28.8 per cent increase in its foreign earnings more than offset a 5.8 per cent decrease in its net income at home.

APPROACH LIKENED TO MARSHALL PLAN

(By Sterling F. Green)

WASHINGTON.—Aware that the United States has reached a crossroads in foreign economic policy, the Nixon administration soon will propose global negotiations to write new rules for world trade.

To cope with a deteriorating trade position, the threat of economic warfare among rival trading blocs, and rising protectionist sentiment at home, the White House is planning an initiative which it likens in scope to the Marshall Plan that followed World War II.

It is determined to pry open European and Japanese markets closed to American products. These barriers are widely regarded as contributing to the declining U.S. balance of payments, and to encouraging the rush of American corporations to go multinational. Harassed at home by cut-rate prices on foreign products, and facing limited markets abroad. American corporations are moving

production facilities to foreign shores where they too can get the low wages, tax benefits and favorable tariff arrangements available to their competitors.

RIVALS JAPAN

The exodus has reached such proportions that American industry-in-absentia now rivals Japan as the world's third greatest economic power.

As the United States moves to deal with the decline in its exports, the multinationals pose two complications: Sales of U.S. subsidiaries abroad already contribute 10 times more to the payments balance than the surplus of goods exported over those imported; the foreign facilities of multinationals are sitting ducks for retaliation by any country that deems its trade injured by U.S. actions.

Fully aware of the problem, the Nixon administration nonetheless is determined on tough bargaining.

"I no longer see any excuse for our not having fully reciprocal access to markets," said President Nixon's top foreign economic adviser, Peter G. Peterson, in an interview.

"It is time to revive the tradition of the tough Yankee trader."

FOUR-WAY APPROACH

Basically, President Nixon is seeking "a strategy to insure American competitiveness and leadership over the next two decades," Peterson said. It would involve measures designed to:

(1) support a continuously advancing industrial technology, (2) assure long-term access to raw materials and clean energy sources, (3) develop new relationships between the government and industry to foster exports, and (4) restore a steady rise in productivity.

The planned presidential statement on foreign economic policy can be expected, said Peterson, "within the next few months."

Nixon signified his concern over the trade outlook, and the possibility of competition between blocs, by establishing in January the Council on International Economic Policy with Peterson as executive director.

The decline in American trade competitiveness, attributed by many to persistent inflation and blamed by some for the European "dollar crisis" in May, stirred deep concern within the administration.

Officials are impressed at the astonishing speed of the reversal in U.S. exports—from a $9.5 billion surplus in merchandise trade three years ago to last year's $2.7 billion, most of which represented government-financed shipments.

DEFICIT RETURNS

A real blow came in April when the United States ran an actual trade deficit, the first in two years.

The administration has sent up clear signals that it would welcome initiatives from abroad—meaning voluntary trade concessions—to hold back the tide of protectionism in this country.

Nixon's State of the World address in February noted that Congress in 1970 came perilously close to committing the country to protectionism, and said:

"Other countries can no longer proceed on the facile assumption that no matter what policies they pursue, liberal trade policies in the United States can be taken for granted."

Nixon contributed to his own legislative dilemma when he agreed to quotas for textiles. Protectionists promptly added quotas on shoes, and an amendment saddling the President with the authority, and responsibility, for coming to the aid of other industries threatened by foreign competition.

With the help of a hastily-organized bloc of free traders, Congress blocked action on the bill.

In approving quotas to help the depressed textile industry, Nixon apparently hoped the Japanese would be pressured into accepting "voluntary" curbs on its exports. The Japanese refused, claiming they supplied only 1.3 per cent of the textiles consumed in this country.

QUARREL BUILDS UP

Japan's absolute barriers to many American products in the past have angered American industries and unions. So the U.S.-Japanese quarrel has escalated.

While the cold statistics of weakened trade competitiveness have convinced both free traders and protectionists of the urgency of the problem, it may be a year before White House strategy is fully charted.

Some essential studies have only been begun. And even if plans were ready, the time seems inopportune both here and abroad.

The mood of Congress, say White House aides, is such that they dare not revive the trade bill. It probably would be converted overnight into a protectionist law reversing the liberal trade policy under which American commerce has flourished until recently, for a third of a century.

And Europe's mood of the moment is not conciliatory. There is resentment at the United States over the dollar crisis, which added currency complications to the Common Market's difficult internal negotiations over the entry of Britain. Europe also accuses the U.S. of exporting its inflation to Europe along with the oversupply of dollars.

DUMPING TARGET

Meantime, the administration has stepped up enforcement of anti-dumping laws which permit imposition of extra tariffs on goods sold here at less than the price charged in the manufacturer's home country. It also has considered wheeling up the seldom-used countervailing duty law permitting extra tariffs on cut-rate imports if the foreign government subsidizes the manufacturers.

The anti-dumping act is better known and oftener used, but American industry has had little use for it, finding that success was infrequent, legal costs high, relief tardy. Treasury investigations can and have taken three years, as in the case of last March's ruling that Japanese companies had sold huge numbers of television sets in this country at dumping prices.

"You could lose an industry during the investigation," the AFL–CIO has complained. "The patient dies while the diagnosis goes on."

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the economy is in very serious trouble. The number of people unemployed increased 1.1 million in June, pushing the total number of jobless to 5.5 million—the highest figure in 10 years. One of the industries hardest hit by the current economic recession is the steel industry.

The flood of foreign-produced steel imported into the United States in recent years is a major cause of the steel industry's problems. The amount of foreign steel imports has reached such alarming proportions that it now threatens to undermine the domestic steel industry. For example, more than one-fifth of this country's speciality steel and stainless steel market is controlled by foreign manufacturers, particularly those of Japan, Sweden, and the Common Market countries. Foreign-produced steel is estimated to total 16 million tons in 1971, or 17 percent of domestic consumption.

The disastrous consequences of a policy that permits excessive quantities of foreign-produced steel to enter the United States manifested itself in the recent closing of the United States Steel Corp.'s Ohio Works plant in my home city of Youngstown, Ohio. The shutdown of the Ohio Works plant has resulted in the layoffs of 2,700 steelworkers and several hundred more maintenance, clerical, and management personnel.

These layoffs will have a multiplier effect: unemployed people have less money to purchase the goods and services of other businesses in the Youngstown area. Already some shopowners are denying credit to furloughed steelworkers and their families. Unless the United States Steel Ohio Works reopens soon, unemployment benefits will run out and proud, hard-working men may be forced to go on welfare. Such a state of affairs must not be allowed to happen.

Largely due to the direct, personal efforts of House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS, the steelworkers of the Ohio Works plant in Youngstown are not without hope. Congressman MILLS has done more than any one man in the Government to persuade the representatives of foreign nations to voluntarily limit their steel exports to our country. He deserves the gratitude of everyone connected with the steel industry.

However, in view of what has transpired in my own congressional district, I believe that legislative action is necessary to prevent further steel plant closings in Youngstown and throughout the country.

Last week, I introduced a bill to limit the amount of foreign-produced carbon and specialty steel mill products and other steel products which may enter the United States each year. I do not believe America can afford to wait any longer for the voluntary steel import quota negotiations to produce results. The time has come for Congress to limit foreign steel imports by law. The time has come to put American workers and American industry first.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker. First let me congratulate my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others who participate here for their capable leadership in the very important field. I am glad to join their efforts for corrective action. Again I rise to speak on the distressing subject of the impact of imports on the people of Florida, and especially about its impact on the residents of the First Congressional District of the State which I represent.

Florida is a remarkably versatile State in the production of goods. In fruits and vegetables, seafood, and manufactures,

Florida's production makes an important contribution to the economic growth of the Nation. In each of these areas of our economic activity, mounting imports are threatening to disrupt markets, depress prices, and impair our State's potential for full employment.

Let me illustrate this disturbing fact with some specifics.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Florida is a leading State in the production of vegetables. Our commercial production of vegetables for fresh market of about 2 million tons per year exceeds that of the entire North Atlantic States, or the North Central States, the South Central States, or the Western States, excluding California. The farm value of Florida's output of fresh vegetables exceeds $200 million per year. Our principal production is of lima and snap beans, cabbage, celery, cucumbers, eggplant, escarole, green peppers, spinach, and tomatoes.

Florida is, of course, the Nation's leading producer of citrus fruits. The State is also a leader in the output of cantaloups and watermelons, and avocados. The citrus crop has a market value in excess of $500 million. The melons are valued at about $20 million; the avocados at about $4 million.

There are about 120,000 persons who earn their livelihood on Florida's farms. More than 10 percent of the State's farms and farm owners and operatives are located in the First Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

From these data, I think it clear that both Florida and my district have an important stake in the stability of the Nation's markets for fruits and vegetables. Foreign trade trends in fruits and vegetables are of fundamental importance to Florida's producers of fruits and vegetables.

FOREIGN TRADE TRENDS IN FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

In 1958 the United States had a favorable trade balance in fruits and nuts: exports of $270 million and imports of $178 million. By 1965 this favorable balance of $92 million was completely erased: exports and imports of fruits and nuts were each valued at $339 million. In 1970 we had an unfavorable balance of trade in fruits and nuts in excess of one-half billion dollars: imports of $735.2 million and exports of $219.9 million. Our imports increased by 313 percent while our exports declined by 19 percent between 1958 and 1970.

The story on vegetables is quite similar. A favorable trade balance of $25 million in 1958—exports of $122 million, imports of $97 million—was cut down to $9 million in 1965—exports of $148 million; imports of $139 million. In 1970 we had an unfavorable balance of trade in vegetables of $110 million: imports of $288.7 million and exports of $178.5 million. Imports increased by 198 percent, while exports rose only 46 percent between 1958 and 1970.

Imports of fruits and vegetables directly competitive with Florida's principal products have reached a very substantial level:

	1970 quantity (thousands of pounds)	1970 value (in thousands)
Watermelons	119,116	$3,035
Cantaloupes	148,803	8,037
Other melons	33,578	1,427
Subtotal	301,497	12,499
Citrus fruit	179,924	24,739
Beans, fresh	12,523	1,733
Cabbage	7,727	463
Celery	1,702	110
Cucumbers	143,306	12,330
Eggplant	16,906	1,985
Peppers, fresh	69,910	12,759
Tomatoes	646,725	95,832
Subtotal	1,078,723	149,951
Total	1,380,220	162,450

In these products of direct and immediate concern to the fruit and vegetable producers of Florida, imports were received in 1970 at an average rate 89 percent by quantity and 150 percent by value above 1965. These imported fruits and vegetables accounted for the following percentages of domestic production: watermelons 6 percent, cantaloups 10 percent, other melons 13 percent, citrus fruit 4 percent, cucumbers 15 percent, eggplant 43 percent, fresh peppers 24 percent, and tomatoes 25 percent. The farm products which are of greatest importance to my district have been affected by particularly rapid increase in imports between 1965 and 1970. The value of imports of watermelons increased 129 percent, cucumbers 134 percent, tomatoes 220 percent, eggplant 484 percent, and green peppers 502 percent.

The products listed in the above tabulation had a foreign origin value of $162.5 million in 1970. With freight, insurance, duty, and importer's markup, these foreign fruits and vegetables were worth roughly $350 million in the U.S. market—equal to about one-third the value of Florida's fruit and vegetable crop. This degree of import penetration of the U.S. market is alarming, and the implications for the welfare of Florida's workers very disturbing.

CATTLE

Florida is an important cattle-producing State, a fact which is not often recognized. The total quantity of livestock on farms in Florida is greater than in any of the other South Atlantic States; indeed, Florida raises more livestock than some of the Western States which are traditionally thought of as leading cattle States, such as Idaho, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Imports of live cattle and of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, or pork, therefore, have a direct impact on the economy of Florida and of my district. In 1965, the total value of live cattle and of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, or pork, imported into to the United States was $321 million. By 1970, this had increased to $732 million, an increase of 128 percent during the period.

In 1969, imports of all meat were equivalent in quantity to 6 percent of domestic production. The import share was equivalent to 7.6 percent for beef. The import quota system established by legislation in 1962 has not regulated imports as intended by the Congress because of the execssive generosity of the State Department in negotiating bilateral agreements with meat-exporting nations which the President then substitutes for the mandatory quota contemplated by the statute.

SEAFOOD

Florida has nearly 3,000 operators and employees engaged in commercial fishing operations—more than any other State in the Union except California and Massachusetts. Nearly 200 million pounds of fish are caught annually by Florida's commercial fishermen, with an ex vessel value of more than $40 million. These fishing boat captains and their small crews are among the most rugged of that fast-disappearing breed of stalwart Americans, the independent individualist who pits his courage and skill against the challenges of nature to produce food for his fellow Americans.

The principal catch from the point of view of value is shrimp, and by a misfortune which many Congressmen have sought to correct, shrimp caught by foreign fishermen are imported into the United States in rapidly rising volume absolutely duty free. It would seem that those least able to battle cheap foreign products in American markets because of the limited financial resources of the small independent shrimp boat owner-captain are given the least assistance from their Government in means of import regulation.

Imports of fresh or frozen shrimp in 1955 totaled 54 million pounds, valued at about $25 million. In 1970, fresh and frozen shrimp imports reached 140 million pounds, valued at $136.5 million, up from 1955 by 159 percent in quantity and 446 percent in value.

While imports were soaring by these staggering amounts, the domestic catch of shrimp also increased but at a much lower rate, rising from 122 million pounds, heads-off basis, in 1955 to 224 million pounds in 1970. The imports are taking a disproportionate share of the growth in the domestic market.

On the border of my district, the important shrimp port of Apalachicola struggles with this unending market disruption caused by the ever-rising flood of shrimp imports. It is a matter of concern to the Nation, to Florida, and specifically to my district. The Government has deliberately handed the U.S. shrimp market to foreign commercial fishermen, and turns its back on our own people. Look deeply into the plight of America's commercial fishermen and you will find unfair foreign competition at the bottom of it all. Small wonder that in the Nation the number of persons employed in fisheries has declined steadily, from 263,000 in 1950 to 217,000 in 1968. The number of fishing craft has also plunged downward, from 92,000 in 1950 to 81,000 in 1968.

MANUFACTURES

The largest group of Florida's citizens engaged in the production of goods consists of the approximately 326,000 persons employed in manufacturing establishments. Some 20,000 of these live and work in the First Congressional District. Manufacturing payrolls total more than

$2.25 billion annually in Florida, and nearly $225 million of this takes place in the First Congressional District.

One of the principal industries in my district is the production of manmade fibers. The world's largest nylon plant is located in Pensacola, and nearby a separate plant is engaged in producing acrylic fiber. Thus, the First Congressional District of Florida—and the State—have a direct stake in the textile import problem. The failure of the executive branch to solve the manmade fiber textile import problem is especially ominous in its implications for my State and district.

A few facts will suffice to put this problem into perspective. When imports of cotton textiles reached about 5.4 percent of domestic consumption, President Kennedy instructed the State Department to negotiate an international agreement providing for the regulation of the rate of increase of cotton textile imports. Other nations were told that if the United States could not achieve a negotiated solution of the problem, the President was prepared to act unilaterally. The Short-Term and Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangements were quickly drawn up and with the consent of the nations principally affected, put into force.

The problem is much more serious now for manmade fiber textiles, but no action seems forthcoming from the executive branch. I believe that the Congress should legislate an appropriate set of import controls. We should not delay any longer waiting on the Executive to achieve a solution to the problem.

How grave is the problem? Well, for the year 1970, imports of manmade fibers, filaments, yarn, fabric, and apparel, on a pound-equivalent basis, were equal to 11.2 percent of domestic consumption of manmade fibers—nearly two and a half times the degree of import penetration that existed when President Kennedy properly and forthrightly moved into action on the cotton textile problem.

The rate of increase in imports of manmade fiber textiles is astounding. On a square-yard-equivalent basis, imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel of manmade fiber in 1961, just 10 years ago, totaled 151 million square yards. In 1970, the figure had rocketed to 2.8 billion equivalent square yards. During the first quarter of 1971, imports zoomed still higher, reaching the equivalent of 4 billion square yards on an annual basis. This is three and a half times the volume of imports of cotton textiles and 40 times the volume of imports of wool textiles. It is ironic that we have an international accord on the limitation of imports of cotton textiles but no agreement for the regulation of imports of manmade fiber textiles.

The products of the plants in my State and district are now right on target for market disruption, depressed prices, and job curtailment caused by unregulated import increases. There is absolutely no logic to a situation which finds our Government permitting ever more rapid increases in imports, the dismantling of such limited regulatory means for imports as existing duty rates provide, and the saturation of domestic supply with imports in clear excess of the capacity of the American market to absorb the supply.

The tremendous investment of capital which created the man-made fiber plants in my district, and the thousands of jobs which my constituents have been provided in these plants, are threatened: first, by the skyrocketing imports of manmade fiber textiles which have been stimulated by the deep reductions in duty improvidently granted by the executive branch in the Kennedy round, and second, by the inability of the Nixon administration to achieve an international accord with respect to manmade fiber textiles. President Kennedy manifested his determination to act unilaterally under the national security provision of the trade agreements legislation in the context of a comprehensive case which had been brought by the combined textile industry under that provision. But manmade fibers still are left out in the cold.

The case is still pending; President Nixon has at his finger tips the power to act unilaterally or, alternatively, by manifesting his determination to increase his efforts to persuade our trading partners to enter into meaningful negotiations for a limitation on manmade fiber textile imports. Since President Nixon came into power, the volume of manmade fiber textile imports has more than doubled. Every month's delay builds a massive volume of imports into the domestic market and escalates the difficulty of achieving any meaningful solution by negotiated action.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, American citizens engaged in the production of the wealth of our Nation in the form of agricultural, fishery, and manufacturing products are being acutely and adversely affected by the increase in imports of products of every name and description which compete with them. Our citizens, whether they be stockholders, management, or workers, must not be ignored by the leadership of our Government. Some in the executive department even appear to give greater weight to the accommodation of the avaricious appetite of foreign manufacturers which are capturing the American market than to the legitimate interests of our own home industries.

The Congress has vacillated—and I regret that I must use that word—in a series of inconclusive efforts to cope with the problem. I believe that the majority of the Members of this body favor forthright, determined, and decisive action through legislation to reassert equitable and sensible means for controlling the volume of imports in a manner consistent with the best interests of the American citizens. The leadership has gravely disappointed me and other Members by failing thus far to bring legislation to the floor of the House for action in this session of Congress. I hope this need will soon be corrected.

If we value the strength of our Nation and the pride and integrity of the working men and women of this Nation, we must without further delay formulate and enact legislation which will protect their jobs and their investment in American productive enterprise against destruction by foreign producers.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his most appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding and take this opportunity to congratulate him and the other Members who are here participating in this most important discussion.

It was my good fortune to be in the company of Mr. GAYDOS and our colleague, Mr. DENT, and the other Members of the Pennsylvania delegation last week when we saw a vivid portrayal of just what the gentleman is talking about; namely, a comparison between the new steel mills that are being built in Japan, which are flooding the American market with their products, and our producing mills.

Unless something is done, the great steel industry of the United States which has been one of the cornerstones upon which our economy is built will actually fall.

I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that I thank him for taking this time when the discussions are being held between management and labor with reference to the settlement of the differences that exist between those two and at a time when they looked forward to the next several years in the steel industry, unless there is a recognition on both sides of this important factor of imports, regardless of what the settlement is, unemployment in this country, as bad as it is in the steel industry, will increase by leaps and bounds.

Not too long ago, as an example, when th Japanese are supposed to only be getting rid of their surplus, according to people in the State Department, there appeared an ad in a number of our popular magazines of rototillers being manufactured in Japan. Very frankly, you can go to Japan and you can look at that country from one end to the other and you will find absolutely no rototillers at all. They are being built and produced to capture the American market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) has expired.

FOREIGN IMPORTS CONTINUE TO HURT AMERICAN INDUSTRY

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

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I may complete my statement which I was making on the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS)?

Mr. DENT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) because ever since JOHN DENT has been a Member of this Congress he has been one of those outspoken individuals who has been crying to have protection of this great industry and to solve the problems with reference to the importation of foreign-made products. It is only because there are men like him in the Congress that we are ever going to solve this problem.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. DENT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. I dislike very much to interrupt the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) before he has started his special order, but in my experience I know that he has had a very sincere approach to this problem.

I would like to conclude my remarks in this manner. I believe that the myth should be dispelled—and I am sure my friend in the well agrees with me—that wages are not the culprit, the high wages in the United States, as to the reason why we are not competitive. I think that is wrong. I think the facts will show that we have other elements, far more important elements, such as the entire approach to the problem and the economic situation we are experiencing as Japan has devised its assault upon the international market. That means longterm credit arrangements for industry. They have the weak to feed the strong. We cannot do that in this country because of antitrust legislation. There are also rebates on certain types of operations, a concept that is relatively new in the economic world which Japan has devised, is implementing and putting into effect. Those are the real culprits and not the difference in wages.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me.

Mr. DENT. I certainly do.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS), my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and others for taking this time today to discuss this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a free trader all my life, and little did I suspect that I would stand up here shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) when he expresses his concern about the steel industry.

However, I will say to the gentleman that I have lost my radio industry in my district and thousands of jobs went down the drain. We have lost the television manufacturing business also. I saw my textile industry in my State lose 60,000 jobs in this decade.

I saw my shipbuilding business vanish, I saw my airplane business disappear, and I do not want to see the steel and automobile business disappear. So I am going to study very seriously what is said by you Members on this subject today, because I believe that, as leaders of the Government, we should be alert and keep our eyes open and respond to protecting our American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this has been a long, hard decade for the American people. It was during this past decade that we have all rested, sat idly by and watched this Nation's economy be dissipated, either by the actions of this Congress or the lack of action on the part of the administrative officials of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to put into the RECORD at this time some of the statistical facts as well as some of the logic because this has to do with the serious problem of the unprecedented flood of imports of foreign-made products into our country.

In the first place, contrary to the figures fed to the American people by the Department of Commerce and the State Department and the White House, I have a report that concerned a study of 110 industries in the United States which shows a deficit of $13,321,000,000 in the trade deficit in 1969.

It has been said that these figures are not factual. Mr. Speaker, this is a computerized study made by an independent agency that had nothing to do with the political situations that we have found ourselves in.

The breakdown shows that, of every industry in the United States that indulges in exports and imports that we have a deficit.

For instance, the passenger car deficit; in that particular field alone there is a deficit of $3,232,000. But that is not the real deficit. That is the deficit in money. The real deficit that is killing the economy of this country and strangling this Nation and its growth, and causing the highest taxes to be assessed against the people in these United States in order to maintain a somewhere near minimal way of life for the unemployed and for those lesser blessed citizens of our Nation, is the deficit in the product import. For instance, it shows a little item here, an item of $14 million worth of electric safety razors that have been imported. But the point is that an electric razor enters the country at a price of $7.16, and yet when we export an electric razor it enters a foreign country at a price of $22.40, which makes it so that twice as many, and almost three times as many workmen have been displaced by less money.

So the real facts in this case are that we have got to get away from the so-called balance of payments as a criteria, as to the health of our international trade, and get back to the criteria of jobs displaced; get back to the criteria of hours worked; and get back to the criteria of products displaced in this country.

Throughout this entire study you can find the product line that applies in your particular district.

Another important item that ought to be recognized is the so-called industry lost jobs in the key industries of America. For instance, let us just take a little, wee rundown in the sugar industry by which, because of our quota system of limiting sugar production in the United States and subsidizing foreign sugar coming into this country, we lost 10,029 jobs.

In the leather, glove, and mitten industry we lost 40 percent of the total employment in that industry in 1968 through 1969, and that loss has been added to in 1970 and 1971.

The change of imports in that particular industry shows that in 1968, 30.1 percent of the entire glove and mitten consumption in the United States was imported. The change of imports from 1964 to 1968 shows an increase of 20 percent.

In another area, in the particular type of work that requires the highest skills in the production of its products, we find a change in the 1968 ratio of imports to be 95.3 percent of the total consumption in the United States.

We find a change in 1968 on the ratio of imports to be 95.3 percent of the total consumption in the United States—only seven-tenths of 1 percent of this product is produced within the United States any more.

The change of imports from 1964 to 1968 was 109.7 percent.

The job loss was 223.7 percent—the job loss in 1968—between 1968 and 1969.

You could go on through this whole list, and it was a computerized study that defies any criticism of the facts as they are found here.

Let us see what is imported into this country. I intend to take a few minutes so that some of you who are here, and those who are absent—and in the absence of our colleagues reminds me of the breakup of the Roman Empire—when Nero fiddled while Rome burned—and Members of Congress do not have the time to listen to the burning of the American empire—and it is dying just as fast as the Romans died and perhaps a more grievous death because we have more to lose, and we are losing by our own hand. The disease we are suffering from is self-inflicted. It is not put on to us by any foreign power. It is the action of this Congress of the United States and of the executive branch of the Government that has spread this poison into the bloodstream of the American economy and there is nowhere it can go but to its death. It will die. Everything I predicted in the past 12 years has come to pass and it has come to pass even in a more terrifying way and worse than I had even dreamed it to be.

In the industry of vitreous china utensils, we find in 1968 the ratio of imports to the domestic market was 52.6 percent. That was in 1968. That figure has now reached 76 percent of the American market.

That means that 76 percent of all the men and women working in that industry and 76 percent of the service people who tended to that industry are no longer working in this country.

Do you want to know where the unemployment is? The unemployment in this country—or rather the employment has been shipped overseas in exchange

for yens, marks and for a few rubles and things.

In textile goods 51.2 percent of the entire market of the United States.

400,000 jobs were lost in the textile industry and 1,100,000 jobs have been lost in industries that provided the services and the raw material for that industry.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there will soon be another edition of the foreign handout bill before the House of Representatives and there will be an opportunity at that time for Members to offer amendments that can have some effect—and I say some effect upon the situation that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has alluded to so often and so well on the floor of the House.

It seems to me that now of all times we ought to, in the consideration by the House of the socalled foreign assistance bill, probe it deeply for opportunities to shut off the flow of money to countries that are subscribing to the very things the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his contribution.

The gentleman well knows the reference to that. I cannot see that the Congress would have that opportunity because it is not the custom for the Committee on Ways and Means to come before this floor and give the Members an opportunity to offer amendments. The legislation we are discussing will come out under a closed rule and we will be asked to vote it up or down. They will take maybe the textile industry and give it some relief. Maybe they will take the shoe industry and give it some relief and they will maybe take the fur coat industry and give it some relief. Then they will get the votes to pass that and let the rest of industry that does not have a powerful voice in the committee die. You know it and I know it. You know that and I know it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

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

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman says about the Ways and Means Committee, of course, is true. I was alluding to the Foreign Affairs Committee and the bill that will be coming in the next week or so from that committee dealing with foreign aid.

Mr. DENT. It might interest the gentleman also to know on that score that in 1961 I was successful in offering an amendment to the foreign aid bill that limited to 10 percent the amount of product that any plant rehabilitated, rebuilt, or reconstructed with foreign-aid money—only 10 percent of its products could ever be imported into the United States.

The bill went to the Senate, and they amended it to 20 percent.

The State Department of the United States has never once implemented that law, has never looked at the percentage of imports, has never questioned the imports.

Mr. Speaker, in any other country of the world every person in its State Department that had handled the administration of such a bill would have been indicated. But not in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I recall the gentleman's amendment, and I commend him for having offered it, and I regret as much as any Member of the House that the United States never availed itself of the opportunity to protect the people of this country.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman remembers the hearings held by my subcommittee in 1961. At that time the President named a counterpart committee in order to have an answer to those facts which we were discussing in our arguments. As chairman of that committee he named a man who was the president of Inland Steel, Chicago, Ill., a man named Randall. At that time he appeared, testified, and said that anything we had to say about trade was not correct, that this Nation had to have trade to survive, that we sold more than we bought, and that the way to peace in the world was through international trade and the exchange of goods.

Let us see what he might be saying today. Today I read in the New York Times where Inland Steel has suspended operation of several facilities in its East Chicago steel mill and has laid off additional employees due to declining demand for steel products.

We are using more steel products every day of our lives in this period of our lives than we ever used in our lifetime. Yesterday he laid off 650 workers, workers who will no longer be able to find a job in the steel industry. A week earlier he laid off 100 employees. This is the Randall who said, "We have nothing to fear."

United States Steel testified to the same position.

Now, tonight, we have invited all the Members of the Congress to come and see a display prepared by United States Steel that now says that unless we get relief in the steel industry, the steel industry of the United States may still go the way of all flesh. And it is no small, laughing, or matter to be ignored, because in 1961 we had testimony from the specialty tool industry. They warned that within 10 years unless we did something about the importation of specialty steels in this country, we would find ourselves in a serious strait in employment, production, and the ability to stay alive.

What has happened? In 10 years 71 percent of the specialty steel business, stainless steel rods, has gone over to the Japanese and West Germans. Every specialty steel industry in the United States is now working on borrowed money. Stocks have dropped from $36 to $44 limitations down to $7, $8, and $9. Forty percent of their employees are laid off. Twenty-five percent of their official executive family have been let out. Every executive in Latrobe Steel has had to take a pay cut.

I say to you Members of Congress who are here that you had better prod your fellow Members, because no nation on the face of the earth can survive in peacetime, nor can any nation win in wartime, without a specialty steel industry. It is the one basic industry of all, because without a specialty steel industry you cannot make this watch, you cannot make this suit, you cannot make this microphone, you cannot make anything you can see or anything that you can feel without a specialty tool industry.

The Japanese themselves admit that the reason they lost the war was because they ran out of steam and product in their specialty tool industry. They have taken our tool industry right out from under us, with the permission, with the cooperation, and with the urging of the U.S. State Department and the White House under many administrations.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is most important at this time that the gentleman from Pennsylvania at least give us a quick rundown as to what he discovered personally when he visited Midland Steel and Crucible Steel and what he found in the specialty steel industry as to what they lacked and what their dire predictions are.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was going to lead into that. Here is what happened as reported in one of the magazines lately. There is a picture of Kinzo Haga, a young Japanese. He said, "I sell Japanese steel." I am sure every other Member had an opportunity to look at it because it came free to our desks as many magazines do. I will not read more than a few paragraphs. He said:

> So lower prices along with high quality of course which we produce is the one significant selling point for we Japanese. The customer has to have something to offset the inconvenience of time and distance and the savings on price is really all we have to offer.

The Japanese make the price advantage even more appealing for buyers by specifying prices at the time the contract is signed. The U.S. prices, on the other hand, are specified effective at the time of delivery. So when we sign contracts with the Japanese, they get the price they sign for at that moment—but they can do that because they cannot strike and they cannot get a pay raise between the granting of the order and the delivery of the steel.

And our free labor has practiced stupidity to its finest perfection. They complain about the jobs and they come in for all kinds of reasons, and as chairman of the committee that handles welfare and pensions in this House and also the minimum wage, I am faced with the dilemma of increasing the so-called cost of production by adding fringe benefits and also increasing the minimum wage while at the same time, up until just a few days or few weeks or few months ago, not one member of organized labor came along to hold my hand and try to help me during these 11 or 12 years of my lonely fight.

The year 1975 is the target date of the Japanese for becoming the largest steelmaking country in the world. What does that mean? Today they are No. 3. They produce 111 million tons,

60 percent of which they have to sell outside of Japan. They are increasing their productivity to the point where they will top the United States and also Russia, which is No. 2. At the same time the only way they can dispose of the steel is through export—and Uncle Sucker will be the buyer.

But the United States is going to run out of money one of these days. Every time we take a steelworker out of his job, we also take out three other people from income earnings, including the barber and the baker and the shoemaker and the candlestick maker, as well as the automobile worker and the glassworker and Members of Congress. Every person is affected. Pretty soon those service people who seem to be sound asleep while Nero fiddles and Rome is burning will find out they do not have any Japanese customers coming to get their hair cut. They will not have the West Germans or the French or the Italians coming in to get their shoes fixed or to buy a suit of clothes from the haberdasher. Those people do not go into the American restaurants.

So who is going to keep this economy going? We have been paying out billions of dollars in welfare checks, but where are the welfare checks going to stem from? Somebody has to work. There is not one single ingredient in this economy or in any other industrial economy which is more important than a job. I am from a family of 12, and I started work when I was 13 years of age, and I have been working ever since.

I am amazed at the number of young people today who cannot find even part-time work, and they want to work, and I am amazed at the number of men who have become so sick of looking for work that they are satisfied to stay home and draw welfare checks.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the statement he is making here on the floor of the House this afternoon.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) has been the No. 1 Member of this Congress who has been fighting over the years on just what he complains about; that is, the shadow that hangs over the steel industry in America.

There are three major steel mills in my congressional district—the U.S., the Inland, the Youngstown—and several specialty steel materials factories.

What the gentleman states regarding the importation of steel from Japan and other nations is correct. Today that probably is the greatest threat to the American economy that faces us for the future, because steel is our basic industry throughout the country, and not just in Indiana, Pennsylvania, California, and other places.

Why does the Congress and the State Department do this? I say "the Congress" because, as a member of the Rules Committee, about every time the Ways and Means Committee comes in before the Rules Committee I try to find out what is being done regarding placing some kind of a barrier against the wholesale importation of steel made by cheap labor across the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The gentleman's statement today should be put into the newspapers throughout the country, to bring public opinion to concentrate on using pressure on the Congress, on the Ways and Means Committee, on the State Department, and on the executive department to save this great industry.

I commend the gentleman for the great statement he is making.

Mr. DENT. I thank my colleague.

I should like to give a couple of figures. I want to dispel some of the very false propaganda and information fed to Members of Congress by our own State Department, by our own Commerce Department, and by the best organized and the best financed free trade lobby the world has ever seen.

They say we are not correct in saying that our labor still outproduces the labor of our steel competitors. Well, in 1960 it took 15 man-hours to produce a ton of steel in the United States. It took 24 man-hours in West Germany. It took 44 man-hours in Japan.

I will bring this down to 1970. In 1970 we still produced steel with fewer man-hours than any other area of the world. We produced a ton of steel with 11.9 man-hours. West Gemany took 14.5 and Japan 12.4.

Every time I have gone before the Tariff Commission they have told me the reason why we are in jeopardy on trade is we have not kept up our technology, that we have let our plants become obsolete and outdated. If that is so, how do we produce with fewer man-hours than any other place on the face of the earth?

These are just red herrings put before the American people so that they will not recognize the jeopardy we are in.

We talk about wage rates. Every time we go before the Tariff Commission or go before the Commerce Department or try to argue with the State Department about this particular subject they say, "Well, the wages in other countries are going up faster than ours, percentage-wise, every year, and soon they will catch up."

Let me say something about that catching up. In 1960 a U.S. steelworker received $3.82 an hour. The West German received $1.21 an hour. The Japanese received 62 cents an hour. The difference was $2.61 for West Germany and $3.20 for Japan, per hour.

Let us go down to 1970. Yes, the American steelworker has gone up to $5.68 per hour. But a lot of people do not know that a great portion of that is paid in Federal, State, and local taxes to take care of the unemployed, to provide money for foreign aid, to take care of Vietnam, to take care of Korea, and to take care of everywhere along the line we want to go.

In West Germany the hourly wage is $2.66, a differential of $3.02 between their wage and ours.

In Japan they went up to $1.83, but the differential is still $3.82. Why? Because if you have a $5 wage to begin with and you go up 5 percent, you go up a quarter. The Japanese have a 15-cent wage increase, and they go up 20 or 25 percent. They go up, so our stupid administrative leaders, both heretofore and now, always come before our committee and say, "Well, they are going up gradually, and some day they will catch up to us." Well, I will tell you one thing. They will never do that, because by the time their wages get to be the same as our wages that we have to have in this country in order to live, you will not have to worry about the steel industry or the glass industry, because they just will not be here.

You can already forget about the electronics industry. Do not worry about that. It is all gone. There is not one table radio made in the entire United States. We do not make a single watch in the United States, so be careful. If you should break your watch and you do not like to buy foreign products to replace it, you will just have to look at the sun in order to find out what time it is. And if the shadows on the horizon keep creeping up on us, you will not be able to see the sun, either.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote a letter in a kind of nonpartisan, nonpolitical fashion, consisting of five pages, in which I laid the plight of the tool industry before the President. I just want to state that I have received an answer on May 14 one paragraph long, and I have not heard from him since.

I ask unanimous consent to include this letter and other extraneous material at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The material follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: All of us realize the question of trade is not a simple black and white picture. We know that a great deal of consideration is given to the many facets of the international trade picture, and its problems. However, Mr. President, the very grave situation facing us on many import fronts cannot be left without serious and deliberate actions.

I have been working in close conjunction with my Committee and many industries; and, with the scientific study that has been going on for many years, I can say without hesitation, that any competitive industry that is penetrated by more than 5% of the American consumption by an import product will find itself in a struggling position to maintain its status-quo, let alone produce the growth so necessary to our economic well-being.

While I know you cannot possibly have the time to delve into all of the facts and figures, I do believe that we are getting dangerously close to a situation that will not be solvable, if the pace of imports in general are not slowed up and in some instances stopped.

I know you have had a great deal of correspondence concerning the plight of the tool and specialty steel industry. I have been warning this nation about this particular industry for many years. It has been affected, not only by imports in the last three years, but in some areas by a severe restriction on raw material and semi-processed ingredients

which, in some cases, are embargoed and in other cases were denied American Industry by manipulation of cartels and our own domestic stockpile policies.

While it is true that for a long time we felt that Industries were "crying wolf" on imports; we now arrive at the stage when the wolf is in the pack and the sheep are in trouble.

Tool steel is the latest industry to feel the impact of a commercial invasion which accomplishes, in the end, exactly the same results as does a military invasion, without the destruction of property and life; although, one may wonder if there is much difference between a bombed-out glass plant, steel mill, textile plant and one that is idle because their production has been stopped peacefully (and I might add the latter smilingly).

With the unprecedented impact of imports on the tool steel industries, this country nor any other, will survive in peace and certainly will find it impossible to wage war. Imported steel products are selling at prices of 18-50% of our required minimum prices.

Another circumstance, Mr. President, that compounds the injury is that many industries are the sole means of employment in some given communities. For example, I have a tri-city area in my district which once was the heart of the aluminum district, a great provider of glass, and all of the supporting semi-manufacturing and services required for a successful industrial venture.

This area has over 40,000 people who now have less than a thousand jobs, in these two main stay industries, to sustain themselves.

I note, Mr. President, that our competitors in the European area have announced that they will continue to ship and push automobiles and other trade goods, at the same prices before the raid on the dollar. This is in direct violation of the anti-dumping laws. It is just a small and very insignificant example of the intense, unrelenting attack on the American marketplace by the exporting nations.

Mr. President, I would appreciate an opportunity to present a computerized study by an impartial research project which proves, beyond a doubt, that in the area of job displacement by imports this nation is getting perilously close to the point of no return. Few, if any nations, that I have visited or studied allows one single item, in any measurable numbers of volume, to enter their markets in direct competition of like products of their own.

If we look at our national debt of approximately $393 billion, when one measures what we have spent in the various forms of aid and support—militarily and commercially—not one cent can be traced to new public buildings, roads, or services to the American people. While our wealth is great and our ability to spring back and rebuild in times of emergency has been phenomenal heretofore, the future holds no such promise.

I have just received a report in answer to a criticism that I made on the depreciation and death of a small but important ball bearing industry. On June 31, 1969, they made an application requesting an investigation under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. A 48 page report on this industry was submitted by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Preparedness. The report says, in simple terms, that while there is data in evidence to show that serious injury is present, it is concluded that the deterioration is due more to a sharp decline in domestic demand than imports. Figures, however, show that more ball bearings are being used now than ever in the industry's history; and, further more computer study shows the damage to the industry is caused by imports.

Page 13 of your own report reads: "Total annual sales of imported bearings covered in the application increased from 290,000 units in 1964 to a high of 3.9 million units in 1967."

Page 15 is the d—dest statement ever fed to an innocent, ignorant, or plain stupid Congressman. I pray I don't fit this description.

"It nevertheless appears, from the results of OEP's investigation, that at the present time production capacity could still be expanded, if necessary, to meet anticipated mobilization requirements. This expansion assumes that, in an emergency, governmental priorities would be placed on industrial production and necessary Government assistance for obtaining materials, equipment, labor, and working capital would be provided."

Mr. President, is this the kind of illogical, negative position we have been getting for the last 10 years from our trade experts?

Certainly we mobilized for two World Wars. The people were willing, we had the trained, eager workers, we had willing fighters.

Would we be able to do the same in today's world? Simply put, our belief is "we can do anything with money". You can make a silk purse out of a sow's ear—but it's not worth it.

The long ten year study I have made into all of the slogans, statements, and outright questionable figures on trade show that we have been basing our trade balance on two sets of figures, one foreign and one our own. When measured truly, we have greater unemployment than at any time in our history, including the Hoover depression. I say this because during the much maligned Hoover Administration, and I joined in the chorus with millions of others against Hoover, everyone who walked was called unemployed.

Today the statistics on unemployment are narrowed down to a very slim field and, with statistics being what they are, we fail to count the millions of people in this country who are not in the labor market business, because of the economic programs such as Social Security pensions, organized welfare and relief of all kinds. As a result, no true picture can really be given as to the drain upon our employment resources by the impact of imports.

Future historians will wonder what type of economics we were studying and practicing that we took such a stiff and unrelenting position on the restriction of immigrants who we feared would crowd the labor market, and at the same time we allowed the products made by these would-be immigrants to flood the American Marketplace and take the jobs away from our industries and people—just as surely as if we had let them come in and go to work in our plants.

Finally I say that I am willing to cooperate, as I do not believe we should do anything to upset the economy of so many nations; but there are two things I would do if I had the power and felt the need as strongly as I do. First, I would bar from this country any imports of any nation who by its acts devaluates the American dollar in world trade; and secondly, I would immediately start a long-term program of reducing, by percentage, all products that take away jobs from the American workman.

Mr. President, I have jurisdiction over minimum wage and I note there are some rumors that, if passed, you would veto the $2.00 minimum. This does not appear to be reasonable to me, since on one hand you are calling for family maintenance at a level of minimum $500 more than a covered employee under minimum age, who works 2080 hours in a full work year. I find it difficult to expect a man to work for less than his neighbor would get for not working. On the other hand, Mr. President, I am told that any increase in wages at the minimum level would act as an acceleration all the way up the line and, therefore, endanger American jobs from imports.

Perhaps Solomon with the advice of his 1000 wives could find a solution that would resolve this dilemma in a nice non-controversial manner, but having neither the wisdom nor the wives I must rely on the judgment and experience as a public servant, to do that which generate the greater good for the greatest number of people.

I might say that you will probably never find time to read this letter, which I had difficulty finding the time to write, but I wish whoever is reading it would consider it in the vain in which it was written—sincere belief that this country is on the brink of industrial economic disaster. I feel strongly that it is now no longer a fight for protectionism but a fight for survival.

With apologies for taking so much of your time, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT.

P.S.—Mr. President, if you do not have the time to read the attached speech I made before the Congress on June 28, 1962, during the passage of the Kennedy Round agreements, I would hope that Mr. Peterson and Mr. Stans would read it and relate the text to you. It really could be called "Coming Events Cast Their Shadows Before."

Any candidate who will take the side of economic survival against the antiquated trade theory will win any office.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1971.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of May 12 to the President regarding the international trade situation and the impact upon American industry and labor. I will be pleased to present your letter and the copy of your 1962 floor remarks during the debate on the Kennedy Round agreements to the President for his consideration.

With cordial regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

COLT INDUSTRIES,
Midland, Pa., April 21, 1971.

Subject: Imports—Specialty Steel Industry.

Hon. PAUL W. MCCRACKEN,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCRACKEN: You were kind enough to have a meeting with Mr. E. A. March, Mr. B. Bolles and me regarding the import problem on October 21, 1970. To keep your office informed, I am enclosing up-to-date figures and charts on the effect of imports on the specialty steel industry.

You will note that in 1970 there was a continued rise of imports into this badly distressed market. The 1971 data is a projection of the imports for the first two months of 1971, projected on a yearly basis if this level is maintained. It is startling to note that all imports of steel in January and February are "record" for this period of time, and are 71½% greater than they were for the same period of time in 1970. On Chart No. 7, you will note that imports for stainless and tool steels exceeded the voluntary levels that had been projected by 39%, and that based on the first two months extrapolation, they are at a rate of 56% in 1971 over the projected voluntary quota. The effect upon the capability of members of this industry to stay alive and the possible effect upon our defense industry for the future cannot be ignored.

Besides the loss of jobs and the revenue to the government on taxes, imports have been absorbing all the growth development and potential in this industry. Imports have depressed prices to the extent that in addi-

tion to a serious possibility of many of the companies in this industry failing rather soon those that do survive cannot expend funds for capital improvements and developments necessary to keep the industry whole and viable. These problems, coupled with the tremendous sums of money necessary for pollution control, sharply diminish the chances of survival of many of the companies involved.

Serious efforts are being made through the State Department for quick action. However, it is startling to read, as on April 20, a dateline from Tokyo stating that a separate quota for special steel exported to the United States is being set up at the 1970 level. This is highly unacceptable and will not permit the specialty steel industry to survive. Further, the imports of stainless steel and tool steel imports to the United States should be 32% below the 1970 shipments to be at the level of the voluntary restraint agreement.

Mr. Roger Ahlbrandt, President of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, has written directly to the President on behalf of the domestic specialty steel industries, requesting a meeting, and we would appreciate any efforts on your behalf to impress upon the President the need for such a meeting so that the industry can clearly demonstrate and amplify the problems involved.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of Mr. Ahlbrandt's letter to the President.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN N. ORNITZ.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, June 28, 1971]

LOCAL INDUSTRY IS IN JEOPARDY

It will be a setback of major proportions for both the city and the Commonwealth if the Harrisburg Steel Company is forced out of business by a change in government regulations.

Routine hearings held in Washington on Feb. 23 and March 16 produced some very dismaying results. The Hazardous Materials Regulation Board has promulgated a series of modifications in rules which, under specified conditions, would permit foreign-made compressed gas cylinders to be imported and sold in the United States.

The manufacture of such cylinders was a peace-time adaptation of a shell-making capacity which flourished during World War II. Although there are four other companies making cylinders, Harrisburg Steel is the principal supplier of the U.S. market. Foreign competitors have been excluded by a government regulation requiring that specified chemical analyses and tests be performed in this country. Adopted soon after World War II as a means of excluding cylinders fabricated overseas to less exacting standards, the rule was periodically reaffirmed by the Federal Trade Commission. More recently the matter came under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Transportation and, specifically, the Hazardous Materials Regulation Board where new attitudes prevailed.

Why the change now?

Partly because foreign governments, working through the U.S. Department of State, have been requesting elimination of the in-country testing requirements for years. Partly because the U.S. Department of Justice has advised that the regulation is actually an act in restraint of trade. And partly—and maybe principally—because bureaucrats failed to incorporate the necessary exceptions when specifics of the Occupant Crash Protection Program were written by what is now the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Beginning July 1, 1973, all new cars sold in the U.S. must include a "passive restraint system," a major component of which is expected to be a compressed gas cylinder. Understandably enough, foreign manufacturers want to ship their cars here already fitted out with the necessary cylinder. Hence the push now for the change which will not only accommodate overseas automotive companies but, unfortunately, flood the American market with cylinders offered at a price with which U.S. producers cannot compete.

Harrisburg Steel is this city's largest taxpayer, largest purchaser of water and steam and second largest purchaser of electricity. At stake here are about 800 jobs, a payroll in excess of $6 million and a total annual tax take by the city and State of close to $400,000.

The issues involved in the proposed rule changes are complicated and go to the heart of several national economic policies. Obviously, if the matter is reopened, they need to be unraveled carefully but we believe our legislators in Washington, the employe unions involved and anyone else with clout in the right place should request a delay in effecting the changes. The secretary of the Hazardous Materials Regulations Board has indicated that communications reaching him before Sept. 9 "will be considered before final action is taken on this proposal."

After World War II the United States bestowed its largesse on exhausted allies and defeated enemies alike, becoming a principal contributor to the recovery of their economies. But today the U.S. has a huge debt, a clouded economy of its own and a currency under siege. This is not the hour to make additional concessions to Germany, Japan or any other. It is time, rather, for them to become concerned about some of our needs.

The chance to manufacture and sell compressed gas cylinders may be mere minutiae in a purview of total world trade but it is a matter of large concern to this city. Our case deserves further consideration.

DEAR MR. DENT: While Japanese specialty steel imports keep pouring in, in violation of the Limitation Arrangement, American industry erodes—in profit, jobs, and planning for the future.

You and your colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation and those from other steel community centers throughout the nation are urged to organize in support of ebbing the flow of specialty steel imports, which are seriously damaging your constituencies—as we have discussed.

Regards,

R. S. AHLBRANDT.

LATROBE STEEL FIRST QUARTER LOSS

First quarter sales of $9,957,000, down from the $12,855,000 reported for the like period of 1970, were announced yesterday by Latrobe Steel Co. The firm had a first quarter loss of $542,000 or 45 cents per share, compared to earnings of $48,000 or 4 cents per share for the initial quarter last year.

Marcus W. Saxman, III, president of Latrobe Steel, told the shareholders' meeting the disappointing earnings were the result of continued influx of specialty steel imports, continuing poor business conditions and inflationary increases in operating costs.

ALLEGHENY LUDLUM NET FELL 38 PERCENT IN FIRST QUARTER

PITTSBURGH.—First quarter earnings of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., still plagued by a high level of specialty steel imports, dropped 38% below year-earlier figures on a 7% decline in sales.

Profit of the big specialty-steel maker was $3.9 million, or 52 cents a share, compared with $6.4 million, or $1.02 a share, a year earlier. Sales dropped to $137.3 million from a $147.4 million.

Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president, said that while earnings showed a substantial improvement over the last two quarters of 1970, they were still unsatisfactory. He attributed the disappointing results to the decline in sales resulting from the slow recovery of the general economy, as well as "the continued adverse effect caused by excessive foreign imports of specialty steels."

NEWS RELEASE OF ALLEGHENY LUDLUM

PITTSBURGH, April 22.—For the first quarter of 1971, Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., today reported sales of $137,244,000, a decline of seven per cent below first quarter 1970 sales of $147,420,000. Net earnings for the quarter were $3,973,000, equivalent to 52 cents a common share after preferred dividend requirements and 38 per cent below first quarter 1970 earnings of $6,364,000, or $1.02 a common share. Per share figures in both periods are based on average number of common shares outstanding during the quarter.

Roger S. Ahlbrandt, President and Chief Executive Officer of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, noted that earnings for the first quarter of 1971 showed a substantial improvement over the last tw^ quarters of 1970. However, he attributed their still unsatisfactory level to the decline in sales due to the slow recovery of the general economy, as well as the continued adverse effect caused by excessive foreign imports of specialty steels. He said the corporation and the industry are intensifying their efforts to secure some relief from this situation through administrative action by the government and through the voluntary restraint arrangements with some foreign producers.

Recent higher levels of orders have resulted in an increased backlog, particularly in steel operations, the Allegheny Ludlum official stated, adding that some part of the increase can be attributed to inventory building by customers against the threat of a possible steel strike in August.

ALLEGHENY LUDLUM INDUSTRIES, INC.—STATEMENT OF CONSOLIDATED INCOME

	First quarter—	
	1971	1970
Sales	$137, 244, 006	$147, 420, 140
Costs:		
Cost of goods sold, administration and selling expense, etc	122, 981, 118	128, 804, 579
Depreciation	4, 204, 114	3, 811, 621
Interest	2, 329, 511	2, 099, 299
Federal income taxes	3, 756, 000	6, 340, 167
Total costs	133, 270, 743	141, 055, 666
Net earnings	3, 973, 263	6, 364, 474
Earnings per share of common stock [1]	.52	1.02
Average common shares outstanding	4, 744, 490	4, 744, 482

[1] Based on average number of common shares outstanding and after preferred dividend requirements.

THE IMPORT CRISIS IN THE SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY

(By M. N. Ornitz)

There is great danger that the specialty steel industry of the United States which is presently severely depressed could, within five years, be reduced to a very limited number of firms unless restraints are placed on the rising tide of foreign imports. Although we have been talking about this for some time, it is now clearly apparent to all that we are in a trade war.

It is startling to realize that the tremendous expansion program going on in the Japanese steel industries will by 1975 give Japan capacities far in excess of anything we are producing in the United States. In the stainless steel industry, Japan now has

capacities exceeding those of this country. In addition, there is a substantial increase in capacity under construction in Europe, and more contemplated. I am not pointing a finger at Japan only—their data are readily available in print, and they are the largest importers.

Overall world capacity is anticipated to increase 27% in the next five years. Of even more importance to the specialty steel producers is the fact that in 1970 the Japanese Stainless Association estimated that their yearly output of stainless will be 1,200,000 tons. This is compared to one of the largest production years in United States history of 900,000 tons of stainless steel in 1969. In 1970, this was down to 700,000 tons. Further complicating the future is the fact that in 1971 another fully integrated Japanese stainless steel plant with an output of 20,000 tons per month will be in production.

This is a very somber picture considering the present import situation. In 1970, imports had already captured 66.5% of stainless rods, 53% of stainless wire, 34% of the stainless sheet business, and 11% of the stainless bar market. The experience is that when over 50% of a market is captured by imports, domestic producers are irrevocably impaired and can no longer compete.

That threat has since become so severe that on February 3, 1971 the international officers of the United Steelworkers of America, their district directors and local presidents joined in a conference with management teams from 32 of our country's specialty steel companies in Washington, D.C. Present also at the conference were Government representatives including the Departments of State, the Commerce and Labor Departments and the Tariff Commission.

Last July I made the categorical statement that we were in a trade war. That war has now become so intensified that it is having dire consequences for all stainless and tool steel, low alloy steel and tubular steel producers in this country.

The earnings reports bear this out—

Many companies showed losses for 1970, others marked reduction in profits—some in the magnitude of a 34 to 200 percent drop from their previous earnings levels.

Crucible, of course, is a major producer of stainless, so that most of the data I will present to you directly reflects on our markets.

The effect of the rising tide of imports is felt not just on the volume of sales—imports also reduce price structures and weaken the ability of American producers to survive in an already troubled market.

Imports affect our ability to provide jobs, our ability to expand our facilities, our ability to carry out our obligation to be good citizens and support community projects.

I think you realize the need for corrective action, so that the stainless and tool steel industry does not fall by the wayside, as did many American producers of pottery, radios, electronic equipment, watches, shoes, textiles, and utensils.

The effect of foreign imports of specialty steel first became apparent in 1968. Through the efforts of our Congress, and negotiated by our State Department, a voluntary agreement was concluded with the European Coal & Steel Community and the Japanese steel producers. This agreement called for a reduction of approximately 22% in tons of all steel imports shipped into the United States in 1969—from 18 million tons to a level of 14 million tons in 1969.

This agreement was to take into consideration existing product mix and geographical location. The language of the agreement read, "During this period, Japan will try not to change greatly the product mix and distribution as compared with the present." Subsequently, it was agreed that increases of 5% over rollback levels of each preceding year would be allowed.

APRIL 27, 1971.

Hon. JOHN DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently I saw your picture inspecting the Crucible Steel plant at Midland, Pennsylvania in one of the Pittsburgh papers. While I am not one of your constituents, we are both interested in the same thing, that is bringing more jobs to Pennsylvania and keeping the ones we have.

My home town of Carnegie used to have a mill called Superior Steel. Superior employed 1,100 people making stainless steel and no longer exists. Now the Universal Cyclops Pittsburgh Works is down to 30% of production.

I am enclosing, for your attention, a sheet taken from a trade journal, the Material Handling Engineering Magazine, showing what advantages foreign countries have over American steel companies in terms of depreciation in addition to lower wage costs. If the American steel industry is to survive and American steel workers are to have jobs in the future, they must have the most up-to-date equipment possible so that they can compete internationally.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES H. NIXON.

INCENTIVES FOR INVESTMENT

(By A. N. Wecksler)

Faced with declining investment in equipment, the Nixon administration has provided new incentives for capital investment by liberalizing depreciation allowances.

The primary goal of this new policy is to stimulate new equipment investment and thus strengthen the economy. But equally important is the objective of making U.S. industry more competitive in the world markets through the use of more productive equipment.

Specifically, three important changes in the depreciation provisions of the tax laws are involved:

(1) A more flexible application of "guideline lives" for classes of equipment. On equipment acquired after 1970, depreciation life can be up to 20% shorter or longer than the "guideline lives."

(2) Termination of the "reserve ratio test," a complicated formula requiring manufacturers to show that they had met their projected depreciation schedules.

(3) Increasing the depreciation allowance for the first year.

The economic effect of the new policy is to make additional funds available for new equipment. Business tax payments will be reduced by $2.6 billion this year, with reductions rising to a peak of about $4 billion in 1976, and gradually declining after that.

A big factor in the decision to liberalize depreciation was the greater incentive to capital investment which foreign governments give manufacturers through more lenient tax writeoffs. But even with the new rules, the U.S. is still considerably behind Canada, France, Japan, the United Kingdom, and West Germany in depreciation allowance over the first seven years of equipment life.

The new policy represents a compromise between advocates of a return to a formula giving industry an actual investment credit, and critics who generally oppose any sort of incentive to industry.

In 1961, President Kennedy proposed a special investment credit, arguing that ". . . our friends abroad now possess a modern industrial system helping to make them formidable competitors in world markets. If our own goods are to compete with foreign goods in price and quality, both at home and abroad, we shall need the most efficient plant and equipment."

An investment credit of 7% was put on the books, and remained in effect until late 1966, when it was suspended to relieve short-term inflationary pressures in the capital goods market. The suspension was lifted after five months, in 1967. Finally, the credit was terminated as a result of the 1969 Tax Act.

During the period that the credit provided tax incentives to capital investment, there was a strong pickup in the development of production capacity. And the system of tax incentives for such investment abroad has similarly increased investment in plant and equipment in those countries.

By contrast, since the end of the investment credit for U.S. manufacturers, business has tended to trim expansion plans. Initially, this merely meant a slower rate of increase in spending for plant and equipment. But, just before the announcement of the new depreciation policies, capital spending plans for 1971 were reported to be 3% less than last year.

This reduction in capital spending comes at a time when U.S. industry is facing intense competition from modern, well-equipped foreign industrial plants. A special Task Force on Business Taxation, named by President Nixon in the fall of 1969, recently pointed out that Japan and its steel industry furnish a dramatic illustration of modernization of facilities.

The Task Force report reported that in 1960 Japanese steel output was slightly in excess of 24 million tons. By 1968 it had more than tripled, to 74 million tons. By 1973 the Japanese plan to have 125 million tons of steel-making capacity, 80 million tons of which will be less than eight years old. Right now, two-thirds of the Japanese steel capacity is less than nine years old.

In contrast, the Task Force reports, "much of the steel manufacturing plants of the United States industry is obsolete. Only one-third of our physical plant is less than 10 years old."

The tremendous growth of the Japanese auto industry, and the construction in recent years of large sheet glass factories in Western Europe and Japan, are also cited as examples of rapid development in foreign productive capacity.

The Taxation Task Force came to the conclusion that the United States must continue the modernization and expansion of its industrial plant just to maintain our present position in world competition. The new depreciation policy came as a partial answer to these recommendations.

The new policy, named the Asset Depreciation Ranges or "ADR," in general will apply to all types of assets for which a guideline life had already been established. And use of the ADR system assures the taxpayer that his depreciation deductions will not be questioned if they are within these ranges.

Different trades or business, even under the same owner, may use different depreciation rates. The purpose of the new system is to provide flexibility to take account of different conditions prevailing in different industries.

Once the taxpayer selects a depreciation schedule for a particular year, he must stick with it for that year. But this does not mean that he must select the same schedule the next time. In order to achieve this flexibility, the Treasury Dept. requires separate depreciation computations for assets placed in service each year, and identification of when these assets are placed in service.

The ADR system also provides a new, modified first-year convention, designed to offer a greater depreciation allowance. This option allows all assets acquired in the first half of the year to be treated as if acquired on the first day of the year, and all assets acquired in the second half of the year to be treated as if acquired at the mid-point of the year.

Finally, the reserve ratio test, which has been highly criticized by industry, is eliminated for taxable years ending after December 31, 1970.

THE DOLLAR AT BAY

The suddenness of last month's announcement that five of Europe's principal central banks had temporarily stopped accepting dollars sent shock waves across the nation. Most Americans simply found it impossible to believe that their dollars, which had been the world's hardest currency for a generation, were no longer "as good as gold."

The cause of this disenchantment with the dollar, as most executives know full well, is the chronic deficit in the nation's international balance of payments. This deficit, which has occurred in thirteen out of the last fourteen years, reached a record $9.8 billion in 1970. The situation would have even been more serious if business had not done its part by exporting $3.6 billion more in goods and services than it imported. Without this surplus in the balance of trade, the payments deficit would have been an incredible $13.4 billion.

The cause of the deficit is, of course, quite obvious: that the U.S. bears virtually the entire defense burden of the non-Communist world. We spend about 8% of our GNP for defense, while the Germans spend only 4% of theirs. And Japan, with the world's third-largest GNP, spends less than 1% of it for military purposes.

Undoubtedly, one answer to the balance-of-payments problem is to bring increased pressure on the West Europeans and the Japanese to bear a larger share of their defense costs. And the obvious way to apply that pressure, at least in the case of the Europeans, is to threaten to reduce our heavy troop commitment in West Germany. But even if our allies were persuaded to come through, the best that could be hoped for is a $2 billion-$3 billion reduction in the deficit.

NEO-STALINIST DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HUNGARIANS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today, with reference to Hungary and Czechoslovakia and other Communist countries.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a resolution passed by the American Hungarian Federation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 34 months several of us were paying constant attention to the plight of the peoples of Czechoslovakia who, during the first 8 months of 1968 succeeded in freeing themselves from the shackles of Stalinist leadership and in establishing a semi-independent, semi-Communist transition regime, the evolution of which could have led Czechoslovakia toward a better future where national interests and individual rights would have been adequately protected.

On September 22, 1968, I rose together with more than 20 distinguished Members of the House to denounce the treacherous action of the Soviet Union which also forced this time all of its satellites except Rumania, to participate in this new rape of Czechoslovakia. Today I do not have the time to enumerate the entire sordid record of deception, harassment, persecution, and false charges brought against the courageous leaders in Prague and Bratislava—Pozsony—and the depths to which the half-willing, opportunistic present Czechoslovak leadership, installed by the grace of the Soviet occupiers had to sink as a result of the heavyhanded Soviet intervention into the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia.

Our silence about the events in Czechoslovakia continues, however, unabated. We are supposed to be in the "era of negotiations" instead of "confrontations," and we do not want to rock the diplomatic boat. Yet I believe that to cement and/or solemnly recognize the status quo of Soviet hegemony in Central Europe would be both a moral travesty earning us the contumely of the nations of the regions and a major political-psychological mistake as well. I also believe in negotiations, but these must commence with a frank discussion of political realities as we see them, and the fact is that perhaps nowhere else in Europe is Soviet intervention more blatant and far-reaching in 1971 than in Czechoslovakia.

Today when even the present Soviet leadership seems to have second thoughts about the long-term value of not alienating world opinion, we should definitely expose in the court of public opinion the true situation in Czechoslovakia, instead of, what we seem to be practicing with regard to our past Vietnam policies, wallowing in self-incrimination and self-criticism.

For we are receiving steady reports on the enforced change of leadership even in cultural and social organizations both of the majority and minority nations and nationalities. We also have the proof that the Soviet use of the divide et impera is egging on the exacerbation of nationality conflicts which, perhaps more than ever in the life of the two Czechoslovak Republics, were on their way to an equitable solution in 1968.

Those of us familiar with the Communist jargon are able to discern easily the true significance of events even by reading the Czechoslovak press of today. Today I am referring to the situation of the 700,000 to 750,000 Hungarians in Slovakia. Until the sixties they formed the most mistreated and repressed part of the population, having had to submit to innumerable and unmentionable humiliations and brutalities between 1945 and the late fifties, first on a national, later on a national-ideological basis.

In the summer of 1968, my distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) and several of us discussed the great improvements in their fate and their renewed expression of belief in humanism and the values of individual freedom and dignity during the Dubcek "thaw." I wish, we could report the same today. Alas, rather the last vestiges of an independent representation of the Hungarians in Slovakia, the CSEMADOK, the only nationwide social and cultural organization, appears to have been effectively curtailed, if not destroyed, by the election of new Stalinist Central Committee members and of the position of the national president. With the CSEMADOK as a loyal and colorless indoctrination center for the Soviet type of communism foisted upon the Slovak Communist Party, the courageous democratic voices of the Hungarian leadership in the Czechoslovak Republic will be effectively silenced.

This unfortunate development occurred at a time when Hungarians are again generally attacked as vanguards of the 1968 deviation and as the former exploiter of the masses in Slovak magazines and periodicals, which have official blessing by the Slovak Communist Party or by the Slovak Cultural League—Slovensk Matica. Some of my colleagues will insert material on this last issue. For myself, I only want to insert the resolution passed by the American Hungarian Federation last week on the sorry events and I am asking for unanimous consent in this regard. The American Hungarian Federation has proven to me not only a reliable source of information gathered by specialists like the chairman and secretary of their International Relations Committee, Prof. Maurice Czikann-Zichy, Immaculata College in Pennsylvania, and Z. Michael Szaz, Director, American Institute on Problems of European Unity, Inc., and of Troy State University, but also as a genuine American organization, a trustworthy bulwark of democracy and individual freedom and dignity under the wise leadership of my good friend, Rt. Rev. Zoltan Beky, D.D., bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Reformed Church of America.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION ON THE SITUATION OF HUNGARIANS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The American Hungarian Federation has pursued with concern and interest the deteriorating situation of the long suffering Hungarians in Slovakia. There were definite developments in 1968 which displayed signs of alleviation in the life of the minority but today the government of Czechoslovakia, at the behest of the Soviet occupiers, is again in the hands of Gustav Husak who played a significant role in the post-1945 period when the Hungarians of Slovakia were individually and collectively officially deprived of their civil and political rights. The new campaign to oppress responsive and responsible leadership in the only nationwide cultural and social organization, CSEMADOK, started already in 1970 and culminated this year.

The American Hungarian Federation, upon being informed by the Hungarian-language newspapers in Czechoslovakia (*A Het—The Week* and *Uj szo—New Word*) of the recent change in the CSEMADOK leadership resulting in the "election" under duress of Stalinist and pro-Soviet members to replace the leadership in office since 1968, and

Upon being informed by the same newspa-

pers and weeklies of the continuing pseudo-academic and journalistic denunciation of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia,

1. Denounces the removal of Laszlo Dobos and of many Central Committee members at the annual session of the Central Committee of the CSEMADOK as measures foisted upon this organization (which constitutes the only nationwide representation of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia) by the Soviet occupation authorities and their newly installed Slovak Communist Party quislings. These steps are actively depriving the Hungarians of that country of their last semi-independent cultural and vocational representation in the CSR.

2. Condemns the continued anti-Hungarian book and article publications, including Vladimir Manac's *The Stirring of Embers*, the February 1969 issue of *Mlady Slovak* (Young Slovak), edited by a member of the Presidium of the *Slovensko Matica*, P. Virsik, and many others, and expresses its hope that Hungarian journalists and academicians will not fall prey to persecution in the name of the obligatory acceptance of the Brezhnev Doctrine and the anti-Hungarian views of the servants of the Soviet Union in the Slovak Communist Party.

3. Expresses its concern that the continuing deterioration of the cultural and political rights of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia may be a consequence of Soviet policy to rekindle some support in Slovakia by giving free reign to Slovak antagonisms toward Hungarians as a concession for forcing upon the Slovaks the occupation of their country.

4. Appeal to the United States Congress, the press, radio and TV media to oppose, by exposing to publicity these events and the reasons and motivations behind them in regard to the sorry state of the three quarter million Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

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

Mr. PATTEN. I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) for his statement and for the remarks that he has made on many occasions prior to this in the House in regard to the enslaved nations, including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other nations.

Mr. Speaker, this being Captive Nations Week, it is very proper for the gentleman from New Jersey to bring to the attention of the Members of the House and to the American public the tyranny and the enslavement that continues to hover over the captive nations, including Czechoslovakia. After all, the methods used and the barbarous atrocities that have been committeed by the Communist leaders on the Czechloslovakian people and the other captive nations has not changed any whatsoever since they were first enslaved by the Communist tyrants, and I believe that the fight must continue.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) has stated here today, these nations some day will be free. History reveals that over the centuries we have had many tyrants who have enslaved free people, but that eventually these tyrants, because of their atrocities and their enslavement have caused the people to rebel, and they have risen against these tyrants and overthrown their tyrannical oppressors, and restored free government and regained their liberty. There is no doubt in my mind but that in the future, as long as the people of the free world continue to help in every way possible to give encouragement to the enslaved people in the captive nations that, just as history has revealed in the past centuries, they will be restored to their liberty and freedom.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) for his comments.

I further wish to say that while we sit here and hear a lot of talk about the captive nations, that I saw the results of the fighting in Hungary, saw the Russian soldiers on the streets of Budapest in clusters of 20 or more, and I saw their tanks after 1968. And right today Hungary is controlled by the Russian military, and the Hungarians have lost their freedom.

Do you know that Hungary has the highest suicide rate in the world? It is 13 times ours. Hungary also has the lowest birth rate. They are really carrying out a policy of racial genocide against the Hungarians. While we sit here, the last figure that I heard was that there were over 400,000 Russian soldiers still in Germany; there were 320,000 Russian soldiers still in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I say that all of those of us who love freedom and law and order ought to pay attention to those of us who are interested in the captive nations, and the problems that we point out, so that we may all have a fuller understanding of where we are going and what the problem is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members for joining with me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) and several other House Members are today discussing recent disturbing events in Czechoslovakia, a country occupied by the Soviet Union since August 1968 in brutal disregard of its right to national self-determination and noninterference.

We have seen a wave of oppression in Czechoslovakia since August 1968—a wave of oppression which has slowly but surely engulfed the Hungarian minority there. This minority, which suffered far-reaching national and political discrimination between 1945 and 1949, was one of the groups espousing liberal change in Czechoslovakia and a just resolution of still-existing national and nationality problems in that country. There was hope, before August 23, 1968, that their aspirations would be realized in the new federated state structure.

The present regime in Czechoslovakia decries the Hungarian minority's demands for cultural autonomy and self-administration as bourgeois-nationalist. The leadership of the CSEMADOK, the only national social and cultural federation of Hungarians in Slovakia, has been completely changed by Soviet-inspired Slovak Communist pressure. The polemics against the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, both on a national and a class basis, are reemerging.

It is important that we point up these distasteful developments while we negotiate with the Soviet Union. We must realize that unless the Soviet Union abandons the Brezhnev doctrine, lasting peace and detente in Central Europe may be impossible.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received information about the continuing restalinization in Slovakia both in the Slovak Communist Party and in the hitherto liberal and responsive leadership of the only nationwide organization of Czechoslovakian Hungarians in the cultural and social field, the CSEMADOK, from the American Hungarian Federation and the National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, which is collaborating closely with the former.

In 1970, the leadership of CSEMADOK had to criticize its own responsible actions in 1968–69 when they were asking for liberalization, and a just resolution of the existing nationality problems in the spirit of cultural autonomy and self-administration.

In April 1971, the newly co-opted members in 1970 were "elected"—as a result of official pressure of the reconstituted neo-Stalinist Slovak Communist Party—as chairman, general secretary, secretary, and further members of the executive committee were co-opted to give the neo-Stalinists a majority in the body.

In the meantime, Slovak literary, historical, and political polemics continue with Soviet blessing—tearing up the path to reconciliation which has been taken by both nationalities in the 1968 Dubcek period.

We must not close our eyes to these developments and I am joining the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN), and other colleagues, in denouncing the developments in Czechoslovakia which have resulted in a further restriction of its citizens' human and civil rights.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my distinguished colleagues ably led by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) in reporting to the House the population problems in Czechoslovakia, a deterioration which now reached with its full force along with the Hungarian minority of that country.

The last 35 months have witnessed constant interference with the internal politics and administration of that country by the occupying Soviet forces and their political advisors.

One of the major problems in Czechoslovakia in 1968 was the just resolution of the nationalities problem. Auspicious beginnings were made in the federalization of the state between the Czech and Slovak parts and by recognizing the rights of nationalities within the federal provinces as well. The social and cultural organization of the Hungarian minority, CSEMADOK, played an important and substantial role in exposing past abuses and suggest's concrete proposals designed to promote peaceful cooperation between the nations and nationalities of Czechoslovakia.

Today, the policy of 1968 is buried by Soviet fiat. In 1970 the Slovak Communist Party was "reformed" and its new leadership, pro-Soviet and neo-Stalinist imposed upon the Presidium of the Central Committee of CSEMADOK a number of neo-Stalinist officials who were not members of the Central Committee

in 1968. In April 1971 these new members were "elected", under intense pressure of the new, neo-Stalinist Slovak Communist Party, as chairman, general secretary and secretary of the organization and many new members were "co-opted" into the Central Committee's Presidium to give them a majority. The first acts of the new leadership were not only the denunciation of the 1968 program but also open kowtowing to the Slovak Communist Party and insistence on a rigid adherence to the Party line.

In the meantime, the Soviet divide et impera approach is used not only within but also among the nationalities. Slovak Communists are encouraged to start polemics with the Hungarians in order to create an atmosphere in which discrimination, either on national, or class and ideological basis, could be successfully employed against the 1968 spirit of the Hungarian minority.

Under such circumstances it is of importance to recall what the minimum requirements of the Hungarian minority have been after the Soviet occupation. Such a survey is given in the excellent unsigned article in the Hungarian-language daily A Het—The Week—about 2 years ago, that is, about 10 months after the Soviet occupation. I insert the translation of the text of this article into the RECORD:

WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE HUNGARIAN

(Unsigned)

The retention of mother tongue and nationality belongs as a natural right of man. Insisting upon these is not a sign of nationalist bias. This basic loyalty is forced upon man by the demands of survival, for our future survival lies in our awareness of this relationship.

Our age is both an age of modern national consciousness and inevitable social integration. These two processes are complementary: national consciousness would be transformed into national intolerant pride, while integration without national consciousness would become cosmopolitanism. Consequently, modern national consciousness cannot form an obstacle in the path of mutual understanding of peoples, or to the establishment of intensive relations among them. At the same time, integration cannot violate the interests of nations and nationalities. Sometimes tensions are discernible between these two basic processes. The reason is that the process of integration is motivated by mostly economic factors, while national consciousness is formulated by intellectual forces. In order to provide for undisturbed development, these two determining tendencies must be harmonized. It is a general rule that economic problems are relatively easier to solve while national sensitivities often create more complicated situations. The latter are usually caused by the lack of solutions of the national and nationality questions and this leads—as practice teaches us—to conflicts. It is the most ardent desire of any nation to live its own unique life style to the fullest. National self-expression absolutely requires the practice of national self-determination and self-administration. If either of these principles is impaired or is lacking, the compulsive need for national or nationality expressions necessarily becomes more apparent and the nation—in order to ensure its survival—begins to fight for the recognition of its rights. Thus the suppression of justified national claims and aspirations fails to weaken national consciousness. It rather strengthens it while distorting the same and the existing satisfaction can create extreme nationalism. Thus we have already arrived at the roots of national and nationality conflicts.

A farsighted and sober national policy will want to prevent national and nationality conflicts by solving the nationality problem justly and generously (thus we find no chauvinism or irredentism in Finland).

We are witnessing the interdependence of even non-neighboring nations in regard to science, economy, etc. Even more obvious is the interdependence among neighbors. Thus, unsolved national problems should never interfere with improved relations and cooperation. The consequences of antagonisms would be too horrible to contemplate; therefore, the only way out is to solve the problems arising of national and nationality coexistence. If we recognize and this is to discern—that the right to national self-expression fails to threaten the existence and interests of any nation, especially if such right is given to a nationality forced to live with the others in the state community, the solution of the problems indeed becomes possible. If we deny the above tenet, any solution of the problem will nearly become impossible. If a minority, forced to live in a foreign linguistic and social environment has to demand for itself all the specific national rights enjoyed by the majority, it is obvious that the numerically stronger majority will want to substantially influence those who are numerically weaker: it wants to deprive the latter from its specific ethnic character and condemn it to the fate of assimilation.

It is well-known, however, that national existence alone on the part of the national minority can create certain disadvantages. Therefore, the view must be adopted that national minorities must be given guarantees and specific rights in order to maintain its existence and national character. The numerically weaker is increasingly exposed to the assimilating influence of the majority and to the danger of linguistic and cultural eradication. In order to remove this fear an honest and sincere majority will attempt to grant special rights to the minorities. (It is a common rule of ethics that the weaker must be protected.)

The process of national and social renaissance which had begun in our country in 1968 had as its goal the just resolution of the nationality problems. The solution has to consist of the awarding of equal rights and the guaranteeing of special nationality rights. The most important of these rights is that a nationality should enjoy the protection of its national character in regard to culture and the mother tongue.

The granting and guarantees of special minority rights are not opposed to the principle of equal rights despit- its favoring the minority at the expense of the majority. Accordingly Laszlo Rehak, a prominent expert on nationality problems in Yugoslavia, has stated, "The meaning of the special rights consists of opening the doors to the minority to form a unit with the majority without having its national character compromised and to receive compensation for its inherent disadvantage of being a numerical minority." (*The Minorities in Yugoslavia*).

This means that the use of the mother tongue by that nationality, living in ethnographically compact areas, e.g., the Hungarians of our country, may claim the use of its language as the accepted language of social contact in the areas where they form the majority. The same applies to the majority language as the accepted language of social contact in areas where it is spoken by the majority. Only this state of affairs deserves the definition of equal rights. Socialist equality of rights cannot be twisted around. There are no superior nations recognized in it. Every nation or nationality whose national existence is recognized by the Constitution, becomes a state nation. Thus, free use of the mother tongue by the nationalities forms the first requirement of practical equal rights. This was shown by the findings of the International Seminar held under the auspices of the United Nations in June 1965 in Ljubjana dealing with human rights in a multinational community. At this seminar the majority accepted the principle that "in certain circumstances and environments the so-called language of the Republic is not always the generally used language, but it is replaced by that of a particular national minority. Thus, in recent times, the learning of the nationality language has increasingly become a necessity in areas where it forms the language of (social) contact. This (finding) is particularly valid in regard to political cadres and leading experts who have a different mother tongue."

A particularly significant task is performed by the nationality schools. They possess a two-fold importance: (a) they are the guarantors for the retention of the specific features of the nationality (national consciousness, mentality, education, traditions, customs, etc. . . .) and **(b) they serve** the quality of education in the most efficient manner. Through limiting instruction in the mother tongue the nationality would not only be deprived of its specific right, but also of equal rights as such. Here we have to struggle against many deficiencies, yet only in regard to the grade schools does a rough equality of education exist for nationality schools. The nationality schools cannot accomplish their task in a social environment in which the school language is not practically recognized, but forms only a tolerated means of social contact. The language of instruction does not exist in a vacuum. Language is the most unique characteristics of anation. Without it, a nation dies or disappears. Nothing can substitute for the loss of the language. Expanding the teaching of the mother tongue and recognizing the equal rights of languages form basic preconditions which the Socialist policy of national equality forces upon us irrevocably and without delay. In order to do so, all of us have to admit finally that we must, once and for all, reject the integral nationalist illusion that "elements which are alien to the nation" must be assimmilated by the majority. It is widely known, that especially in the years after World War II, the Hungarians here had to subject themselves to many discriminatory measures which were not only opposed to international law clauses but violated their human dignity, if they wanted to remain in their region. As a result, even today the number of those who, because of their intimidation during that period or later and because of forced appeals to their conscience, do not dare to confess their own nationality and true mother tongue. Their number is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

We must therefore recognize the inalienable right of the possession and expression of ethnic character. National ethnic character and language should no longer form objects of dispute and compromise. This is only possible if all nations and nationalities recognize the fact that theirs is not the only nationality and other ethnic features but other nations have the right to possess them, too.

Man, no matter to which nation he may belong or wherever he may reside on the face of the earth, is from ancient times on, propelled by the same desires and aspirations to live a fully human life and to achieve the recognition of his individuality. These truly just and weighty requirements can only be generally observed if we can identify ourselves with the humanistic traditions of our history; with the warning advice coming from fateful past encounters which according to historical findings—always originate in the inability of neighboring nations to settle their own affairs. This sober rationality based

on historical recollections is now reenforced with the menacing world catastrophe.

To maintain ourselves and also to survive form mutual conditions. We can say that the present world situation bids us sternly "to settle our own affairs."

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in Congress, the people of the Fourth District of Kansas, and the rest of the Nation in commemorating the national observance of this the 12th annual Captive Nations Week. By joint resolution on July 17, 1959, the 86th Congress authorized and requested the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. Twelve years have passed since then and there have been many changes in domestic and international affairs. But one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

We must not allow ourselves nor the rest of the world to ignore the sad plight of these courageous people. We must continue to recognize and to support the concepts of national independence, of political and personal freedom and of maintaining basic human dignity.

Thus be it only fitting that Captive Nations Week should fall in the same month as the celebration of the independence of the United States. July 4 represents the reaffirmation of the American people, of their belief and faith in the principles which were set forth in the Declaration of Independence 195 years ago. Captive Nations Week represents the recognition by the American people of the ever pressing truth that if we wish to safeguard our own independence, we must help the Communist-enslaved peoples of the world to achieve their freedom.

For some 25 years, the peoples of the captive nations have suffered under the oppression of Communist rule with little or no freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. These people however, have not, and with God's help, will not lose their all encompassing desire to be free.

In conclusion it is with a great deal of pride and sadness that I speak today in remembrance of our fellow men enslaved by communism. I, as I know all of the free people of the world, hope and pray for the times when Public Law 86-90 is no longer needed and the day when the peoples of the captive nations are free and are able to shape their own destinies.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman whose district includes many fine citizens of Czech, Slovak, and Hungarian descent I have long taken a keen interest in developments in Czechoslovakia.

I watched with pleased, though cautious, optimism at the good news in the summer of 1968 of the liberalization that had taken place in that nation. This included the freedom loving and democratic forces in the ranks of the Hungarian minority of Slovakia which gave full support to the Dubcek regime. They were making progress for a just resolution of national and nationality problems, facilitating the process of reconcilation.

Then, in September, I took the floor to speak on the shameful Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, to express my fears that the popular expression for freedom and human dignity might be repressed by Soviet arms and political intervention.

These fears become a reality. The cultural and social organization of the Hungarian minority, the CSEMADOK was purged progressively in 1970 and this year until the new leadership now is strictly neo-Stalinist and a pawn of the purged, neo-Stalinist Slovak Communist Party. Anti-Hungarian polemics, blaming the minority for the events of 1968, are prevalent and trusted leaders are becoming "nonpersons" at an alarming rate. Thus I must raise my voice to denounce these developments and express my conviction that without Soviet abandonment of the Brezhnev doctrine and its oppressive consequences for the nations of East Central Europe, no lasting detente in Europe will become possible.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) in denouncing acts of discrimination committed against the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia. These acts against the freedom loving and democratic peoples of Czechoslovakia can be attributed to members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, now under the control of pro-Soviet forces.

The Soviet occupation advisors have reportedly been actively promoting nationality discrimination and agitation in the country with the goal of dividing opposition to the pro-Soviet forces. In a divide-and-conquer-type movement, Slovaks are urged to attack Hungarians and Czechs are urged to disagree with Slovaks with the end result being a vast confusion of discrimination and attacks on nationality.

The hopes for national reconciliation raised in 1968, when the Hungarian minority was awarded a minimum of rights and promised more for the future, are swiftly disappearing, and the minority is being relegated into a servile status.

It is our duty as representatives of the largest and most powerful free nation, to bring these matters to the attention of the court of world public opinion. We must heed the lesson that without the end to the Soviet-imposed Brezhnev doctrine and the recognition of the right to national self-determination and sovereign equality of states in East Central Europe, no lasting detente can be built in Europe.

The Brezhnev doctrine with its limited sovereignty implications, is in reality a restatement of the Marxist-Leninist world view. In other words, in the Soviet view, in the struggle between capitalism and socialism everything is inferior to the goal of revolution and if individuals and even entire nations must be sacrificed to obtain this goal, then these sacrifices must be made.

This frightening concept is what we must fight against in Czechoslovakia, and indeed, in all the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

In this regard, a most informative article by Charles T. Baroch appeared in the July 1971 American Bar Association Journal. Dr. Baroch is the scholar in residence for the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education About Communism and Its Contrast with Liberty Under Law. His article destroys the popular belief that the Brezhnev doctrine is new and explores its fundamental concepts.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I insert Dr. Baroch's article in the RECORD at this point for my colleagues' perusal.

THE BREZHNEV DOCTRINE

(By Charles T. Baroch)

More than two years ago the non-Communist world was shocked by the ruthless intervention of Warsaw Pact armed forces in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The alleged purpose of the intervention was "to defend the socialist character" of a member of the world socialist system and its "socialist achievements."

The Warsaw Pact countries, especially the U.S.S.R., were accused, even by some Communists, of having violated Czechoslovak sovereignty and right of self-determination. Non-Communist reaction was well summed up by the indignant editorial in *The New York Times* of September 28, 1968, in which the name "Brezhnev Doctrine" may have been coined:

The latest Kremlin attempt to justify the invasion of Czechoslovakia is further indication of Stalinism ascendant in Moscow.

The earlier attempt to claim a status of semi-legality on the basis of a supposed invitation to the invaders from high Czechoslovak Government and Communist party leaders has apparently been discarded. Instead, Pravda now enunciates what must be called the *Brezhnev doctrine*, though the same thinking was manifest in the brutal repression of Hungarian freedom in 1956. The core of this doctrine is the assertion that Communist-ruled states enjoy neither genuine sovereignty nor genuine rights of territorial integrity, that the Soviet Union may at any time it deems proper send troops into any such states in order to pressure Communist rule.

What permits the Soviet Union to issue and even to implement such doctrine is, of course, Soviet military power. This reliance on force and contempt for law must raise fears among others that some day Moscow will decide that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of non-Communist nations is also being interpreted too abstractly and without due attention to class principles.

Questions arise as to the origin and scope of this allegedly new doctrine. It seems that the editorialist who coined the term, which has become an international household word, had in mind an analogy with certain American policy pronouncements now, with the acquiescence of other states, part of customary international law. Analogy with the most famous of these, the Monroe Doctrine, is very tempting, but, as I hope to demonstrate, despite superficial similarity, the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine is precisely its opposite in every respect.

There are three fundamental problems regarding the Brezhnev Doctrine: (1) Can it be attributed to Brezhnev? (2) What is its relation to international law? and (3) What are its real content and implications?

PERSONAL DECISION MAKING BY COMMUNIST LEADERS IS MINIMAL

Certain aspects revealing a conventional, narrow understanding of the Communist world outlook are usually stressed by authors considering the Brezhnev Doctrine. It is assumed that the *Secretary General* of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.), with the approval of the Politburo, formulated a *new* doctrine of the *limited* sovereignty of a member of the socialist system of states. Yet, there is in Communist-controlled states very little personal decision making by individual leaders, how-

ever exalted their positions. The "fraternal assistance" to Czechoslovakia was a vital policy decision of the C.P.S.U. Politburo based on evaluation of the global situation and recommendations by several departments of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee apparatus, of which the present Secretary General is a product. He therefore hardly deserves to be honored as the doctrine's originator.

There is the widespread conviction, also, that this doctrine represents a new foreign policy formula or, at least, a revival of policy discarded after Stalin's death. It is enough, however, to consult earlier Communist documents to see the fallacy of this view.

1957 DECLARATION REAFFIRMS BASIC MARXIST-LENINIST TENET

In 1957, for instance, following the suppression of Polish and East German unrest and the Hungarian uprising of the year before, the ruling Communist Parties of the twelve socialist countries met in Moscow to define the Communist co-ordinated policy for the later 1950s and 1960s. They sought to outline basic rules of conduct to avoid the pitfalls of mechanical copying of C.P.S.U. methods (the so-called dogmatism) and, what was considered even more dangerous, of revisionism of Marxist-Leninist tenets or right-wing opportunism. Their declaration stated: [1]

In our epoch, world development is determined by the course and results of the confrontation [*sorevnovaniye*] [2] between two diametrically opposed social systems [socialism versus capitalism]. [In that confrontation] the strengthening of the unity and fraternal cooperation of the socialist [communist-controlled] states and of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries and closing the ranks of the international working class, national-liberation and democratic movements take on special importance.[3]

While asserting that "the socialist countries base their relations on the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty as well as non-interference", the declaration emphasizes that, however important, these principles *"do not exhaust* the essence of their relations". (Emphasis added.) Fraternal, mutual assistance is an integral part of these relations and "finds its expression in the principle of socialist internationalism",[4] which has thus been elevated to a fundamental doctrine, superimposed on international law in socialist interstate relations.

In order to offset the dangers of revisionism, the twelve participating parties forcefully, reaffirmed the correctness of the basic Marxist-Leninist tenet that "the processes of the socialist revolution and socialist construction are governed by a number of basic 'laws,' applicable in all countries embarking on the socialist path." [5] Their declaration then lists these generally valid principles and rules of conduct binding on all Communist Parties, ruling or nonruling alike:

1. Leadership of the toiling masses by the working class, whose vanguard is the Marxist-Leninist Party, in bringing about a proletarian revolution in one form or another [either by peaceful or violent (civil war) means] and in establishing some form of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

2. Alliance of the working class with the bulk of the peasantry and other strata of the toilers;

3. Abolition of capitalist ownership and establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production;

4. Gradual socialist reorganization [collectivization] of agriculture;

5. Planned development of the economy with the aim of building socialism and communism;

6. Completion of a socialist revolution in the sphere of ideology and culture and formation of numerous intelligentsia devoted to the working class, the toilers and the cause of socialism;

7. Elimination of national oppression and the establishment of equality and fraternal friendship among people;

8. *Defense of the achievements of socialism* [6] [emphasis added] against encroachments of external and internal enemies; solidarity of the working class of a given country with the working class of other countries—proletarian internationalism.[7]

Two observations should be made with regard to the 1957 declaration. The Soviet delegation to the 1957 conference was headed by the then First Secretary of the C.P.S.U. Nikita S. Khrushchev, who, for all his reputation as promoter of peaceful coexistence, in 1956, as will be remembered, had given fraternal military assistance to orthodox Hungarian Communists led by Janos Kadar in their effort to preserve socialist achievements in that country.

Also, the same basic rules for Communist conduct defined in the 1957 declaration are quoted, as we shall see, in Brezhnev's arguments to justify the 1968 Warsaw Pact occupation of Czechoslovakia. A constantly deteriorating situation (from a Communist viewpoint) had developed there, with the local Communist Party in disarray and losing its total control (dictatorship) over the state,[8] resembling the 1956 Hungarian crisis.

In the view of the Warsaw Pact governments this situation fully justified armed intervention, aimed at restoring the Communist Party power monopoly. The non-Communist world, however, branded it as "contrary to every elementary rule of international law, to say nothing of the UN Charter".[9]

It is of major interest, therefore, to look next into the Communist attitude toward these elementary rules of international law, which are essential for normal intercourse among states. Since legal norms are basically rules and guidelines of conduct, whether of individuals or states, the importance of understanding the Soviet legal system and its underlying philosophy cannot be overemphasized in our search for communist policy motivation. Secretary of State William P. Rogers summed it up very well when as Attorney General he wrote in this *Journal*:

When we talk about competing with International Communism in the realm of ideas, we are talking in large measure about the ideas which are the basis of our legal system.[10]

The so-called Brezhnev Doctrine has often been qualified in the non-Communist world as a doctrine of limited sovereignty, applicable only to a socialist state. What, briefly, is the Communist concept of state sovereignty within the international law context?

STATE CONCEPT DIFFERS FROM TRADITIONAL NOTIONS

The state concept—and sovereignty is an important attribute of the state—as defined in the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and law differs substantially from traditional notions. The theory of the origin, nature and aims of the state was formulated by Lenin, a lawyer by education, who relied heavily on Frederick Engels's work, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.* As is well known, Engels tied the states' origin to the appearance on the historical scene of private ownership of the means of production and the resulting split of society into antagonistic classes. The state emerged, and continued to exist, as an organ of class rule (slave-owners over slaves, fuedal lords over serfs).

At present, Marxist-Leninist theory distinguishes between the two basic forms of class society: in one the classes are *hostile* and *antagonistic* towards each other and are engaged in bitter class conflict (burgeoisie vs. the working class in a capitalist state); the other, after doing away with private ownership of the means of production, is identified by co-operation of *friendly* classes (the working class and *kolkhoz* [collective farm] peasantry in a proletarian-socialist state) in a joint task and aim: building socialism and, ultimately, communism.

Marxism-Leninism disclosed the *class* nature of the state, and, in a society with antagonistic classes, it considers the state as a machine of suppression. "The state"—noted V. I. Lenin—"is a machine used to support the domination of one class over another." The figurative word "machine" immediately indicates the gist of the class nature of state; it helps to explain that a state like any machine is a tool in the hands of people, a tool which multiplies their strength as representatives of the ruling class. Consequently, the state in its essence is an instrument of a dictatorship—of class domination.[11]

The state in a capitalist society, according to Marxism-Leninism, serves as an instrument for the oppression of the majority (the toiling masses) by the minority (the *bourgeoisie*). The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the other hand, serves as an instrument of suppression of a minority (the remainder of the vanquished exploiting classes) by an overwhelming majority (the working class and the peasants). Only after the complete victory of socialism does the state cease to be an organ of class domination; under socialism it continues to serve as an instrument of political power of the friendly classes of toilers.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IS A FICTION

In theory, the working class rules the proletarian-socialist state and is thus the bearer of its sovereignty. In fact, however, popular sovereignty is a fiction in such a state because of the unique position of the Communist Party, a position equivalent, ultimately, to one of exclusive and total control over the state. The ruling Communist Parties not only formulate policy for all aspects (economic, political and cultural) of society's life, but they also select cadres for the state apparatus who carry out and supervise their policy.[12] This is justified by the party's claim to be the vanguard of the working class in its revolutionary mission to transform the world.

The class character of the Communist-controlled party-state and, consequently, of its sovereignty introduces a new international or, better to say, supranational concept into interstate relations between socialist states themselves as well as between "capitalist" and "socialist" states.

In their interstate or, rather, interparty relations, Communist-controlled states claim to be primarily guided by the principles of socialist internationalism and not by general international law,[13] although, Soviet jurists assert the socialist states consistently uphold the observance in international intercourse of the generally recognized democratic principles of international legality and law . . . they are inserting a new content into old legal forms, a new quality arising from the *socialist* character of those states.[14] [Emphasis added.]

This process is being described as the formation of a separate socialist international law, which will gradually replace general international law "when the world socialist system will occupy a dominant position in all areas of international relations".[15]

Meanwhile, intercourse between socialist and capitalist states is allegedly regulated by norms of general international law, often called by Communist jurists "the Law of Peaceful Coexistence" between states of the two antagonistic social systems. It is not a law of peaceful intercourse in the traditional,

Footnotes at end of article.

non-Communist meaning, but a set of norms operating in a historical situation characterized by the absence of major (nuclear) conflict between the two systems, whose "coexistence" is described as a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism in the international arena. . . . Peaceful coexistence between the two systems does not exclude revolutions in the form of armed uprisings and just national liberation wars against imperialist oppression, which occur within the capitalist system.[16]

In this context the international law principles of the sovereignty of a capitalist state and noninterference in its internal affairs, despite formal acceptance by the Communists, are logically also subordinated to the overriding aims of class struggle (for example, international civil war) and are devoid of traditional significance.

It appears that the negative influence of the Brezhnev Doctrine on international law's validity is self-evident.

BREZHNEV'S ROLE HELPS TO EXPLAIN HIS DOCTRINE

For an understanding of the real content and implications of the Brezhnev Doctrine, we must return to Brezhnev's role, even though the doctrine may not be so new and he is not its author. It would be a great mistake to minimize the influence of this most important representative of the C.P.S.U. Central Comimttee apparatus, which wields enormous power emanating from the party's totalitarian control over the Soviet state and, indirectly, even over the world socialist system. In his public pronouncements the Secretary General interprets and communicates to the world the genuine "Brezhnev Doctrine", a complex set of concepts and motivations which make the C.P.S.U. and other Communist Parties "tick", despite their "rifts". We speak here, of course, of the Communist world view, the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, which is the global, ideological framework of the Communist Parties.

In a recent collection of speeches and articles the Secretary General summarizes "the Party's experience in directing communist construction and the foreign policy of the USSR."[17] It is C.P.S.U. directed foreign policy interpreted by Breznev, then, that will offer us an insight into the problem of "sovereign" relations among communist-controlled states, and, ultimately, also, between those states and their noncommunist counterparts.

INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA HAS BEEN AN IMPORTANT TOPIC

The invasion of Czechoslovakia in August, 1968, a critical foreign policy decision within the socialist system, has been an important topic in Brezhnev's speeches. On November 12, 1968, his address to the Congress of the Polish United Workers (*i.e.*, Communist) Party showed not only concern with a local (Czechoslovak) problem but reflected the communist global view:

"We are living, comrades, in a complicated, stormy and interesting time. The revolutionary process, which centers around the *confrontation of the two principal social systems* of our epoch—socialism and capitalism—is progressing irresistibly."[18] [Emphasis added.]

He admonishes the Communists of the socialist countries that the recent activization in Czechoslovakia of forces hostile to socialism should be understood in terms of this confrontation and that it is vitally important . . . to carry high the banner of socialist internationalism and constantly strengthen the solidarity and cohesion of the socialist countries.[19]

Despite remarks in support of the observance of traditional sovereignty of all states, Brezhnev emphasizes the special importance for the Communists of defending the sovereignty of states which have chosen the road of building socialism. He equates the sovereignty of a socialist country with building "a society free of every oppression and exploitation". True consolidation of sovereignty and independence requires that each socialist country determine the concrete forms of its development along the path toward socialism, while taking into account the specific character of its national conditions.[20]

But, Brezhnev warns, in order to uphold "socialist" sovereignty: there exist also *generally binding principles* of socialist construction, whose neglect could lead to a retreat from socialism. . . . And when internal and external forces hostile to socialism make an attempt to reverse the development of a socialist country *in the direction of the restoration of the capitalist system* . . . then this threat represents not only a problem for the people of that country, but a common problem and task of all socialist countries.[21] [Emphasis added.]

Mutual fraternal assistance, based on principles of socialist internationalism, includes, according to Brezhnev, direct military intervention, even though only as "an extraordinary measure, in order to nip in the bud the threat to the socialist order".

Brezhnev did not elaborate on these generally binding principles and rules, knowing quite well that his host, Gomulka, was one of the signers of the 1957 declaration of the twelve Communist and Workers' Parties that spelled them out in detail.

Two years later, in a monumental discourse, "The Work of Lenin Lives and Triumphs", on April 21, 1970, Brezhnev again reminded his listeners, Communists and sympathizers from practically every country in the world, of the "collapse" of the antisocialist plot in Czechoslovakia, proving "the great importance of the international solidarity of the socialist countries". He remarked, "Neither our friends nor our enemies doubt its force and effectiveness—and that is very good."

When we compare this speech with the 1957 Moscow Declaration, the remarkable continuity of Marxist-Leninist thinking should not surprise us. Prepared by the same apparatus, it repeats the declaration's main points almost word for word: The path of different countries to socialism, and the socialist system itself, are characterized—"as has been emphasized by the fraternal Parties"—by "common landmarks", the socialist revolution in some form which crushes the state machinery of the exploiters and replaces it by the state (dictatorship) of the proletariat; the proletarian (socialist) state, which, in turn, liquidates the exploiter classes, socializes the means of production and inaugurates a cultural revolution in Lenin's meaning.

As for the socialist system once constructed, its fundamental obligatory characteristics are: the rule of the toilers, implemented through the control of the Marxist-Leninist party over society's development; social ownership of the means of production and a planned economy; education of the entire people in the spirit of the ideology of scientific communism; and, last but not least, a foreign policy based on the principles of proletarian-socialist internationalism.

Bearing in mind the doctrinal continuity displayed by the C.P.S.U. apparatus, it is only natural that Brezhnev should publicly deny not only authorship but also the very existence of a "Brezhnev" doctrine. Speaking in Moscow on June 9, 1969, before an international conference of seventy-five Communist and Workers' Parties held to consider the tasks of the struggle against imperialism, he accused "the imperialist propagandists" of having fabricated and circulated the notorious doctrine of limited sovereignty [and of] slandering the principle of proletarian internationalism by contrasting it *artificially* with the principles of independence, sovereignty and equality of national detachments of the workers' and communist movement [Communist Parties].[22] [Emphasis added.]

In support of his argument he quoted as "by no means obsolete" Lenin's definition: "to be an internationalist means to do the utmost possible in one country *for* the promotion, support and stirring up of revolution *in all countries*."[23]

The genuine "Brezhnev Doctrine" is, then, a restatement of the Marxist-Leninist world view: a world engulfed in an irreconcilable confrontation between the two antagonistic socioeconomic systems—capitalism and socialism—which is bound to end with a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society according to Marxist-Leninist tenets. To this supranational revolutionary end *everything* is subordinated, including interests of whole nations (their sovereignty, equality, independence, etc.) as well as the interests of individuals, irrespective of whether they are part of the capitalist or socialist system.

The present Secretary General may, of course, at some future date be replaced by another *apparatchik* (prominent member of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee apparatus), who will continue promoting the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the true driving force behind the Communist effort.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Pravda, November 22, 1957, page 1. Represented were the Communist Parties of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, East Germany, China, North Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. All but Yugoslavia signed the document.

[2] The widely used English equivalent, "competition", is a misleading translation in the author's opinion, since it does not reflect this struggle's irreconcilable character.

[3] Pravda, November 22, 1957, page 1.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *"Zavoyevania sotsializma"* (achievements of socialism), in the author's opinion, is better translated literally "conquests of socialism", since it reflects the Communist large-scale application of crude force and legalized terror in transforming society.

[7] Pravda, November 22, 1957, page 1.

[8] Read a more detailed analysis of the situation in the author's brochure, THE SOVIET DOCTRINE OF SOVEREIGNTY, THE SO-CALLED BREZHNEV DOCTRINE, published by the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education About Communism and Its Contrast With Liberty Under Law. (1970).

[9] The New York Times, September 28, 1968, page 32.

[10] Rogers, *Our Great Goal: Peace Under Law*, 45 A.B.A.J. 1181 (1959).

[11] FUNDAMENTALS OF THE THEORY OF STATE AND LAW (in Russian), legal textbook of the Sverdlovsk Law Institute (1969).

[12] *Id.* at 197–198.

[13] TUNKIN, THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (in Russian) 504 (1970).

[14] Korovin, *Proletarian Internationalism and International Law*, SOVIET YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW—1958 (in Russian) 55 (1959).

[15] Usenko, *International Law in the Intercourse of Socialist Countries*, SOVIET YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW—1966–1967 (in Russian) 44 (1968).

[16] 4 *Philosophical Encyclopedia* (in Russian) at 452–454.

[17] 1 BREZHNEV, THE LENINIST POLICY COURSE: SPEECHES AND ARTICLES 1964–1970 (in Russian) 3.

[18] *Id.*, Volume 2, at 325.

[19] *Id.* at 328.

[20] *Id.* at 329.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Id.* at 397.

[23] *Ibid.*

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 weeks ago, the people of the United States celebrated the anniversary of the most important event in the history of our Nation. On July 4, 1776, the repre-

sentatives of the United States of America declared "the reasons which impel them to the separation" from the Colonial Empire of Great Britain. What were these impelling reasons? The American Revolutionaries held "these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." The King of England, they charged, had held some men more equal than others, had imposed his arbitrary mandates on the American people without their consent. He had, in short, evinced "a design to reduce them under absolute despotism." These revolutionaries felt it "their right, their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security." The philosophy which they believed in was not intended solely for one people at one moment in history, but for all peoples throughout history.

This week, Mr. Speaker, is Captive Nations Week. It is a time to reflect how freedom is gained, and how it is lost. It is a time to remember the aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations; to recall how similar they are to the aspirations of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the American people. And, too, we must be reminded that freedom can be lost—not only through external aggression, but through internal neglect.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we do not neglect freedom, that we do not forget the painful experiences of the captive nations, that we do not lose sight of the ideal expressed in the declaration. Captive Nation's Week helps assure that we do not.

The Kenosha News, one of the newspapers in my district, published an excellent editorial called "Captive Nation's Week: Rekindling the Flame." I am including that fine editorial in today's RECORD. It follows:

CAPTIVE NATION'S WEEK: REKINDLING THE FLAME

Some 1,000,000,000 persons . . . almost one out of every three persons on earth . . . live under the Communist boot. They live in the captive nations.

It is difficult indeed for we who enjoy the fruits and freedoms of democracy to realize what living in a captive nation actually means.

Without freedom, life loses dimension and perspective. In the captive nations, dictators discard rule by law and substitute rule by fear. The glorification of the state is cultivated at the expense of the individual. Human dignity is denied.

Many Kenoshans who have fled their native lands know the meaning of the knock on the door by the secret police, deportation to labor camps, the loss of their possessions and the often permanent separation of families. They know that persons have disappeared after laying a wreath with ribbons in their national colors at a commemorating ceremony.

Perhaps the deepest tragedy is that a generation has grown up which never experienced the fruits and responsibilities of democracy and therefore cannot compare the two systems. And even more tragic is the fact that, with the exception of the years between World Wars, the predecessor generations of the satellite nations were deprived of the opportunity of developing a democratic tradition.

Yet those Kenoshans who have escaped from a dozen iron curtain countries will not allow themselves the blessings of our country without rekindling the flame of hope for those who remain enchained.

Tomorrow, ceremonies commemorating Captive Nation's Week will be held at St. Therese's Parish Park. Hundreds of persons from the Kenosha-Racine area will gather to hear several eminent speakers discuss the plight of the captive nations and to urge the free countries of the world to liberate those who suffer under the yoke of communism. The public is invited to attend. It is a valuable experience profound in its insight to the tragedies of many innocent people caught by virtue of birth in an inextricable web of circumstance and power politics.

One can only come away more appreciative of our American heritage . . . a heritage firmly founded in freedoms which we in the United States are inclined to casually take for granted.

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all origins have grown tired of the continuing Soviet oppression of the people of the "Captive Nations."

They would welcome any meaningful initiative, I am certain, toward easing the state of permanent crisis that has been in constant evidence for more than a quarter century.

The recent upheavals in Poland have reminded us once again of the built-in instability of Communist rule in East and Central Europe.

While a Communist regime still rules Poland, the fall of Wladyslaw Gomulka has shown that the Kremlin could be forced to sacrifice even the most faithful exponent of its line.

Other hardliners in Eastern Europe no doubt have taken notice that no amount of past service to Moscow guarantees perpetuation in power.

All Americans who value their own national freedom are aware and concerned about the imposing reality of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R. itself, Asia, and Cuba.

All Americans join in expressing the hope that the captive peoples will soon be free.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, during this 13th observance of Captive Nations Week, I would like to join with the millions of Americans who deplore the oppression of over 100 million eastern Europeans by Communist regimes. On July 4 of this year, all Americans were reminded of their unique and cherished freedom. It is therefore timely that we mark Captive Nations Week so soon after the celebration of our own independence from tyranny and subjugation.

Although we observe the plight of these countries for only a week, the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania must endure their hardships throughout the year. For this reason, our expression of sympathy should not be and is not a fleeting emotion, but rather is an everyday belief which is underscored during this week.

While strict censorship by the governments of the captive nations prevents the free world from learning much about life in these countries, the glimpses we obtain through cracks in the Iron Curtain hearten our belief that the people's thirst for freedom is unquenchable. The recent uprisings in Poland have reaffirmed in our eyes the people's discontent with a tyrannical government which blatantly ignores their needs and wantonly crushes their dissent when they cry out. Physical captivity has never been able to imprison man's desire for independence and the right of self-determination.

During Captive Nations Week we are serving notice to the leaders of these countries that Americans deplore the abridgment of rights therein and that we will do everything within our power to encourage the people of these nations to persevere in their long and arduous quest for freedom.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 13th year that the United States will observe Captive Nations Week. The law that was enacted in 1959 provided that each year this Nation shall renew its pledge and continue its efforts "until such times as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

As we celebrate this observance of Captive Nations Week all Americans should pause and remember the blessings which freedom has given us. We should then reaffirm our determination to return liberty to those many nations and to the millions of people who are presently living under the oppressive yoke of the Soviet Union.

These nations have been made captive by the aggressive and heartless policies of communism. The peoples of these Communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties.

Man's desire for freedom will soon turn to frustration unless he has hope. The captive peoples must have reason to hope. They must know that although they have been silenced, they have not been forgotten. They must understand that they will not be abandoned for the sake of the status quo or for a policy of so-called peaceful coexistence. As long as there are enslaved lands, as long as there are people living under the chains of communism, the free world must strive ceaselessly to restore to them the self-government and the liberties to which everyone is entitled.

The purpose of this observance, in the words of the original resolution, was to demonstrate to the captive nations "that the people of the United States share with them their aspiration for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate activities, and I urge them to commit themselves to the support of these people.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was first proclaimed in 1959 that the American people might be provided with "a suitable framework for showing their solidarity with their captive brethren in East and Central Europe." There can be no question that such an observance is as timely this year as ever. While we continue to acclaim our own liberties, personal rights, and freedoms of the most basic nature are denied to those citizens of the captive nations.

Over the past months we have witnessed the upheavals and increasing discontent in Poland, and we have become increasingly aware of the plight of Russian Jews. It seems that over the past 13 years little progress has been made in providing permanent solutions for the problems faced by those living in the Soviet satellite nations, although their struggle clearly continues.

While past statements of moral support have served a beneficial function, I believe that this year Captive Nations Week should be regarded as a time to focus on new ways of easing tensions between the countries of the free world and those behind the Iron Curtain. More specifically, now is an appropriate time for increased discussion of the future role of NATO, of the possibilities for mutual and strategically equitable troop reductions in Europe, and of more flexible trade agreements. For it may well be that expanding American influence on the captive nations in these and similar ways will encourage liberalization within these countries, and that the peoples of these states will gradually regain their valued liberties.

The overriding goal of American foreign policy must continue to be the establishment of an atmosphere of peace in a world in which the people of every nation have the right of self-determination in structuring their governments and personal lives. Captive Nations Week serves once again as a reminder of this important objective.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, July 18 to 24, 1971 marks the 13th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Coming so shortly after we celebrated the anniversary of our own Nation's independence, this week provides us with a sharp reminder that millions of people in Eastern Europe are not as fortunate as we, and that their struggle for liberty and democracy continues.

Our heritage requires that we keep the lamp of freedom burning. The captive and oppressed have traditionally looked to us for hope and for inspiration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in the Congress and with millions of Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the plight of the captive nations. We shall continue to work and to pray for their eventual liberation from totalitarianism.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Z. Michael Szaz from Troy State University, who is also serving as the Secretary of International Relations of the American Hungarian Federation, informed me of the neo-Stalinist campaign of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, upon Soviet orders, against all cultural and social organizations of the country, with particular emphasis upon the national minorities, including the Hungarians of Slovakia.

Several of my colleagues, ably led by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) are discussing today the various details of this campaign and purge which resulted in the wholesale removal of the leadership of the only nationwide Hungarian cultural and social organization in Czechoslovakia, shortly before the Czechoslovak Party Congress that hailed the Soviet invasion as the salvation of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

My sympathies lie with the courageous and freedom-loving forces in Czechoslovakia, including the Hungarian minority whose leaders in 1968 fully supported Dubcek and called for a just resolution of the outstanding national and nationality problems on the basis of self-administration and cultural autonomy and respect for human and civil rights.

The tragic developments in Czechoslovakia teach us another lesson that no lasting detente can be built in Europe until the Soviet Union abandons the Brezhnev doctrine and respects the right to self-determination of the peoples of East Central Europe.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years, communism has been a silencing prison enslaving millions of Eastern and Central European people while brooking no formidable opposition from within. Today, however, the surrounding walls are becoming less secure. Both free and captive people are, at last, uniting and solidifying their denial of oppressive regimes as the sole voice of wisdom and truth. Thus, I am proud to be able to partake in this 13th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Our attention is focused on the plight of millions of oppressed human beings, deprived of the freedoms and unalienable rights that their Western counterparts now enjoy. This event comes at a very appropriate time, not only with respect to the month, but also to the year 1971.

As we have just concluded the ceremonies commemorating the birth of our Nation on July 4, the tenets of those freedoms and principles that are inherent in our heritage have been honored. As a nation, we have entered, by Presidential proclamation, our bicentennial—the beginning of a 5-year period to reflect upon the ideals of two of our greatest documents, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, and once again recite their principles to, not only the American people, but to people throughout the world.

All people yearn for freedom and justice. Unfortunately, these basic rights are still unattainable in many parts of the world. Americans, therefore, must continue to take the lead in helping these unrealized freedoms become actualized in all nations. Perhaps our Bill of Rights states most clearly those privileges that we, the American people, have enjoyed and possibly taken too much for granted. Our undeniable freedoms of assembly, religion, speech, and press, as guaranteed by the first amendment, are perhaps the most vital liberties that have helped to sustain this Nation for almost 200 years. Yet, many Americans are becoming disbelievers as to their meaning, and more important, their worth.

How quickly we forget that just 90 short miles from Florida lives an oppressed people. If we are to continue aiding captive people, we first must unite as a nation in the realization of the true worth and merit of our constitutional freedoms. Once our unalienable rights are secure in the hearts and minds of Americans, then and only then, can we convey their value and importance to those in bondage.

During our recent July 4 celebration, we recalled America's struggle, not only to win her freedoms, but to preserve them throughout the years. Our goal was so important then; the result should be equally as important now. Our first amendment freedom of the press recently came under the scrutiny of essentially the whole world, with our heritage and way of life hanging in the balance. The Supreme Court's decision preserved, upheld, and reinforced, I believe, not only our first amendment, but our whole Constitution.

Throughout history, the world has witnessed the plight of the oppressed. World War II sought to put an end to prevailing Nazi tyranny, and hopefully, begin an era of peace, tranquility, and freedom for all. However, the war only brought forth a new enemy and new oppressors. Names and faces may change, but the goal remains intact. I believe our annual observances of Captive Nations Week prove that the United States will not end its efforts to forever insure peace and freedom in the world. The forerunners of despotism are perhaps only now realizing and fearing our efforts to assist the cause of freedom for Eastern and Central European people. However, much work is still needed to finalize a complete breakthrough of freedom for all human beings.

One day there will no longer be a need for the observance of Captive Nations Week. I only hope and pray that day arrives soon. But not until Americans are thoroughly convinced and supportive of their own constitutional freedoms can we work toward the alleviation of oppression and procurement of universal sovereignty.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the third week in the month of July as Captive Nations Week through congressional action in 1959 constituted a formal commitment by the American people through their representatives to reaffirm each year that the plight of the millions of people held in Communist captivity will never be ignored by or acceptable to Americans. Needless to say, a formal commitment was unnecessary to insure that the American people, who deeply cherish the legacy of freedom which is ours by birth, would ever become apathetic toward the political, economic, and individual enslavement to which the captive peoples have been subjected. The formal commitment made in 1959 instead designates a week each year during which vocal expression can be given to the anguish continually in the

hearts of the American people for those who fell behind the Iron Curtain of persecution following World War II.

The citizens of captive nations may have lost their freedom temporarily but there is strong evidence they have not lost hope or their desire to regain it. As long as freedom exists somewhere in the world, as long as free people remain unswerving in their determination to keep freedom alive, hope will flourish in the captive nations of Europe, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.

And so, during this week, we must reaffirm a twofold promise: To remain firm against further Communist usurpation in the world, and to do all within our power to work for the ultimate liberation of every captive nation.

We must restate and reaffirm our concern for those nations which are now captive or in danger of becoming captive; we must reassure the world that we will never acquiesce to the permanent bondage of any people.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend all those who are taking this opportunity to observe Captive Nations Week, and to ask that everyone rededicate himself to the achievement of freedom for the victims of Communist oppression.

As most Americans know, Communist denial of freedom in Russia began on November 7, 1917, the day of the October revolution. What most people do not realize is that the spread of Russian communism began in 1917, continued through World War II, and progresses even today.

As we observe the 13th Captive Nations Week, we are invited to remember this third of humanity that has been living in slavery since the early years of this century. The events in Eastern Europe especially since World War II, show us that the yearning for freedom is not dead. Americans need not be reminded of the millions of people who have voted with their feet since the enslavement of their countries, or of the continuing manifestations of their desire for freedom, whether that desire is expressed by passive resistance, workers' strikes, riots, or outright rebellion.

During Captive Nations Week of 1971, we should remember in particular the heroic demonstrations that took place last Christmas. They are the latest in a continuing series of examples of this type of action that proves to us that the torch of freedom still burns in the hearts of these captive peoples. We should also realize that it is important to eulogize these courageous men and women as they fight in their own ways to regain the liberty, respect, and dignity they once enjoyed as free peoples.

We live in a land fortunate enough to have had forefathers who saw fit not only to bestow the blessings of freedom upon themselves and their posterity but also to defend these blessings successfully when necesary. Thus, sometimes we must be reminded of those in other parts of the world who are less fortunate than we, and who, in some cases, can only remember freedom from their parents' or even grandparents' lips.

Our reminder comes to us in part through Captive Nations Week, which was first unofficially observed in 1958. Its growth has been continuous since then, and during the 86th Congress, this week was officially designated Captive Nations Week. We should not, here in this citadel of freedom, ever forget the reasons for our observance of this week. As has been done every year since 1959, a proclamation has been issued by the President in order to focus attention upon captive nations. The concepts contained in the following joint resolution—Public Law 86-90—exemplify not only our convictions but also indicate the direction which we must follow. To pay tribute to all who have made this week possible and to those now struggling for freedom, I include the joint resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

(Providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week")

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of undersanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Aderbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week when millions of Americans will focus their attention upon the plight of those nations presently under Communist domination. This year's observance comes at a highly important moment in our efforts to lend a helping hand to the people of Eastern Europe—here I am referring to the uncertain fate of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Ever since 1960, when I visited the Soviet Union with one of the first groups of American students to go there, I have been keenly aware of the importance of information in Soviet society. It is a well known fact that the people of the Soviet Union have learned to depend upon Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasts in order to learn about what is really happening in the free outside world. I know that this feeling is shared by many fellow citizens in Connecticut as they try to correspond with lost friends and relatives who are still locked behind the Iron Curtain—only to find that the heavy hand of Communist censorship has edited out much of what their friends have been trying to say.

For over 18 years, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have provided a service which is impossible for other broadcasting media to perform. We cannot afford to undo the great accomplishments which these stations have achieved, nor can we deny to the people of Eastern Europe something which they have depended heavily upon for so many years.

The need for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty still exists. The rape of Czechoslovakia in 1968 proves that the Communists are not ready to allow the freedom of expression in the countries which they illegally and immorally control. The recent persecutions of Russian intellectuals and Soviet Jewry also show the extent to which dogma and doctrine rule the U.S.S.R. itself. The right to know is still the prisoner of Marxist ideology in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of June I went on record as a cosponsor of a bill, H.R. 9330, which would create an American Council for Private International Communications, Inc. which would receive congressional appropriations and make grants to Radio Free Europe for broadcasts to Eastern Europe and to Radio Liberty for broadcasts to the Soviet Union. In keeping with the spirit of Captive Nations Week, I would like to again reaffirm my support not only for this bill, but for the entire U.S. policy of maintaining contact with the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. At a time when new progress is being made to reach the people of Asia, we cannot afford

to lose our most useful method of contact with the people of Eastern Europe. The 13th observance of Captive Nations Week is indeed an appropriate occasion to rededicate ourselves to the task of reaching the oppressed peoples of the world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) correctly pointed out, intensive and far-reaching Soviet intervention into the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia continues unabated.

Either directly, as in the case of the recent convention of the Slovak Communist Party, or indirectly, through the intimidated, or quisling new leaders of the Czech and Slovak Communist Parties, they make their neo-Stalinist views prevail both in the political and cultural life of Czechoslovakia. The promising liberalization of culture and politics and the awaited reconciliation of the nations and nationalities in Czechoslovakia are receiving constant blows by the purge of responsive and responsible leaders and by Soviet permission to rekindle the nationality conflicts in the guise of class warfare among Czechs and Slovaks and Slovaks and Hungarians.

My distinguished colleague dealt with the newest episodes of these trends, and with particular regard to the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, that is, the removal of the national president and much of the Presidium members of the only nationwide cultural and social organization of the Hungarian community, the CSEMADOK, in April 1971. However, the ouster of Dobos and his collaborators was only the climax to external pressures applied already in 1970 by the Soviet-sponsored leadership of the Slovak Communist Party. In this regard I ask unanimous consent to include some material from the Bratislava (Pozsony) Népművelés (Popular Education) of June and August 1970 showing how the ranks of those promoting the demands of self-administration and cultural autonomy were decimated by the inclusion of neo-Stalinists in 1970 and how the others made an attempt to head off the worst by a half-hearted self-criticism. Unfortunately this appeasement could not avert their ultimate removal and the relegation of the organization to the status of complete servitude vis-a-vis the Slovak Communist Party.

With the removal of Dobos and his collaborators, the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia lost their last vestige of representation and public organization. The freedom-loving forces will no longer be able to express their opinions even in the Aesopian guise phrasing their ideals according to the semantic straitjacket of Marxism-Leninism.

At this point I join with my colleagues in denouncing these forced purges of the leaders and the renewed oppression of the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia, as one of the injurious elements of the brutal political application of the Brezhnev Doctrine in this tragedy-ridden Central European country.

I include the following articles:

[From *Népművelés* (*Popular Education*) (Bratislava-Pozsony), June 1970, Vol. XV (6)]

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CSEMADOK HELD ITS SESSION

On May 10–11 the Central Committee of CSEMADOK held its session at Bratislava (Pozsony). It debated and evaluated the activities of the association during 1968–69 and made personnel changes in the membership of the Central Committee, its presidium and its secretariat.

The introductory speech to the evaluation report on the activities of the association (the work of a six-member Committee) was presented by László Dobos, the national president of CSEMADOK. The members of the Central Committee approved the proposed evaluation dealing in details with the positive and negative activities of the association during 1968 and 1969.

Following a lively and fruitful discussion, the Central Committee accepted a resolution analyzing the positive and negative occurrences of the last two years and condemned all overzealousness in the work of its branches and also the erroneous and unrealistic views which were drafted into the program of the association at its extraordinary convention.

This resolution sets the course for the future direction of the CSEMADOK. This will provide the incentive to CSEMADOK to work for a more effective construction of Socialism based on the guiding force of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

The Central Committee also approved the following personnel changes proposed by the Presidium:

Miklós (Nicholas) Duray was expelled from the Central Committee because of the political views held by him in 1968.

In implementation of the resolution of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and of the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party, and in order to consolidate the situation, the Central Committee of the CSEMADOK, like the other constituent organizations of the National Front, enlarged its membership by coopting the following persons:

1. Olivér Rácz, Deputy Minister for Education of the Slovak Socialist Republic;
2. Ferenc (Francis) Pintér, the principal of the Hungarian language grade school of Diószeg.
3. Ferenc (Francis) Szigl, special assistant at the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party.
4. Dezsö (Desmond) Krocsány, Minister for Labor and Welfare of the Slovak Socialist Republic.
5. Zoltán Zalabai, assistant professor and assistant dean of the College of Education at Nitra (Nyitra).
6. István (Stephan) Bartha, the secretary of the Party Committee at Ersekújvár.
7. János (John) Szebellay, the president of the District Committee of the CSEMADOK at Léva (Levice).

Agoston (August) Major, the chief editor of *A Hét* (*The Week*) was transferred from the Central Control Committee to the Central Committee.

Dezsö (Desmond) Misovszky, the president of the Pozsony District Committee was elected as the new member of the Central Control Committee.

The Central Committee of CSEMADOK also accepted the resignation of József (Joseph) Szöke as general secretary after praising his past work as general secretary.

The Central Committee recalled Sándor Varga both as the secretary and as a member of the Central Committee.

To the position of general secretary the Central Committee elected the principal of the Hungarian-language grade school at Köbölkút, Béla (Adalbert) Varga, János (John) Varga was elected as secretary of the CSEMADOK and as a member of its Presidium. István Fábry, Vice President of the Slovak National Council was elected as a new member of the Presidium.

The Central Committee of CSEMADOK charged its Presidium to submit to the next national meeting a thorough analysis of the twenty years of work of CSEMADOK.

Upon finishing the personnel changes, Béla (Adalbert) Varga, the new general secretary of the Central Committee thanked the others for the trust shown toward him and promised that he will work in accordance with the guidance of the Slovak Communist Party in order to work for the cultural and political progress of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

The two day session was closed by a summation of László Dobos, the national president of CSEMADOK.

During the session of the Central Committee of CSEMADOK, a solemn memorial meeting was held in the evening of May 10 in order to celebrate the centennary of Lenin's birth and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the liberation of Czechoslovakia. The memorial speech was given by Bertalan (Bartholomew) Tolvaj, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee who is also in charge of the Nationality Secretariat of the Slovak Socialist Republic.

[From *Népművelés* (*Popular Education*), (Bratislava-Pozsony), August 1970]

THE CSEMADOK AND OUR CULTURAL LIFE

(Details of the Report of the Fourth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the CSEMADOK.)

The Fourth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of CSEMADOK evaluated among others the work of the CSEMADOK in 1968–69 and also the documents which the Central Committee had approved during that period. An important part of the report consists of the evaluation of the program and by-laws passed by the Tenth National Convention. The evaluation concluded that both the program and the by-laws, despite their several positive features, contain passages opposing the political guidelines and the vocation of the CSEMADOK as a cultural organization. For this reason, we are publishing those parts of the central evaluation which tries to expose those errors and show those incorrect theses which were rendered obsolete by political developments and which no longer satisfy the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism in regard to the tasks of social and cultural associations.

Formal errors aside, in our view, we must regard the political analysis, the consideration allotted to the realization of the tasks and their enumeration, and the drafting of the positions on the most important problems in the program as superficial. E.g., it refers to the theses contained on nationality questions in the action program of the Czechoslovak Communist Party as its basis, although the action program was only a stop-gap, transitional Party document. It was generally known that the long-term, universally valid, program of the Party can only be approved by the (Party) Congress which was to be convoked also by the drafters of the action program.

It reflected the weakening social importance of the leading role of the Party that the CSEMADOK program did not phrase its relationship to the policy of the Party in unmistakable terms. In some chapters it did definitely recognize the Party as "the leading force of our society" and wants to contribute to further progress in society "by bearing in mind the leading role of the Party," but

at another passage the program assumes the role of a political partner and wants to act as an "active participant" in the administration of nationality policies. It refers to the CSEMADOK as a partner "which harmonizes its activities with the work of the Party." It is true, however, that in another passage it states that "(it) wants to play the role not as a political party but as a social organization able to mobilize the masses and (it) will exert its role in the spirit of internationalism."

Lack of clarity on this question is also reflected in the view of the role to be played within the National Front. Here, according to the program, the CSEMADOK represents only not the interests of its members but the social and cultural interests of all Hungarians in Czechoslovakia as well," and "expresses the desires based on the specific nature of he Hungarian *ethnicum*." Naturally, the CSEMADOK cannot assume the service of the interests of all Czechoslovakian Hungarians in every direction, only the Party can be representative and protector of the whole gamut of social interests of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia. Therefore, within the National Front, the CSEMADOK cannot serve as the sole representative of the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia as an ethnic group and cannot be "the sole caretaker of intellectual national treasures, the (sole) interpreter of the social, political and cultural needs," and in the coming elections it could not appear as a competing political partner uniting the Hungarian deputies in one bloc, as foreseen in the program.

The phraseology of the program, speaking in the aname of all Hungarians of Czechoslovakia, can also create false illusions. The sentence in the conclusion part of the program is also incorrect in stating that "Our association is approving a program which expresses the interests, needs and aspirations of our members and of the Hungarians of Czechoslovakia." To put it mildly, this is an overstatement as the program failed to include and investigate several basic economic, social, and political strivings and needs which necessarily involve all strata and social groupings in our society. Our association reflects only partially and only in regard to certain dynamics and relationships "the needs and aspirations of the Czechoslovakian Hungarians." In no case does (CSEMADOK) reflect them in their totality, for it shares the representation with other social organizations, and at the highest level only the Party represents the population. This dimensional error originates in the unclear basic thesis of the program, based on the functional disturbances caused in Czechoslovak society by the weakening of the leading role of the Party in regard to social institutions and social organizations.

Following the changes of January 1968, the leading functionaries of our Party did not find the appropriate means in order to implement most effectively the leading role (of the Party) in the complicated structure of our society. Under such circumstances their abandonment of the old methods could only result in chaos and a loss of power. As a result, we, in the CSEMADOK, too, lost sight at times in 1968 of the truism that socialism is not only a nationality or an economic, political, social and ideological problem, but also a question of power. Indeed, primarily a question of power. Atomization of society and the isolation of the constituent groups of society was, though unconsciously implemented, weakening Socialist power.

The deficiencies contained in the CSEMADOK program extend to the phrasing of the organization by-laws, particularly to the second and third paragraphs of Point 4 of Chapter II which stated that "the CSEMADOK expresses and defends the social and cultural needs and the interests of the Hungarian *ethnicum* in Czechoslovakia and contributes with its proposals to the Marxist-Leninist solution of the nationality question." Furthermore "(it) organizes, collects and develops the social, ethnic and cultural activity of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia; protects and develops its intellectual treasures and represents it as an ethnic group in the organs of the National Front."

These points of the organizational by-laws are subject to the same criticism used in connection with similar definitions of the program of CSEMADOK.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past the American Hungarian Federation has been a fertile source of information on the situation in Hungary and in the neighboring countries of Czechoslovakia and Rumania where sizable Hungarian minorities exist. One of the organizations most intimately concerned with the situation of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia and which closely collaborates with the American Hungarian Federation is located in the State of Ohio. This is the National Committee on Hungarians in Czechoslovakia in Cleveland, and its chairman, Mr. Laszlo Sirsich, who works with the various nationalities at the State level with the Republican Party in Ohio.

Of special significance are the two statements issued by this organization on the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia and on the present situation in that country in which the Soviets have reasserted their absolute control and have revitalized nationality conflicts and class warfare.

It is indeed proper and timely for Members of the House to let their voices be heard in condemnation of the misdeeds of Soviet imperialism at a time when we seem to be preoccupied with a policy of self-flagellation concerning alleged shortcomings of our Southeast Asian policy.

The events in Czechoslovakia show again with clarity the impossibility of a lasting detente with Soviet Russia as long as the Brezhnev doctrine exists and as long as the right to independence and national self-determination of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are trampled upon by the boots of the Soviets.

We indeed appreciate the work of organizations like the National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia which was founded about 20 years ago to expose the repressive and Macchiavellian measures taken by the Communists and their allies. I insert at this point the two statements of 1968 and 1971 of the National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF HUNGARIANS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA ASSURES THE HUNGARIANS SEEKING THEIR RIGHTS DURING THE CZECHOSLOVAK CRISIS OF ITS BROTHERLY EMPATHY, MAY 18, 1968

The National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia has been working now for more than twenty years for the cause of the Hungarians of the Highlands and to remind the Hungarians scattered all around the world of their fate and development. It is our duty to hold a meeting now and assure them of our wholehearted empathy at a time the Czech and Slovak crises involve also a crisis for the Hungarians in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. We have foreseen the coming crisis but we remain aware that it could result both in advantages or disadvantages for our people in the Highlands.

The first emotion we must express is that of concern. We stated in 1965: "They liquidated hundred thousands of Hungarians and expelled even those who with rare sincerity served the cause of peace among the peoples of the Danubian region and strove for brotherhood. These were people who were looked upon with gratitude and love by their own generation. They were selfless and honest people who could rightly expect understanding and cooperation from the other side. And those who were allowed to stay, had to remain silent. But they could proudly state in February 1948 when Benes and his friends had to disappear from Czechoslovak politics: "We are starting with an insurmountable handicap, but also with a tremendous advantage: we remained uncorrupted. We were silent and inhumane accusations were not uttered by us."

Twenty years later, the national organization of the Hungarians of the Highlands, the CSEMADOK, stated the present situation as such:

". . . the main origins of the errors consist of the following:

"(a) The nationalities are not recognized as equal social elements in the Constitution and other basic documents as are the two nations;

"(b) The nationalities do not have constitutionally elected nationality organs and constitutionally based nationality institutions."

As a result, the nationalities do not possess the same rights as the nations.

Even more pointed were the demands of the Hungarian section of the Slovak Federation of Writers dealing with the present situation of the Hungarians of the Highlands:

"In the past, Hungarians were as a group, held collectively responsible for the partition of the Republic, and this doctrine of collective guilt found its way even into such basic documents as the Kosice (Kassa) program (of 1945). We request the revision of this accusation which is still officially on the books and have not been adequately and publicly abrogated. Furthermore, we request the rehabilitation of those innocently injured as a result of the collective guilt doctrine, and a revision of the sentences given to those protesting the deprivation of the rights of the Hungarians. Finally, we request the compensation for material damages suffered by persons under the 1945-48 anti-Hungarian legislations. We also find it necessary to have re-Slovakization openly annulled, and to have the locality names restored into Hungarian where they were altered in the Hungarian-inhabited regions and to have the accusation that the Hungarian population is bougeoise-nationalist condemned, . . ."

This, in a nutshell, is the present program of the Hungarians of the Highlands. It is indeed a pleasure to recognize even from far away the quality of the leadership of the Hungarian in Czechoslovakia which is modern, educated and united. This causes joy to all Hungarians around the world, and it proves that the Hungarians in the Highlands are a young and dynamic ethnic group capable to restore itself even after catastrophes.

The image of the future, as seen by the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia within the present crisis, is one of the most hopeful Hungarian phenomena in the last twenty-five years.

The crisis has not ended yet . . . The political balance within the federative constitutional form has not yet been found by Prague. And during this search for balance the Hungarians of the Highlands may face difficult questions and dangerous situations.

As a consequence, despite our concern and our readiness to talk on their behalf, today we restrict ourselves to an agreement with their demands. We do so both as we realize

the unusually complicated situation in Czechoslovakia which can be best handled by the long-suffering Hungarians of the region, and also as we appreciate the courageous loyalty and readiness characterizing the leaders of the Hungarian people of the Highlands.

At our session today, we express not only our concern but also our brotherly joy that our people were steeled rather than broken in spirit by the inhuman pressures of the past . . .

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIANS OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA, JULY 17, 1971

The National Committee for Hungarians of Czechoslovakia, an organization established 20 years ago by exiled priests and ministers, writers, intellectuals, workers and farmers raises its voice to protest the neo-Stalinist discrimination against Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

The NCHC has called the attention of world opinion to the acts of inhumanity employed against the Hungarians in Slovakia in the immediate post-World War II years who were then deprived of their human and civil rights including the right of their children to education and many of whom were either exiled or deported.

The NCHC has pursued with intense interest the development of the Hungarians in Slovakia, their renaissance and struggle for their nationality rights and survival. In the spring of 1968 we expressed both joy and concern. Even when the forces of liberalization seemed to be victorious and had already made life more bearable for all the peoples of Czechoslovakia, we warned that the crisis did not pass and that Slovakian Hungarian may yet face difficult problems and situations. After the Soviet invasion of August 23, 1968 and the removal of Dubcek our fears became reality. Dubcek was replaced by Husak whose government had started a campaign to curb the freedom-loving forces among the Hungarian minority. As a result, the only nationwide organization of the Hungarians in Slovakia, the CSEMADOK, was taken over by representatives of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. Those young Hungarians elected to the leadership of CSEMADOK were purged by the newly "co-opted" members imposed upon them by the Party. This change removed the only organization of Hungarians in Slovakia as a political and cultural force.

We call the attention of the Free World to discern and learn from the bitter experience of neo-Stalinism which the almost one million Hungarians of Slovakia are undergoing and the Free World should recognize, too, the necessity for a new settlement in Central Europe.

PROVIDING AN ORGANIC ACT FOR THE MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today H.R. 9911, a bill to provide an organic act for the management, conservation, development, and use of the public domain lands of the United States; to clarify our national policy with respect to these lands, and, to repeal and replace obsolete and conflicting laws.

Recognizing that our existing laws had accumulated like a tangled pile of yarn for over a century, the Congress created the Public Land Law Review Commission, whose purpose was to review the laws and make recommendations for changes. Practically all of the laws that existed then, and now, had as their principal purpose the disposal of public lands or their resources, and most of these laws were enacted at the instance and request of special interest groups, seeking advantages for themselves.

Times have changed. The national interest has changed. America is caught up in an environmental crisis. Even though the Public Land Law Review Commission has submitted its report to Congress, some ancient and obsolete statutes like the Mining Law of 1872 still remain on the books to obstruct any sound or unified approach to the proper management of our public lands and their resources.

The Public Land Law Review Commission during its 6 years of work, involving many meetings, public hearings, and contractual studies, and in its final report, confirmed what our Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House and the Senate, and the Congress, had already concluded. The public land laws were indeed a mess and needed to be rewritten. Administration of the public domain has bordered generally on the disgraceful—in specific instances, it has been scandalous—despite the best intentions and conscientious labors of many dedicated public servants in the Bureau of Land Management. This vital agency, with nearly one-third of the Nation's land to oversee, has been understaffed and underfunded; frustrated by the obsolete laws, and confronted by political influence exerted by the extractive industries, whose singleminded purpose has been to exploit our public land resources and to profit from them without regard for the environmental damages.

Perhaps the major accomplishment of the Public Land Law Review Commission was the enhancement of public awareness among all Americans of their common interest and their common inheritance in the public domain. Such awareness formerly prevailed imperfectly among the special interest groups in the 11 Western States and Alaska, but hardly recognized anywhere else in the Nation. Now at long last, from coast to coast, the people know what has happened to those lands, what stake they have in them—America's last great open space—and how their proper management will affect the quality of life for themselves and for future generations.

Thus, while no clearcut policy or plan emerged from the work of the PLLRC, nor can a policy be gleaned from its report, it did set the stage for reform and redirection.

To that end I introduced my bill. I solicit the views of all my colleagues and of all segments of the interested public. It will be my purpose to work with my fellow members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and then with the entire House of Representatives, in perfecting this legislation and moving it toward passage.

Instead of "dominant use," the now discredited and generally disowned theory advanced in the Commission's report, my bill proposes the principle of dominant interest—that being the public interest—which should always be foremost in the thoughts and plans of those who administer the public lands, as well as the implementation of laws which govern those lands.

My bill provides coherent policy and adequate authority for the economic development and use of the material resources of the public lands, such as the minerals, the timberland and the forage, and concurrently for the conservation and enhancement of the scenic recreational, wildlife, wilderness, and other environmental values. It provides for the disposal of lands when disposal is in the public interest for residential, commercial, agricultural, or industrial purposes; or for public purposes, when such purposes may best be served in private ownership or in non-Federal ownership.

Among several reforms my bill proposes, the major one is repeal of the outmoded and scandalous Mining Law of 1872—a law that is little more than a license to steal from the people—and its replacement with the mineral leasing system that has worked so well for the petroleum industry. In the old days, when the mining industry or occupation was performed by the lonely and hardy prospector—who grubstaked for a 6-months' stay in the wilderness with his burro and pick—this kind of giveaway law made sense. But it makes no sense today, nor is it just, in this age when prospectors are giant corporations using helicopters and unsophisticated electronic equipment, and when in given areas the surface resources and the environmental values must be protected in the public interest.

I incorporate as a part of my remarks the provisions of my bill, H.R. 9911, together with a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation:

H.R. 9911

A bill to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the public lands; to provide for the development of federally owned minerals; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Domain Lands Organic Act of 1971".

TITLE I—PUBLIC LAND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. The Congress recognizes that the public lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "Secretary") through the Bureau of Land Management, are vital national assets that contain a wide variety of natural resource values including soil, mineral, water, air, plants, and animals, and intangible values. The public lands shall be administered, used, restored improved, and protected: (1) to maintain the integrity of ecosystems and environmental quality, including the protection of natural, scientific, scenic, and historic and archeological values, to protect watersheds, to provide habitat for fish and wildlife, to preserve wilderness, and to afford opportunity for outdoor recreation, including necessary access; and (2) to permit appropriate industrial development under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, including the production of forage, minerals, and timber, and to allow desirable forms of occupancy.

SEC. 102. As used in this title—

(1) "public lands" means all lands or interests in lands administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management, which shall be known after enactment of this Act as "national resource lands";

(2) "multiple use" means the management of the various surface and subsurface resources and values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people; the most judicious use of land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; the use of some land for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment to the environment or the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources and to the ecological relationships involved, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output;

(3) "sustained yield" means the achievement and maintenance of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of land without impairment of the quality of the land and its environmental values;

(4) "qualified governmental agency" means any of the following, including their lawful agents and instrumentalities—

(A) The State, county, municipality, or other local government subdivision within which the land is located; and

(B) any municipality within convenient access to the lands if the lands are within the same State as the municipality.

(5) "qualified individual" means—

(A) any individual who is a citizen or otherwise a national United States (or who has declared his intention to become a citizen) aged twenty-one years or more;

(B) any partnership or association, each of the members of which is a qualified individual as defined in subparagraph (A); and

(C) any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, and authorized to hold title to real property in the State in which the land is located.

SEC. 103. The Secretary is authorized and directed to permit the use of the nonmineral resources of the public lands to the optimum extent and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds consistent with the principles of section 101 of this Act and with the following goals and objectives:

(1) Provision of an adequate supply of resources to meet national, regional, and local requirements at reasonable market prices in a timely fashion.

(2) Protection, development, and enhancement of their outdoor recreational values for the optimum use and benefit of the general public, within the basic framework of multiple-use management, in a manner consistent with the Act of May 28, 1963 (77 Stat. 49; 16 U.S.C. 4601—4601-3, and in conformity with the statewide outdoor recreation plans developed under the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 901; 16 U.S.C. 4601-4, 4601-11).

(3) Preservation of a quality environment for present and future generations of Americans.

(4) Management of Federal lands and resources under principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

(5) Preparation, maintenance, and preservation of the integrity of comprehensive and coordinated National, State, and local land use plans.

(6) Maintenance of an interdisciplinary approach to natural resources programs.

(7) Opportunity for the public to participate fully in the conduct of the public business.

(8) Payment by users of public lands and resources of fair market value.

(9) Adequate opportunity for resource users to plan and develop use and development operations and to secure a fair return for their risk and investment, in those cases where such development serves the public interest and under such reasonable conditions as the Secretary may specify to serve the various purposes of this Act, including recognition that no vested rights in the public domain exist beyond the terms of permits granted for its use.

(10) Maintenance of competition in the allocation and development of public resources.

(11) Prevention of undue concentration of ownership of rights to public land resources.

(12) Encouragement of efficiency in resource use and development and in protection and rehabilitation of the environment.

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall develop and promulgate regulations containing criteria by which he will determine and classify which of the public lands under certain conditions and consistent with the goals and objectives of this Act may be disposed of because they are not needed or likely to be needed for federal purposes and are more valuable and likely to be used, if available, for residential, commercial, agricultural, industrial, or other public uses or development in non-Federal ownership than for management in Federal ownership: *Provided*, that no land shall be classified for disposal that is chiefly valuable for grazing or of forage crops or for production of crops in surplus or likely to be in surplus. The criteria shall give due consideration to all pertinent factors, including but not limited to, environmental quality, ecology, priorities of use, and the relative values of the various resources in particular areas.

(b) No such regulation or any amendment thereto promulgated to this section shall become effective until the expiration of at least sixty days after the Secretary or his designee has held a public hearing thereon. A notice of such hearing shall be given at least sixty days in advance through publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The Secretary or his designee shall give appropriate public notice of any proposed classification of lands for disposal, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected lands at least sixty days in advance of the proposed disposal. No such classification for disposal shall become effective until the expiration of at least sixty days after the Secretary or his designee has held a public hearing thereon if the Secretary determines that a timely and responsible request for such a hearing is received.

(d) No proposed classification of a parcel of land exceeding 1440 acres for disposal shall become final until the Secretary has notified the chairman of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of Congress of the proposal and no objection to it is received from either committee within sixty days.

SEC. 105. Any classification of public lands in effect on the date of enactment of this Act is subject to review for possible reclassification in accordance with the authority granted by this Act.

SEC. 106. The Secretary of the Interior shall review every roadless area of five thousand acres or more on national resource lands under his jurisdiction on the effective date of this Act and by June 30, 1980, shall report to the President his recommendation as to the suitability or nonsuitability of each such area for preservation as wilderness, in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 890). The President shall recommend to Congress inclusion of such areas as he deems suitable within the National Wilderness Preservation System: *Provided*, That the wilderness character of all areas reviewed shall be maintained until Congress has acted.

SEC. 107. The Secretary shall as soon as possible establish boundaries for units of the national resource lands and shall provide adequate and appropriate means of public identification, including signs and maps.

SEC. 108. The Secretary is authorized to sell public lands that have been classified for disposal in accordance with this title. Such sales shall be in tracts not exceeding five thousand one hundred and twenty acres each to qualified governmental agencies at the appraised fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary or to qualified individuals through competitive bidding at not less than the appraised fair market values as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 109. At least ninety days prior to offering lands for sale in accordance with this title, the Secretary shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision of the State having jurisdiction over zoning in the geographic area within which the lands are located or, in the absence of such political subdivision, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body with the opportunity of zoning for the use of the land in accordance with local planning and development and to provide restrictions on use which will help assure its use for the purposes for which the Secretary finds it is best suited. All sales shall be consistent with State and local land use plans and zoning.

SEC. 110. All patents or other evidences of title issued under this title shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits. Patents and other evidences of title may contain such reservations and reasonable restrictions as are necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of this Act.

SEC. 111. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise such lands or interests therein as he deems necessary to provide access or otherwise facilitate the administration of the public lands.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in exercising the exchange authority granted by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property or interests therein and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property or interest any public lands or interests therein under his jurisdiction and which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal and which is located in the same State as the non-Federal property to be acquired. The values of the land so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the value shall be equalized by the payment of money to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. The proceeds received from any conveyance under this section shall be credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 112. Violations of the public land laws and regulations of the Secretary relating to protection of the public lands and the uses thereof shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both. Any person charged with the violation of such laws and regulations may be tried and sentenced by any United States commissioner or magistrate designated for that purpose by the court by which he was appointed, in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as provided for in section 3401 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 113. The Secretary may authorize such persons who are employed in the Bureau of Land Management as he may designate to make arrests for the violation of the laws and regulations referred to in sections 114 and 116 of this Act. Upon sworn information by any competent person, any United States

commissioner or magistrate in the proper jurisdiction shall issue a warrant for the arrest of any person charged with the violation of said laws and regulations, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the arrest by any officer of the United States, without warrant, of any person taken in the act of violating such laws and regulations.

SEC. 114. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 115. In order that the Secretary shall have the benefit of the advice and assistance of others knowledgeable with respect to matters within the purview of this title, he may establish such multiple use, special use, or ad hoc advisory boards or groups as he deems necessary.

SEC. 116. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Any funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 117. (a) Subject to valid rights and liabilities existing at the date of approval of this title, the following Acts or parts thereof are repealed:

(1) Chapter 7 of title 43, United States Code, sections 161–302, homesteads generally.

(2) Chapter 8 of title 43, United States Code, sections 315f and 315g, Taylor Grazing Act.

(3) Chapter 9 of title 43, United States Code, sections 321–338, desert land entries.

(4) Chapter 16 of title 43, United States Code, sections 671–700, sale and disposal of public lands.

(5) Chapter 17 of title 43, United States Code, sections 711–731, reservation and sale of townsites on public lands.

(6) Chapter 24 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1021–1048, under State laws, Minnesota and Arkansas.

(7) Chapter 26 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1071–1080, abandoned military reservations.

(8) Chapter 27 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1091–1134, public lands in Oklahoma.

(9) Chapter 28 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1153–1156, patents for private claims, Missouri.

(10) Chapter 28 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1171–1177, sale of isolated tracts.

(11) Chapter 28 of title 43, United States Code, sections 1191–1193, evidence of title.

(12) Sections 11 and 16 of the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1099, 1101; 48 U.S.C. 355, 43 U.S.C. 728), townsites, Alaska.

(13) The fourth paragraph of section 1 of the Act of March 12, 1914 (38 Stat. 307; 48 U.S.C. 303), townsites, Alaska.

(14) Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 629; 48 U.S.C. 355a–355d), townsites, Alaska.

(15) Act of February 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 35; 48 U.S.C. 355e), townsites, Alaska.

(16) Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U.S.C. 364a–364e), sale of public domain, Alaska.

(17) Act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 414; 48 U.S.C. 364), zoning of land, Alaska.

(18) Act of June 11, 1938 (as amended) (43 U.S.C. 682a–682e), small tracts.

(19) Chapter 28 of title 43, United States Code, section 1181 (a–j), Oregon and California Railroad Act of 1937.

(20) Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753), Coos Bay Wagon Road.

(b) The provisions of this title shall prevail over any existing law not consistent with it and such laws or portions thereof are hereby repealed.

SEC. 118. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, the proceeds from revenues from the sale or lease or other disposition of public lands, minerals and other resources shall be distributed by the Secretary in lieu of taxes to each state for distribution to its counties having public lands, which payments, however, shall not exceed 25 per centum of the revenue received from the public lands in the county where the lands are located.

(b) Wherever in his judgment the amount of such payments may exceed the taxes that are levied on similar lands, the Secretary shall have an appraisal made of the public lands in question, and shall thereafter pay an amount not to exceed an amount equal to that tax would be levied on the public lands in each county if such lands were on the tax rolls. However, in any county where revenues from the public lands for the preceding five years have averaged less than $2 per acre, and the Secretary anticipates that the situation will not materially change in the next five years, he may, if in his judgment the cost of appraisal does not justify having one made, elect to pay only 25 per centum of the revenues, unless such payment would result in a payment to that county of less than 90 per centum of tax equivalency. Appraisals shall, when made, conform to standards for the State and counties involved, and their cost shall be deducted from payments in lieu of taxes to be made.

SEC. 119. Appointments made on and after the date of the enactmnet of this Act to the office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, within the Department of the Interior, shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall (1) have a broad background and experience in public land and natural resource management, (2) be selected from the Federal civil service, and (3) be subject to removal only for cause or disability.

SEC. 120. There is hereby established a special Management Fund in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. All revenues derived from pubic domain lands, not otherwise distributed in lieu of taxes, shall be returned to the Special Fund for acquisition and rehabilitation of retained public lands.

TITLE II—MINERAL LEASING

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Land Mineral Leasing Act of 1971".

SEC. 202. As used in this title—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) "Head of department or agency" means the head of an agency or the Secretary of a department other than the Secretary of the Interior;

(3) "Federal lands" means all federally owned lands except lands—

(A) Held in trust for Indians;

(B) Owned by Indians with Federal restrictions on the title; or

(C) Within units of the National Park System, units of National Wildlife Refuge System, the National Wilderness Preservation System, the national system of Wild and Scenic Rivers, and within units of the National Forests and National Resource Lands classified as Primitive, Roadless, Natural, or Scenic Areas.

(4) "Federal mineral interests" means mineral deposits in Federal lands and federally owned mineral interests in non-Federal lands;

(5) "Person" means any of the following, including their lawful agents and instrumentalities:

(A) any State, county, municipality, or other local governmental subdivision within which the land is located;

(B) any municipality within convenient access to the lands if the lands are within the same State as the municipality;

(C) any individual who is authorized to enter into a contract for acquisition of title in real property in the United States by himself or through his guardian or trustee;

(D) any partnership or association, each of the members of which is an individual as defined in subparagraph (C); and

(E) any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, and authorized to hold title to real property in the State in which the land is located;

(6) "Mineral lease" means an exclusive right to explore for and develop a mineral deposit or deposits in specified lands under this title;

(7) "Mineral license" is a right to mine and remove a specified amount of minerals from specified public lands; and

(8) "Mineral" is a substance that—

(A) is recognized as mineral, according to its chemical composition, by the standard authorities on the subject, or

(B) is classified as mineral produce in trade or commerce except that helium, water, and geothermal steam are not minerals under this title.

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to permit by the issuance of mineral leases and licenses under this title, any person to prospect for, mine, and develop Federal mineral interests to the extend and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds consistent with the following goals and objectives:

(1) Provision of an adequate supply of minerals to meet national requirements at reasonable market prices in a timely fashion.

(2) Preservation of a quality environment for present and future generations of Americans.

(3) Management of Federal lands and resources under principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

(4) Preparation, maintenance, and preservation of the integrity of comprehensive and coordinated national, State, and local land use plans.

(5) Maintenance of an interdisciplinary approach to natural resources programs.

(6) Opportunity for the public to participate fully in the conduct of the public business.

(7) Payment by users of public lands and resources of fair market value.

(8) Adequate tenure and opportunity for mineral prospectors and mining operations to plan and develop prospecting and mining operations and to secure a fair return for their risk and investment.

(9) Maintenance of competition in the allocation and development of public resources.

(10) Prevention of undue concentration of ownership of rights to Federal mineral interests.

(11) Encouragement of efficiency in prospecting and production of minerals and in protection and rehabilitation of the environment.

SEC. 204. The Secretary may decline to issue leases or permits for mineral exploration and development wherever he finds that such activity is likely to result in soil erosion, scenic defacement, destruction of watersheds, or damage to fish and wildlife of such an extent that it is likely to outweigh the value to the public of the minerals that may be produced.

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary may dispose of Federal mineral interests in Federal lands which are not under his jurisdiction only if the head of the department or agency which administers the lands concurs with the proposal to dispose of the Federal mineral interests and in the proposed terms and conditions of disposal insofar as such terms and conditions would affect such head's exercise of his administrative responsibilities.

(b) The Secretary may dispose of Federal mineral interests in non-Federal lands only after he has given the non-Federal landowner an opportunity to review and comment on the planned terms and conditions of the proposed disposal. Insofar as they relate to conservation of natural resources, the protection of the environment, and protection of and compensation for private im-

provements on the land, the Secretary shall, to the extent he deems feasible, include in the proposed disposal the same terms and conditions that he would include if the lands were Federal.

SEC. 206. The Secretary shall consult with the Federal, State, and local governments, advisory boards and committees, and the general public to the extent he deems necessary to secure full public participation in decisions related to the disposal of Federal mineral interests. The head of any department or agency may render, without transfer of funds, technical assistance to the Secretary in connection with the Secretary's activities under this title.

SEC. 207. The Secretary shall publicize all proposals to dispose of Federal mineral interests under this title to the extent and by those means which he deems necessary to comply with the goals, objectives, and other provisions of this title. Notices of such proposals shall describe by incorporation or by reference the terms and conditions of disposals so that the general public may knowledgeably comment on the proposal and potential lessees and licensees will be fully informed what their rights and obligations would be under the proposal.

SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary may dispose of Federal mineral interests by mineral lease and license under this title in any manner which in his judgment will meet the goals, objectives, and other provisions of this title. He may utilize competitive means of disposal whenever he finds that competitive interest exists and competition would otherwise be consistent with the requirements and goals and objectives of this title. In competitive disposals, he may reserve the right to reject any and all bids where he finds that acceptance would be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of this title. Where he finds that any person is dependent upon continued access to Federal mineral interests by virtue of the location of their mining and mineral recovery facilities he may accord such person a preference right to meet the terms and conditions of a proposal to issue a mineral lease or license. Such preference right may include, in the discretion of the Secretary, the right to match the highest bid for the contract when Federal mineral interests are disposed of competitively.

(b) Whenever Federal lands are being drained of oil and gas by wells drilled on adjacent lands, the Secretary may negotiate contract agreements with the owners of those wells and of the oil and gas in the adjacent lands to compensate the United States for such drainage.

SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary shall reserve to the United States the ownership of and right to extract helium from all gas produced under this title, and in the extraction of such helium, he shall cause no substantial delay in the delivery of the gas produced from the well to the purchaser thereof.

(b) Oil shale on public lands shall not be leased until extraction techniques which prevent damage to watersheds and the environment have been developed. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all revenues from oil shale leasing shall be deposited in the treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 210. In leases, licenses, and other contracts issued under this title, the Secretary shall incorporate such terms and conditions that he deems necessary or desirable to promote good business practices; to promote the conservation of lands and other natural resources; to preserve and enhance the environment; to maintain ecological balances; to protect the public health, safety, and welfare; to enable the proper use of the lands; and otherwise to promote or be consistent with the goals and objectives and other terms of this title, including, but not limited to, provisions for—

(1) cancellation and forfeitures for cause;

(2) relinquishment of rights and privileges;

(3) bonds, deposits, or other good faith security;

(4) assignments and subleases, in whole or in part;

(5) renewals and extensions;

(6) removal of improvements;

(7) rentals and royalties;

(8) penalties for noncompliance;

(9) reinstatements;

(10) nondiscrimination;

(11) protection of health and safety of workers;

(12) protection and rehabilitation of natural resources;

(13) prevention of air, water, and land pollution;

(14) adjustment of disputes;

(15) payments in kind;

(16) inspection of premises by Federal and State officials;

(17) inspection of business records;

(18) joint enterprises;

(19) suspension, waiver and reduction of rentals or royalties in order to promote conservation of resources;

(20) reasonable diligence;

(21) workmanlike performance;

(22) disposal of surface estate;

(23) uses of the lands and resources thereon by third parties;

(24) uses of the lands and resources by the contracting parties, including rentals to be paid by the lessee or licensee;

(25) unitization, operating, and other cooperative agreements; and

(26) submittal of plans of exploration, mining, and rehabilitation operations for approval by the Secretary.

SEC. 211. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he finds necessary or desirable to carry out the goals, objectives, and other purposes of this title, including, but not limited to, regulations to establish—

(1) the area or volume or kind of mineral rights that may be held by any one qualified applicant, and

(2) the area or volume or kind of mineral rights that may be acquired by any one person in any area or at any sale.

SEC. 212. (a) All prior laws which relate to the disposition of Federal mineral deposits covered by this title are hereby repealed except to the extent noted in subsection (c) of this section. These laws include, but are not limited, to—

(1) The Mining Law of 1872, as amended (30 U.S.C. 21–77).

(2) The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181–286).

(3) The Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359).

(4) The Act of July 31, 1947, as amended, and the Act of July 23, 1955, as amended (30 U.S.C. 601–615).

(5) The Right-of-Way Leasing Act of 1930 (30 U.S.C. 301–306).

(b) Any valid mining claim, lease, contract, or other right acquired under any laws repealed by this title which existed on the date of enactment of this title shall not be affected by this title until 1977 but shall remain subject to the provisions of the law under which such rights were derived. The Secretary is authorized in his discretion and upon application to him by the owner of the right to issue a lease or license under this title in exchange for a valid mining claim or valid mineral lease, license, or permit issued under the authorities repealed by subsection (a) of this section: *Provided*, that all outstanding claims under repealed laws which are not converted into leases or licenses by 1977 shall be subject to an executive declaration of immediate taking, settlements of which are appealable to the Court of Claims, under section 1491 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) The following provisions of law shall remain in force and effect:

(1) Section 29 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 185).

(2) Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 191).

(3) The distribution of receipts provisions of section 3 of the Act of September 1, 1949 (30 U.S.C. 192c).

(4) The distribution of receipts provisions of the Act of June 1, 1948 (30 U.S.C. 286).

(5) The distribution of receipts provisions of the Act of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740).

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS ORGANIC ACT OF 1971—H.R. 9911

Title: "Public Domain Lands Organic Act of 1971."

TITLE I—PUBLIC LAND ADMINISTRATION

Section 101. States that the purposes of public land administration are to maintain the integrity of ecosystems and environmental quality, and to permit appropriate industrial development under principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Section 102. Defines various terms, including public lands (those administered by the Bureau of Land Management), multiple use, sustained yield, qualified governmental agency, and qualified individual.

Section 103. Sets forth goals in administering non-mineral resources of the public lands, including environmental quality, multiple use, sustained yield, coordinated and interdisciplinary planning, open public planning, adequate resource availability, and disposal at fair market value under competitive conditions.

Section 104. (a) Directs Secretary of Interior to develop regulations for classifying public lands that may be disposed of because they are not needed for federal purposes and are more valuable for residential, commercial, industrial, or agricultural purposes (excluding forage crops or surplus crops), with consideration to be given in classifications to questions of ecology and environmental quality.

(b) Requires hearings on disposal regulations, with 60 days notice and 60 days subsequently for receipt of final comments.

(c) Requires 60 days notice in Federal Register and local newspapers of proposed disposals, with public hearings on request.

(d) Requires notification of Congressional Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of proposed disposals of over 1440 acres, with disposals blocked if either Committee objects.

Section 105. States that all existing classifications are subject to review and reclassification under this Act.

Section 106. Directs Secretary to review all roadless areas of 5000 acres or more on public lands by 1980, with recommendations to be forwarded to Congress on suitability for inclusion in National Wilderness Preservation System and status quo maintained while question is before Congress.

Section 107. Directs Secretary to establish boundaries for public lands (called National Resource Lands), with names conferred on units and maps and signs provided.

Section 108. Authorizes Secretary to sell tracts not exceeding 5120 acres that have been classified for disposal at not less than fair market value, with competitive bidding required in case of private parties.

Section 109. Makes sale of public land contingent on existence of local land use plans and zoning controls which impose restrictions to assure best use of the land.

Section 110. Reserves mineral title to United States in case of all lands subject to disposal.

Section 111. (a) Authorizes Secretary to acquire additional public lands by various means to provide access or to facilitate management of lands already in public ownership.

(b) Authorizes Secretary to exchange

lands classified for disposal to acquire needed lands, and to pay or receive money payments to equalize values.

Section 112. Provides punishment for misdemeanors involving violation of regulations governing public lands, with trials to be before U.S. Commissioner.

Section 113. Authorizes BLM to designate officers to enforce public land regulations and to make arrests, with any U.S. officer authorized, however, to make eye-witness arrests.

Section 114. Secretary authorized to promulgate regulations needed to carry out purposes of Title I.

Section 115. Authorizes Secretary to appoint regular or ad hoc advisory boards.

Section 116. Authorizes appropriation of sums necessary to carry out purposes of Title I, with appropriated funds remaining available until expended.

Section 117. (a) Subject to valid existing property rights, some 20 major historic disposal statutes are repealed in whole or part, including Homestead Act, Taylor Grazing Act, Desert Land Act, Small Tract Act, and O & C Act.

(b) Provides that all other laws inconsistent with this Act are repealed also.

Section 118. (a) Provides for a system of payments in lieu of taxes in place of revenue sharing on public lands, with a limitation, however, of payments in any one county of 25% of the revenues derived from public lands there.

(b) Authorizes the Secretary to have appraisals done of public lands for purposes of determining payments in lieu of taxes, with payment of only 25% of revenues derived from public lands authorized in those cases where revenues from those lands have averaged less than $2.00 per acre in previous 5 years, unless this would result in payments of less than 90% of tax equivalency.

Section 119. Provides for appointment of Director of BLM by President with advice and consent of Senate, with appointment to be made from Civil Service rolls, and removal only for cause or disability.

Section 120. Provides that all revenues derived from public lands, that are not distributed in lieu of taxes, shall be placed in the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used for acquiring additional public lands and for rehabilitating public lands.

TITLE II

Section 201. This title is to be cited as the "Federal Land Mineral Leasing Act of 1971."

Section 202. Defines various terms, including "Federal Lands" which means all federally owned lands, except lands held in trust for Indians or owned by them under federal restrictions, and lands within the following protective systems: National Park System, the system of National Wildlife Refuges and Ranges, National Wilderness Preservation System, national system of Wild and Scenic Rivers, and national forest and BLM areas classified as Primitive, Roadless, Natural, or Scenic areas.

Section 203. Authorizes Secretary to issue mineral leases for prospecting and mining development on federal lands to extent consistent with various goals which are set forth which include environmental quality, coordinated, interdisciplinary planning, multiple use and sustained yield, public participation in planning, adequate mineral supply and payment of fair market value, with adequate opportunity for a fair return on investment, maintenance of competition, and efficiency in operations.

Section 204. Authorizes Secretary to decline to issue mineral leases wherever he finds that exploration or development might cause loss in noncommercial values, such as soil erosion, scenic defacement, watershed destruction, and damage to fisheries and wildlife, that would outweigh values of commercial production.

Section 205. (a) Provides that Secretary may only offer mineral leases on lands under other federal departments with the concurrence of the head of that department, both with respect to the advisability and terms and conditions proposed in so far as they affect that other department.

(b) Before issuing leases on federal mineral interests in non-federal lands, Secretary must offer private owner opportunity to comment. Secretary can impose conditions in such cases with respect to conservation and compensating private owner for improvements affected.

Section 206. Authorizes Secretary to consult with other public agencies, advisory boards, and public in deciding where, when, and how to issue mineral leases.

Section 207. Directs Secretary to publicize mineral leasing proposals with terms and conditions described and comment invited.

Section 208. (a) Authorizes Secretary to lease by competitive bid where competition exists and consistent with goals of this Title. Authorizes the Secretary to extend preferences to operators dependent on continued access to public resources, including opportunity of matching highest bids.

(b) Authorizes Secretary to negotiate payment agreements with operators of oil and gas wells on adjacent lands that are draining pools under federal lands.

Section 209. (a) Directs Secretary to reserve right to extract helium from all gas produced under federal leases.

(b) Provides that oil shale deposits shall not be leased until techniques are developed to prevent damage to watersheds and the environment, with receipts on ultimate development to be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in federal treasury.

Section 210. Directs Secretary to put terms and conditions in leases to serve various goals: good business practice, conservation, environmental protection, ecological balance, public welfare, and proper land use. Requires provisions in leases dealing with following subjects: cancellation and forfeiture, relinquishment, bonds and deposits, assignments, renewals and extensions, removing improvements, rentals and royalties, penalties, reinstatements, nondiscrimination, worker safety, site rehabilitation, pollution prevention, settling disputes, payments in kind, inspection of operations and books, joint enterprises, suspension, waiver, and royalty reduction owing to conservation restrictions, reasonable diligence, workmanlike performance, disposal and use of surface estate, use by third parties, unitization, and approval of rehabilitation plans.

Section 211. Authorizes Secretary to issue regulations on limiting amount of lease holdings that may be held by any one party, and in any one area and as result of any one sale.

Section 212. (a) Repeals various previous mining acts, either in whole or part, including the Mining Law of 1872, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Mineral Leasing for Acquired Lands.

(b) Provides that rights established under repealed mining laws shall be convertible into leases under this Title, with those not converted subject to immediate condemnation after 1977, and settlements appealable to the Court of Claims.

(c) States that specified portions of certain existing mining laws continue to remain in effect, mainly those relating to the distribution of receipts.

FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF OUR ELDERLY AMERICANS

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the past week I have been circulating for co-sponsorship several bills that will help relieve the financial plight of our elderly Americans.

Today over 25 percent of those over 65 live below the poverty level. Many of these did not face poverty until they retired. Over half of our senior citizens earn less than $5,000.

This group of Americans has been hardest hit by inflation. Health care for instance, is a primary factor in their expenses. Four out of every five older Americans have a chronic health condition, disease or impairment. In terms of price increases, doctors' fees, hospital costs and other medical expenses have gone up far faster than the average cost of living. Only two-thirds of these costs are covered by medicare and other health plans.

Additionally, food, rent, and clothing for most elderly Americans comprise the remainder of their expenses. The cost of these items, too, has escalated much faster than other items in the cost of living index.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many of my colleagues stand here in this well and talk about how greatly concerned they are for the conditions of the elderly. I have heard proposals for increased welfare for the elderly, increased rent subsidies for the elderly, increased this and increased that. Unfortunately very few of these proposals are translated into beneficial programs.

However, Mr. Speaker, many of our elderly Americans do not want welfare programs or handouts. Many of them would be content to continue working on a part-time basis or a nearly full-time basis to earn the extra income over their social security payments that makes the difference between poverty and a normal existence.

Yet at 65 these people, who have worked hard all their lives, who have contributed daily to the social security trust funds, who have been good upstanding citizens working for a better America, are told by our laws that they cannot earn more than $1,680 without losing their social security payments. Even with the proposed increase to $2,000 contained in H.R. 1, the combined outside earnings and social security income barely comes to more than the poverty level income.

How can we continue to deny a person these payments? The trust fund was set up as the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Fund, an insurance or pension plan for all working Americans.

Contributions are made to this fund by the employee and his employer. The payments are mandatory. Yet when the person reaches 65 and desires to continue his life at the same economic level as before retirement, he finds he cannot work without losing his earned social security payments. Many must forfeit the payments in order to survive.

The inequity becomes more acute when one considers that the persons suffering from this provision are those who need the income most. If a person has an income of $50,000 from investments, he is still entitled to social security benefits

as long as he does not have wages over $1,680.

My bill, H.R. 7018, which is being circulated for cosponsorship, would rectify this alarming inequity. How can we continue to deny these people the right to work for additional income without losing their social security payments? How can we at the same time continue to permit high income elderly Americans to receive social security while those in poverty cannot?

Elimination of the outside earnings limitation would extend social security benefits to those who really need it—to those whom the law was intended to help. It would eliminate a goodly number of our elderly poor now living on welfare because working for more than $1,680 a year would cost too much in lost social security payments. It would increase tax revenues from the added income tax these citizens would pay. And it would help State and local governments since it is an economic fact that elderly Americans at moderate and low income levels spend all their income immediately on consumer items.

Through the resources of Staff Builders of New York, a nationwide firm that specializes in placing elderly Americans in jobs, I am conducting a petition campaign calling for elimination of the outside earnings limitation. The goal is 1 million signatures. The response so far from across the country has been impressive. Tomorrow, I will point out some particular problems that have come to my attention through this campaign. In the meantime, I hope you will contact me or my office to join me in reintroducing the following bills:

BILLS BEING CIRCULATED FOR CO-SPONSORSHIP BY CONGRESSMAN BIAGGI

A. SOCIAL SECURITY REFORMS FOR THE ELDERLY

1. H.R. 7018—A bill to eliminate the outside earnings limitation for recipients of social security benefits.*

2. H.R. 8238—A bill to provide for an increase in the lump sum death benefits payment to $750.

B. TAX REFORMS FOR THE ELDERLY

1. H.R. 7920—A bill to provide a $5000 retirement income tax exemption for civil servants at retirement and for all taxpayers at age 65.

2. H.R. 7922—A bill to provide a full deduction of all medical expenses for taxpayers over age 65.

3. H.R. 7924—A bill to provide a taxpayer with an exemption for an over age 65 dependent regardless of the dependent's income. This is the same as in the case of a dependent who is under age 19.

C. MEDICARE REFORMS FOR THE ELDERLY

1. H.R. 9151—A bill to provide for payment of optometrists' services under Medicare.

2. H.R. 9672—A bill to include prescription drugs under Medicare.

3. H.R. 4507—A bill to include chiropractor services under Medicare.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation.

As the Nation observed its 195th anniversary earlier this month, it appears that we are emerging from the hectic, disruptive 1960's to a more stable progressive era. U.S. News & World Report states flatly: "The Nation at its 195th birthday seems headed solidly toward stability." It notes that the country is still a "place of opportunity" for people of all backgrounds and races. The "melting pot" has produced a Nation of tremendous talent and diverse cultural backgrounds.

APPALACHIAN COMMISSION SLOWLY FADING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very deeply concerned that the Appalachian Regional Commission, which I have often called the best program in the Federal Government, is going to die very soon.

The creation of the Appalachian Commission was, I believe, the finest hour in the history of the very active Public Works Committee, on which I am privileged to serve. But the life of the Appalachian Commission is passing rapidly away, and with it, one of the greatest of this committee's achievements.

Already, the fate of the Appalachian Commission hangs by the flimsiest of legislative strands—a continuing resolution that will expire in 17 short days.

And yet there are those who insist on holding this popular and worthwhile program hostage, and attempting to run a more controversial program through on the strength of Appalachia's popularity.

Changing the character of the Economic Development Administration to the extent proposed by some Members of this body, in my opinion, should require new hearings, and those hearings should not be allowed to delay passage of the Appalachian extension measure.

Hearings of this nature take time, and I cannot stress too strongly, time is not our friend. I favor continuation of the Economic Development Administration, and I have said so many times. But it is a disservice to the EDA, and a potential tragedy for the Appalachian Commission, to proceed as has been suggested by some here.

Let us abandon this legislative maneuvering, for the sake of a program that has proven its effectiveness and earned its keep, but even more for the sake of 20 million people in the Appalachian region, who have long regarded the Appalachian Commission as their brightest ray of hope for a better life.

Let us have a clean bill to extend the Appalachian Commission and its companion title V commissions now, and then let us consider the EDA revisions in a separate bill with separate hearings.

This is the responsible and reasonable course, and the one the majority of my colleagues must surely recommend.

ELECTION REFORM BILL INTRODUCED

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would simplify voter registration requirements, proclaim Federal election day a national holiday, require that all polls be kept open 24 hours, and require that all polling places in the country close at the same time. The title of this legislation is the Election Reform Act of 1971.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the number of voters and to assure that the votes in one section of the country do not influence votes in other sections of the country. The polls should be open 24 hours because the longer they are open the larger the vote will be. Though there will be an added cost involved in keeping the polls open longer I believe it would be some of the best money we have ever spent.

Under this bill, election day would be 36 hours long. Each State could decide which hours its polls would remain open so long as the total number of hours was 24 and their polls closed by 12 midnight, eastern standard time.

I believe that this legislation would increase the vote in two ways: One, by keeping the polls open longer, and, second, by proclaiming Federal election day a national holiday. It is perfectly logical to make election day a national day since no day in a democracy is more important than a day on which citizens choose their elected officials.

As for closing the polls all over the country at the same time, it is undemocratic and unnecessary to allow polls in one section of the country to close 3 or more hours before polls in other sections of the country are closed. In a presidential election, with the networks' super computers forecasting results almost instantaneously, the election could be effectively over even before the polls on the west coast or Hawaii closed. This kind of system discourages a voter turnout in western parts of the country, and simply has no place in a democracy.

The section of the bill which simplifies registration requirements closely parallels a bill introduced by Representative MORRIS UDALL, of Arizona. It would:

Abolish all residency requirements for voting for President or Vice President;

Require that, during a 3-week period before a presidential election, the Bureau of the Census conduct a door-to-door drive to enroll all eligible persons who have not yet registered under State law;

Enable a person absent from his district to cast a special absentee ballot in the nearest polling place, even in another State.

I think that this kind of legislation has been too long in coming and I hope that my colleagues will give it their serious consideration.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

* Subject of a nationwide citizen petition campaign.

West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a survey of metropolitan news media comment seems to show that most of them hail with delight the Supreme Court decision in the case of the stolen "classified" Pentagon documents, and the House vote on the CBS citation case. They consider both of these as vindication of the media stand on the first amendment issue. An example is the headline on a signed article in the Christian Science Monitor for July 15, 1971. It reads: "CBS Victory Swells Free-Press Tide."

Some newspapers are not sure. I offer as examples two editorials from small city or small town newspapers. One is from a daily, the Martinsburg Journal, published in Martinsburg, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Paul B. Martin. The other is from a weekly published in the small town of Petersburg, W. Va., the Grant County Press, edited by Mrs. Ralph P. Welton.

It seems to me that both of these editors offer honest and fairminded questions and suggest cogent and unequivocal answers. What they say may represent public opinion more truly than do the metropolitan media. The metropolitan media take the position that they express—that is, dictate—public opinion. The rural papers are close to the people. They do not often misunderstand what the people think.

It is somewhat astonishing that the Christian Science article referred to above suffered from a qualm of uncertainty. After the flamboyant headline quoted above, it ended up with the paragraph which I take the liberty of quoting:

While overriding these factors (arguments used in the debate), the House vote evidently left much of the adversary relationship between Congress and the press undisturbed. Not one representative rose to defend the network against charges of deceptive editing practices. Two committee chairmen vowed to never again to consent to pretaped interviews.

I insert the two editorials mentioned above:

[From the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, July 13, 1971]

NEWSPAPER AND TV DIFFERENCES

The liberal press and politicians are trying their best to make the cases of the publication of stolen Pentagon papers and the investigation of the Columbia Broadcasting System by Representative Harley Staggers' House committee appear as one and the same thing.

Actually, there is all of the difference in the world except that both The New York Times and CBS are trying to wrap themselves in the flag of freedom of the press.

Efforts to halt publication of the stolen papers by the newspapers involved "prior restraint", the right to stop a news medium before publication. Not at issue at all before the Supreme Court in its recent decision was whether the documents had been stolen or whether the newspapers bought stolen property, both of which come under criminal statutes.

The House committee did not try to prevent CBS from showing the so-called "documentary" entitled "The Selling of the Pentagon." The House committee wants to know whether CBS deliberately distorted facts and twisted statements in preparing the one-sided anti-U.S. film.

A huge broadcasting network such as CBS is a semi-monopoly and is controlled by government just as are monopolies in the field of electric power, telephone service, and interstate truck lines. These monopolies are permitted because they are the only practical methods of carrying on particular businesses. It was recognized long ago, however, that these monopolies should not be allowed to take advantage of their situations and were, therefore, subjected to governmental control and license.

Freedom of the press is a cornerstone of our Anglo-American form of government and no one who believes in representative government opposes it, but freedom of the press also entails great responsibility. As someone once said about freedom of speech, it does not extend to crying "fire" in a crowded auditorium. The same is true of the use of news columns of a newspaper.

The difference between a newspaper and a television network is vast. In the first place, newspapers are purely private enterprise which must compete in the open market. Television networks are at least semi-monopolies. It is easy to separate news from editorial opinion in newspapers. It is much more difficult on TV programs. Another big difference is that newspapers operate within a limited circulation area while TV networks cover the entire nation and, therefore, can be a great influence on many more people.

We commend Congressman Staggers on the position he has taken and hope that the full House of Representatives will support him.

[From the Grant County (W. Va.) Press July 14, 1971]

THE PURLOINED PAPERS

While we agree that the recent Supreme Court decision regarding publication of the "Top Secret" Pentagon Papers was right and proper in light of the First Constitutional Amendment, we feel that a couple of facets of the case deserve comment:

1. What did the Court really decree?
2. What secrets have so far been revealed?

As to the first question: The Supreme Court did not, as is erroneously held by some, grant the news media unrestricted rights to print whatever they desire without fear of reprisal. The historic decision struck only at prior restraint, denying the government the privilege of deciding beforehand what a newspaper may or may not print. Nothing in the decision, however, relieves a publisher from responsibility for what he prints after-the-fact. Certain justices who voted in the majority, most notably Byron White, took pains to include in their opinions broad hints as to the government prerogative and responsibility to prosecute where it can be shown that theft or publication of classified documents have in fact done actual damage in violation of existing espionage laws.

As to the second question: Have secrets been revealed? Well, from what we've read to date from the purloined papers we find: Some politicians practice deception—Bureaucrats scheme against one another too—Bob McNamara and his Defense Department Whiz Kids were not omnipotent—Politicians are inclined to play general and generals are inclined to play politics—Combat-wise military leaders (MacArthur, Ridgeway, Taylor and others) repeatedly warned against a land war in Asia—Presidents are reluctant to admit error—The CIA doesn't operate by Boy Scout rules—Bobby Kennedy didn't trust Lyndon Johnson—Lyndon Johnson didn't trust Bobby Kennedy—Dean Rusk didn't trust anybody.

So far there's been little reported that any thinking American who reads, watches TV, listens to the radio, or just chats about current events with his neighbor couldn't have known as far back as 1967. If there is truly Secret and Top Secret information in the documents which could be detrimental to the country, as there is reported to be, we would like to believe that it hasn't been printed because of the restraining hand of responsible editors.

The real danger, as we see it, is not so much the substance of what's been printed, but the fact that so many directives and messages are being repeated, apparently verbatim, which were originally transmitted by US Secret code. Such scrambled transmissions are routinely recorded by foreign governments. But unless they break the code they don't know what they have. So, they file the tapes indefinitely waiting for a break. The Cryptographer's nightmare has always been that such a foreign government would obtain the exact, clear-text version of what he had transmitted by code. Such are the keys by which codes are broken, allowing foreign governments to decipher all that stuff they've been saving for years to read.

Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the young intellectual who admits stealing and releasing the documents is currently under indictment for the theft. It will be interesting to see if the government will attempt an indictment against the newspapers for their coverage—and on what grounds.—WJB

THE POTENTIAL HAZARDS OF AEROSOL PROPELLANTS

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the report of Grace Lichtenstein published in today's New York Times regarding the potential hazards of aerosol propellants.

Miss Lichtenstein's article explores a problem which has been of growing concern to me since the misuse of aerosols by young people was first called to my attention by an article published in the Bethlehem Globe-Times, Bethlehem, Pa., in February of 1969. In that instance, a Lehigh University professor had reported that high school students were experiencing a "high" after repeated use of a lipstick-size aerosol mouthspray device. A subsequent check by my office with the Food and Drug Administration indicated the mouthspray aerosol utilized a propellant known as Freon 12 which had been associated with symptoms of light-headedness reported by the children and also had been attributed as the cause of a number of deaths.

As the result of my interest in the apparent hazards associated with the propellant gases used in a broad range of aerosol products, and including a number of contacts with persons associated with or knowledgeable about the aerosol industry, I was privileged to participate in a joint Government-industry conference held in the Rayburn Building on June 21, 1971. My participation in one of two panel discussions at that time afforded me the opportunity to explore industry attitudes toward what clearly is a growing aerosol hazard—the potential of aerosol propellants to produce sudden and unexpected death when excessive quantities of certain of the propellant gases are inhaled.

As early as 1969, I asked the FDA to consider requiring that aerosol dispensers carry an appropriate warning on

their label to alert users that excessive inhalation could be dangerous. FDA rejected the suggestion, contending instead that consumer education would be a more satisfactory approach.

In my view, there is a fundamental inconsistency in the FDA endorsement of education of consumers about the hazards of aerosol dispensers and its refusal to require a warning that the gas propellant is extremely hazardous if inhaled in excess. While there always is a possibility that the consumer will not read the label, a printed warning on the label would provide instant education for anyone who took the time to read it.

There is no more guarantee that the aerosol industry's education program will come to the attention of the aerosol user. As a matter of fact, the $5 billion-a-year industry's expenditure of only $100,000 to educate consumers about the hazards of aerosol propellants is almost a certain guarantee that the vast majority of consumers will never learn of the hazards.

Industry figures indicate there were about 2.5 billion aerosol containers of more than 300 types of products sold last year. These 300 products undoubtedly are sold under several thousand brand names.

Since the industry offered me a $100 honorarium for my participation in the industry-government conference on aerosols last month, I am returning that check to the sponsors with a suggestion that each manufacturer of a brand aerosol product match it with equal $100 contributions for each brand aerosol product it markets to the industry's education program within the next 12 months. If the industry responds, its education program can be expanded at least tenfold within 1 year.

Beyond that, I would hope the industry will move voluntarily to develop a suitable warning about the hazards of inhaling the propellant gases and display that warning prominently on their products, that the industry will package its products in containers which will not explode, and that it will step up efforts to find or develop a propellant which is harmless even if misused

As a matter of interest, the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Buffalo, N.Y., reported last year that aerosol containers could be equipped with a safety device to prevent explosions at a cost of a penny a can, although markup might raise that figure to 5 cents to the consumer.

In addition, I want to point out that I learned several weeks ago that the Carter-Wallace, Inc., producers of a number of aerosol products including Arrid and Easy Day deodorants, Rise shaving cream, and Nair hair remover, has voluntarily begun applying warnings to its deodorant labels. The firm reports that production of Arrid and Easy Day carrying the cautionary message, "Warning: Avoid excessive inhalation which may be harmful," has begun. A similar warning is not planned for the Rise or Nair labels, however, because both are dispensed from their containers as foam and the propellant gas is not easily separated from the product to make excessive inhalation even readily possible, according to a company spokesman.

I hope that other aerosol manufacturers whose products have the potential to be misused or abused in a manner which might cause the death of some unsuspecting person will follow the example set by Carter-Wallace and provide a warning on the product label.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a copy of Miss Lichtenstein's report on the aerosol problem in the RECORD at this point:

AEROSOL SNIFFING: NEW AND DEADLY CRAZE

(By Grace Lichtenstein)

Physicians, government officials, drug experts and chemical manufacturers are growing increasingly worried about a deadly and relatively new drug-abuse problem among the nation's children: the inhalation of aerosol sprays.

The aerosol product—hair spray, deodorant, household cleaners or some other—is sprayed into a paper bag or a balloon and then inhaled because the propellent produces a strange, floating kind of high.

The propellants, usually hydrocarbons or fluorocarbons, can also produce death, usually from cardiac arrest.

According to the Food and Drug Administration, more than 100 youths have died from deliberate aerosol sniffing since 1967, with an average of four deaths a month currently being recorded. Dr. Millard Bass, a forensic pathologist who has published papers on the problem, calls it an "epidemic."

Concern about aerosol misuse has prompted two conferences on the subject in Washington within the last month, Aerosol manufacturers sponsor a Government-industry conference June 21, while the F.D.A. held a closed meeting of aerosol experts last Friday.

To combat the problem, the industry has begun an educational campaign to warn youngsters about trying aerosol sniffing.

"They're really trying awfully hard," said B. J. Burkett, a spokesman for the Inter-industry Committee on Aerosol Use and public relations manager for the Freon Division of du Pont de Nemours & Co. "I'm very pleased with the progress we've made."

The campaign includes a film-strip, "Rap On," that has been distributed to 3,000 school districts. The industry has also put out a booklet, "Will Death Come Without Warning?" which declares that aerosol products are safe when used as directed.

But some members of Congress and public health officials are not satisfied. They are demanding that aerosol cans carry explicit warnings about inhalation and that a safer substitute for fluorocarbons, the most frequently used propellent, be quickly developed.

At least one company is heeding the call for voluntary warnings on labels, although the industry is not enthusiastic about the idea and the F.D.A. is reluctant to mandate such a warning.

Carter-Wallace has just begun to add the line "Warning: avoid excessive inhalation, which may be harmful" to the labels on its Arrid and Easy Day deodorants. The company said in a statement that the move had been taken because of "isolated reports of misuse of aerosol products."

There are several researchers who feel even a written warning is not enough. "Maybe we should go back to the old skull and crossbones," said Dr. David Blake, chairman of the University of Maryland's Department of Pharmacology and Toxology, who chaired the F.D.A. meeting Friday.

Representative Fred B. Rooney, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and Representative Tim Lee Carter, Republican of Kentucky, who participated in the June conference, have both called on the industry to produce a safer propellant.

"Even with warning labels I doubt that a high percentage of users are aware of the hazards," said Mr. Rooney, who also complained that the $100,000 budget for the industry's education campaign "is almost a certain guarantee that the vast majority of consumers will never learn of the hazards."

In the filmstrip "Rap On," the industry contends that "research is going on" to come up with a substitute for fluorocarbons, but that "meanwhile people need and want" aerosol products.

There are no nationwide figures on how many youngsters have experimented with aerosol sniffing, although the state Narcotic Addiction Control Commission estimated last August that there were 35,000 solvent and aerosol sniffers in New York State.

One researcher, Dr. Rita Hass of the Connecticut Department of Mental Health, reports that users generally are 11 to 15 years old.

According to Dr. Bass, it appears that death occurs after a youngster deeply inhales an aerosol spray for a prolonged period, either on a single occasion or several occasions. The fluorocarbon propellant Freon, the best-known brand of fluorocarbon, can make the heart beat irregularly and then stop.

Not every youth who abuses aerosol cans dies from sniffing, apparently because each body reacts differently to it. But those who suffer an attack from sniffing do not recover. "Once the final event begins, it's quick, sudden and irreversible," Dr. Bass said.

300 PRODUCTS SOLD

At one time, the youth underground's favorite brand was spray that chilled cocktail glasses. It is no longer sold. However, experts stress that any of the 300 kinds of aerosol products now on the market can be equally abused because all use similar propellants.

New York City has recorded only one "sudden sniffing death" this year, that of a 21-year-old man who inhaled an aerosol spray from a balloon.

Dr. Milton Helpern, the Chief Medical Examiner, said yesterday that "so far it isn't as much of a problem here as it is in other jurisdictions."

"Perhaps our kids are more blase about it," he said. "But, you never know about these things—I always keep my fingers crossed."

BISHOP PAPKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from California, Honorable GEORGE E. DANIELSON, in welcoming Bishop Papken, representative of the diocese of the Armenian Church of America in Washington, D.C., as guest chaplain in the House of Representatives.

Bishop Papken assumed the post of primate of the diocese of the Armenian Church in California in 1957, and has served the Armenian Church with dedication and devotion for more than 35 years. On past occasions he has given the opening prayer in the House, and it is good to have him with us again.

In behalf of my constituents of the Seventh Illinois Congressional District, many of whom are of Armenian descent,

I extend warmest greetings to Bishop Papken and wish him continuing success in his work with the Armenian Church.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this week in the month of July each year the Congress of the United States in following up the resolution adopted by the Congress observes "Captive Nations Week." I think it is well to remind the public that the Communist tyrants who have enslaved many nations adjacent to the Soviet Union have not changed their barbarous and tyrannical methods of government.

The Soviet propaganda machine has spent vast sums of money and Soviet manpower to mislead the world regarding their barbarous and inhuman methods of enforcing slavery upon nations under their domination. The Communist representatives of the United Nations have consistently voted against any action of that international body that would present for debate and discussion true facts regarding the inhuman methods used by Soviet leaders against their captive neighbor nations.

Today in my remarks on Captive Nations Week, I think it is well to bring to the attention of the newer Members of Congress and the American younger generations who are unfamiliar with these methods used by the Soviet tyrants to subject innocent and free people these true facts. Forty years have passed since the Soviets committed probably the greatest international crime in world history when they massacred approximately 15,000 Polish leaders and intelligentsia of the then free Polish nation.

When some of the mass graves of those massacred citizens were discovered 2½ years after the crime, the Soviet propaganda machine immediately sent out volumes of propaganda disclaiming this crime and blaming Hitler and the Nazi storm troopers for the atrocities.

After Hitler's death the Soviet propaganda machine, without any global opposition, convinced millions throughout the world that they were innocent of this greatest of international crimes.

With the help of the Polish American Congress, resolutions filed by myself and a number of my colleagues, this Congress created a special investigating committee to hold hearings and settle for posterity and establish authentic guilt for this "crime of the ages." Hearings were held over a 2-year period in the United States, England, and Europe.

In my remarks today during this anniversary week of Captive Nations, I think it is well to include for the younger generations and older people who might have forgotten the conclusions reached by the congressional committee that investigated the Katyn Forrest massacres committed by Stalin and Soviet leaders in the winter of 1939–1940. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit the authentic verbatim conclusions and recommendations that the Katyn committee submitted to the Congress and the world in the report filed on July 2, 1952:

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

XI. CONCLUSIONS

This committee unanimously finds, beyond any question of reasonable doubt, that the Soviet NKVD (Peoples' Commissariat of Internal Affairs) committed the mass murders of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia.

The evidence, testimony, records and exhibits recorded by this committee through its investigations and hearings during the last 9 months, overwhelmingly will show the people of the world that Russia is directly responsible for the Katyn massacre. Throughout our entire proceedings, there has not been a scintilla of proof or even any remote circumstantial evidence presented that could indict any other nation in this international crime.

It is an established fact that approximately 15,000 Polish prisoners were interned in three Soviet camps: Kozielsk, Starobielsk and Ostashkov in the winter of 1939–40. With the exception of 400 prisoners, these men have not been heard from, seen or found since the spring of 1940. Following the discovery of the graves in 1943, when the Germans occupied this territory, they claimed there were 11,000 Poles buried in Katyn. The Russians recovered the territory from the Germans in September 1943 and likewise they stated that 11,000 Poles were buried in those mass graves.

Evidence heard by this committee repeatedly points to the certainty that only those prisoners interned at Kozielsk were massacred in the Katyn Forest. Testimony of the Polish Red Cross officials definitely established that 4,143 bodies were actually exhumed from the seven mass graves. On the basis of further evidence, we are equally certain that the rest of the 15,000 Polish officers—those interned at Starbielsk and Ostashkov—were executed in a similar brutal manner. Those from Starobielsk were disposed of near Kharkov, and those from Ostashkov met a similar fate. Testimony was presented by several witnesses that the Ostashkov prisoners were placed on barges and drowned in the White Sea. Thus the committee believes that there are at least two other "Katyns" in Russia.

No one could entertain any doubt of Russian guilt for the Katyn massacre when the following evidence is considered:

1. The Russians refused to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the German charges in 1943.

2. The Russians failed to invite any neutral observers to participate in their own investigation in 1944, except a group of newspaper correspondents taken to Katyn who agreed "the whole show was staged" by the Soviets.

3. The Russians failed to produce sufficient evidence at Nuremberg—even though they were in charge of the prosecution—to obtain a ruling on the German guilt for Katyn by the International Military Tribunal.

4. This committee issued formal and public invitations to the Government of the U.S.S.R. to present any evidence pertaining to the Katyn massacre. The Soviets refused to participate in any phase of this committee's investigation.

5. The overwhelming testimony of prisoners formerly interned at the three camps, of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies, and of observers taken to the scene of the crime conclusively confirms this committee's findings.

6. Polish Government leaders and military men who conferred with Stalin, Molotov, and NKVD chief Beria for a year and a half attempted without success to locate the Polish prisoners before the Germans discovered Katyn. This renders further proof that the Soviets purposely misled the Poles in denying any knowledge of the whereabouts of their officers when, in fact, the Poles already were buried in the mass graves at Katyn.

7. The Soviets have demonstrated through their highly organized propaganda machinery that they fear to have the people behind the iron curtain know the truth about Katyn. This is proven by their reaction to our committee's efforts and the amount of newspaper space and radio time devoted to denouncing the work of our committee. They also republished in all newspapers behind the iron curtain the allegedly "neutral" Russian report of 1944. The world-wide campaign of slander by the Soviets against our committee is also construed as another effort to block this investigation.

8. This committee believes that one of the reasons for the staging of the recent Soviet "germ warfare" propaganda campaign was to divert attention of the people behind the iron curtain from the hearings of the committee.

9. Our committee has been petitioned to investigate mass executions and crimes against humanity committed in other countries behind the iron curtain. The committee has heard testimony which indicates there are other "Katyns." We wish to impress with all the means at our command that the investigation of the Katyn massacre barely scratches the surface of numerous crimes against humanity perpetrated by totalitarian powers. This committee believes that an international tribunal should be established to investigate willful and mass executions wherever they have been committed. The United Nations will fail in their obligation until they expose to the world that "Katynism" is a definite and diabolical totalitarian plan for world conquest.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This committee unanimously recommends that the House of Representatives approve the committee's findings and adopt a resolution:

1. Requesting the President of the United States to forward the testimony, evidence, and findings of this committee to the United States delegates at the United Nations;

2. Requesting further that the President of the United States issue instructions to the United States delegates to present the Katyn case to the General Assembly of the United Nations;

3. Requesting that appropriate steps be taken by the General Assembly to seek action before the International World Court of Justice against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for committing a crime at Katyn which was in violation of the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

4. Requesting the President of the United States to instruct the United States delegation to seek the establishment of an international commission which would investigate other mass murders and crimes against humanity.

RAY J. MADDEN, *Chairman*,
DANIEL J. FLOOD
FOSTER FURCOLO
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
GEORGE A. DONDERO
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

Mr. Speaker, whether it is in Moscow, Peking, Warsaw, or other captive nations, the Communist captive nation tyrant's barbarous methods of enslavement have not changed since the days of the Katyn Forest massacre. World history reveals that despotism by despots runs its course and eventually enslaved

people finally rebel and destroy their shackles so their liberty and self-government can be restored.

A BILL TO REDUCE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS IN VOTING

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that I believe would make an important addition to the growing body of laws further enfranchising the American electorate. This Voter Assistance Act would extend to congressional elections the same liberalized durational residency requirements recently applied to the election of President and Vice President by the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970.

Henceforth State residency requirements could not exceed 30 days prior to the election. Moreover, this bill would provide a simplification of absentee balloting and registration for all Federal elections that are similar to the procedures available to our Armed Forces since 1955. In this latter provision the proposal I introduce today goes beyond the amendments to the Voting Rights Act that passed last year.

The proposal I introduce today has been suggested by others and reflects the growing interest in the Congress in further enfranchising our electorate, an interest and concern reflected also in the rapid passage of the 18-year-old voting amendment—by the Congress and the States—and the increasing disposition of the courts to reject arbitrary classifications and regulations that limit voting rights. As a Nation we cannot afford to disfranchise so many of our voters by continuing antiquated anachronistic residency, and absentee voting provisions.

The Gallup poll's indepth analysis of the 1968 election claimed that the true number of citizens who were disfranchised by restrictive residency laws exceeded 5 million persons. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in urging support for the amendments to the 1970 Voting Rights Act amendments, noted that approximately 3 million fully qualified American citizens were denied the right to vote for President in that same election simply because they were away from home on election day and were not allowed to obtain absentee ballots.

The Bureau of the Census took a poll in November 1968, and found that of 26,942,000 people not registered to vote, 3,602,000 were physically unable to do so—illness, incapacity—3,220,000 did not meet residency requirements where they lived. The poll also found that more than 14 million simply showed no interest in registering and voting.

The legislation I am introducing today by liberalizing durational requirements and simplifying absentee voting would solve many of the problems of the more than 3 million who did not meet residency requirements and the more than 3 million who were physically unable to register in 1968. I believe this proposal might well induce some of the 14 million who were not interested in registering and voting to do so, to exercise their right and responsibility to vote.

This legislative proposal insures that a citizen will not be deprived of the opportunity to vote for Members of Congress because of a change of residence and accompanying duration residency requirements. Those who take up a new residence more than 30 days, or up to 30 days, before an election are guaranteed the right to register and vote in the State to which they have moved notwithstanding any durational residency requirement imposed by State law, provided, of course, that they are otherwise qualified to vote.

In addition this bill requires only a 7-day notice for application for absentee ballots. It also provides a simplified absentee vote request form, one which functions as absentee registration to vote in congressional or presidential elections and as an application for an absentee ballot for use in such elections. These forms will be available at post offices and Federal buildings, with charts showing addresses of State and local voting officials, as well as elective offices to be filled and election dates.

I do not think that we can justify in any way the present confusion, uncertainty, and difficulty surrounding voter registration and absentee voting. I believe that the 1970 amendments to the Voting Rights Act made a good start by establishing the 30-day residency period for voting for President and Vice President and a 7-day notice for application for absentee ballots, with a special provision for voting for those who move into an area less than 30 days before election time. I believe that we must now apply the 30-day residency regulation and the 7-day-prior-to-election application for absentee voting to all Federal elections. Indeed since many States are more liberal on voting requirements, residency requirements for voting for President and Vice President than for congressional elections, this kind of legislation is urgently needed for the numbers who are disfranchised, unable to vote for Members of Congress, are likely to be much higher for these offices.

The arguments given by some States that they need stringent residency requirements in order to prevent fraud and to make sure that the voter has sufficient information to base a voter judgment upon, if not specious are at least highly vulnerable. Voter registration is the appropriate prevention for fraud—for voter registration determines voter identification and eligibility—no matter when it is secured, whether 6 months or 6 days before an election. Durational residency requirements make no contribution in the effort to detect voter fraud.

As far as voter information is concerned, the amount, the kind, the quality of information necessary for casting an informed vote, are debatable issues. Certainly the last 30 days before an election the public is saturated with information. The interested voter in that period of time—the amount allowed in this legislative proposal—could certainly come to know a great deal about both candidates. Extended durational residency requirements do not contribute toward voter information in any automatic or necessary way, then, and should not be used purportedly for that purpose.

In the 1970 amendments to the Voting Rights Act the Congress found that durational residency requirements violated constitutional and civil rights of citizens by frequently denying citizens their right to vote, their freedom of movement across State lines, due process and equal protection of the laws guaranteed under the 14th amendment. Moreover, they concluded that these durational residency requirements did not bear a reasonable relationship to any compelling State interest in the conduct of elections.

These findings of the Congress in that legislation were made in connection with voting for President and Vice President. I believe that they are just as applicable to voting for Members of Congress and that the right of citizens to vote in congressional elections needs to be insured by legislation such as I have introduced today.

RIZZO CALLS FOR ACTION ON DRUG PROBLEM

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a letter from the former Police Commissioner of the City of Philadelphia, the Honorable Frank L. Rizzo, has expressed the concern that is growing among the American people regarding the accuracy of published figures of heroin users among our servicemen and the seriousness of the problem.

Early this month a news dispatch from Saigon indicated that heroin addiction among returning servicemen was only about 2 percent. Yesterday a story said that initial tests of returning servicemen show that 4.5 percent are heroin users instead of the 10 to 20 percent estimated earlier.

Mr. Rizzo, who is a candidate for mayor of Philadelphia, requests a thorough congressional investigation of the situation with a view to an accurate assessment of the danger and effective solution to the problem.

I believe that his letter clearly expresses a concern shared by so many of our people and ask unanimous request that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *July 13, 1971.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARRETT: On July 6th the United Press International carried a dispatch from Saigon quoting unnamed sources as stating that the rate of heroin addiction among returning servicemen was only about 2 percent. This figure is at variance with higher figures which had appeared in the press. Consequently, we believe the Department of Defense should be asked to clear up this confusion with a definitive report.

In Philadelphia, as you undoubtedly know, there has been much discussion among parents and services organizations of the addiction of servicemen while on foreign duty. My contact with veterans' groups has shown me their sincere concern for returning veterans who have drug problems.

Certainly the examination procedure for Vietnam veterans must be as thorough as medical science can devise. The same should be said of induction physical tests.

You realize, I am sure, that the combination of ordinary neurosis which afflicts some veterans returning to civilian life, together with the difficulty of finding jobs during the economic recession, creates a potentially volatile situation when combined with drug addiction.

I strongly urge you and all members of the Senate and House to investigate this situation thoroughly with a view to:

(1) an accurate assessment of this danger, and

(2) an effective solution.

In this connection, I have instructed members of my staff to obtain whatever information is available locally in this matter, and to try to work out effective measures toward a solution of this unfortunate and pathetic byproduct of war.

Respectfully,

FRANK L. RIZZO.

NEW YORK TIMES ENDORSES COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT BILL

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1971, the Select Education Subcommittee which I have the honor to chair, of the House Committee on Education and Labor, unanimously and favorably reported H.R. 6748 the comprehensive child development bill.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 Members of the House of Representatives are cosponsors of this legislation and over 30 Members of the Senate, under the able leadership of Senators WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota and JACOB K. JAVITS of New York, are cosponsors of similar legislation.

The comprehensive child development bill is, in the House, the product of over 2 years of effort, reaching back into the last Congress, on the part of a bipartisan group of members of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I believe the outlook is bright for action in this session of Congress on this legislation, and I am glad to note that the measure has just received the endorsement of the New York Times in an editorial entitled "A New Deal for Children," published July 19, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A NEW DEAL FOR CHILDREN

A bipartisan group of Congressmen, led by John Brademas, Indiana Democrat, and Ogden Reid, New York Republican, has sponsored an important bill which would offer pre-school care and education to all children at least from the age of two.

The Comprehensive Child Development Act, which has been approved unanimously by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, could usher in a new era in American child care. By helping to close the gap between the children of the rich and the poor, it may hold the key to prevention of the massive retardation for which the existing school systems have found no remedy.

The advantage of this measure over an Administration proposal to extend similar day care privileges to children of welfare families is that it does not limit the benefits of early pre-school physical, educational and psychological development only to the deprived. Although disadvantaged children would be given absolute priority, middle-class youngsters could, in return for modest fees adjusted to their parents' income, share in the natural extension of American education. The children of the more affluent already enjoy many of these advantages, either in expensive nursery schools or in the home.

The proposal includes Federal funding for public and private nonprofit agencies other than the schools, thereby promising greater diversity of ideas and action in a field that has already given rise to much promising experimentation outside the traditional education system.

With its concern for all children, the act reduces the danger of creating another educational ghetto for the underprivileged. This is important because pre-school programs can so easily be turned into cheap, unimaginative and stultifying babysitting arrangements merely to get children temporarily out of their parents' way. Giving all mothers, including those with educational sophistication and political influence, a stake in truly imaginative child development centers is a way of creating an instant support force to fight for high quality and expert staffing. The act properly extends the American education commitment to those early years of growth in which the seeds of success or failure, and of frustration or happiness, are so often sown.

FREE PRESS, FREE PEOPLE

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the freedoms most crucial to the effective functioning of a democratic society is the freedom of the press. The recent publication of the Pentagon papers and the debate in Congress over the citation for contempt of CBS and Dr. Frank Stanton are only the most recent and dramatic examples of the difficult relationship between the National Government and the freedom of the media.

Mr. Speaker, few of our colleagues in the House of Representatives are better qualified to speak of the place of a free press in a free society than the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable OGDEN R. REID. A tenacious and articulate advocate of a free press, Congressman REID was once himself the publisher of a great newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, and he therefore brings to this crucial subject an extra dimension of experience.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to draw to the attention of Members of the House an excellent article by Congressman REID, entitled, "Free Press, Free People," published in the New York Times of July 13, 1971.

The article follows:

FREE PRESS, FREE PEOPLE

(By OGDEN R. REID)

Our democracy does not work well in secret. The Pentagon Papers illuminate the arrogance of those in high places and the serious erosion, if not breakdown, of our constitutional system of checks and balances.

At least two Administrations, if not three, believed that they were not accountable to the Congress and the American people for watershed decisions taken about Indochina.

The present Administration has gone even further and launched the most serious attack on the press in our history: subpoenaing reporters' notes, threatening reprisals against television and radio stations under the power to license, and, for the first time nationally, invoking prior restraint against the right to publish.

This precensorship was claimed to be justified because of an "immediate grave threat to national security." Critical national security touching our very survival is not in fact at issue here—nor is crytographic intelligence.

While the Kennedy and particularly the Johnson Administrations' failure to inform Congress is a shocking example of unilateral executive decision-making, the attempted effort by the Nixon Administration to prevent what is essentially past history reaching Congress or being published is hardly more reassuring.

After six days of hearings before the Government Information Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, certain remedies are clearly called for if the Congress is to reassert its constitutional role.

First, the Congress must enact a new statute governing classified documents. This law must sharply limit that which should be labeled secret and it must provide for automatic declassification and Congressional oversight. If a matter should remain secret after a stated period, there should be an affirmative, positive finding as to why continued secrecy is necessary.

The Congress should explicitly reserve the right to make public material improperly classified by the executive contrary to statute when its classification is not a matter of national security and is simply a device to avoid governmental embarrassment. Equally, no Executive order on classification should be issued that subverts the intent of the Congress. Above all, there must be a vast reduction in the corps of 8,000 Defense Department officers who now have authority to originate top secret and secret designations.

Second, the Freedom of Information Act should be tightened in two respects. The types of information now permitted to be withheld must be sharply limited, and time permitted for Government response to a court suit must be reduced from the present 60 days.

Third, the Congress must come to grips with executive privilege. Here we are dealing with a collision between the executive and the Congress that has been going on since George Washington assumed office. It should be subject to accommodation, but that will never happen if the Congress does not assert the powers and responsibilities given to it by the Constitution.

Fourth, legislation may well be required to protect the Fourth Estate. The press often serves as a coordinate branch of our democracy, especially when a breakdown occurs between the other three. Specifically, we need a national Newsmen's Privilege Act—now law in six states—protecting the confidentiality of sources, absent a threat to human life, espionage, or foreign aggression. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit the issuance by the courts of injunctions against publication, thereby removing prior restraint from the reach of the executive.

Congressional legislation and assertion of appropriate initiatives can help redress the current situation. If need be, the power of the purse can be more resolutely used vis-a-vis an unresponsive executive. But more fundamentally, what we need is government with faith in the American people and in their right to participate in the great decisions. If we do not see this now, after the Bay of Pigs, the Dominican Republic intervention and the whole tragic history of Indochina, then as a nation we do not really understand democracy.

SOVIET JEWS RECEIVE CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Government has drastically reduced Jewish emigration to Israel, cutting the number of daily departures from an average of 36 a day to five a day. The reduction in emigration is the result of Arab pressures.

The Soviet Jews desire to leave the Soviet Union because they have been made special targets by the U.S.S.R. for harassment and cultural deprivation. It is not easy to practice one's religion in the Soviet Union no matter what that religion is but there is a significant difference in the degree of harassment.

In the Soviet Union the Jews represent one of 120 recognized national groups under the Soviet Constitution. But it is only the Jews who are not permitted to teach their children in their national languages of Yiddish and Hebrew. For example, the Soviet Union permits the Russian Orthodox Church to maintain seminaries where priests are trained but refuses to permit the Jews to maintain seminaries for the purpose of training rabbis. In the Soviet Union there are nearly 3 million Jews, and in the European part of the Soviet Union where most of these Jews live there are only three aged rabbis. In Moscow with a Jewish population of 500,000 there is only one rabbi and he is 78 years old and ailing. In the city of Leningrad with a Jewish population of 300,000 there is only one rabbi and he is over 80 years of age.

The Jews are among the few dissenters willing to publicly stand up in the Soviet Union and ask that the Soviet Union honor its own constitution and treaty commitments with the United Nations which provide that Soviet citizens shall have the right to freely emigrate. Tens of thousands of Jews desire to leave the Soviet Union and most of them desire to go to the State of Israel which welcomes them.

Recently 45 Georgian Jews engaged in a fast in Moscow in support of their wish to emigrate and were given 15 days in jail sentences. The Soviet Union's campaign to stamp out these efforts to call the world's attention to the Soviet Union's barbarism leveled against the Jews most recently resulted in three trials in which 34 Jews were sentenced to penal camps. Basically the charges against most of them were that they had sought to teach their children in the Yiddish and Hebrew languages and to do so they had translated and published books for that purpose.

Furthermore they had sent a petition to the United Nations requesting aid in their desire to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. When I was in the Soviet Union in April of this year, I met with two of the families of those on trial, Lassal Kaminsky and Lev Yagman, who now sit in jail for 5 years because of these acts of courage which are termed anti-Soviet by the Government.

While most of these Jews have as their goal living in the land of Israel, we should display the humanitarianism that this country rightfully prides itself in and urge the Soviet Union to allow those Jews who wish to leave to do so. And to make our offer more than rhetoric we should provide 30,000 special refugee visas to be made available to the Soviet Jews in the event the Soviet Union were to open its doors. Our action hopefully would stimulate other countries to do the same and provide similar refugee visas for these people.

I am pleased to announce to the House today that the distinguished minority leader, GERALD FORD, has become a cosponsor of H.R. 5606, as amended, which would provide these visas. At the present time the bill has 118 House cosponsors and 34 Senate cosponsors. The bill will be reintroduced next Thursday and I would urge our colleagues to join in its cosponsorship.

CHAPTER XIV—CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROGRAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this is the 14th in a series of articles on children and youth and maternal and infant care programs. Support for H.R. 7657 as amended is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth and maternal and infant care programs which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 87 cosponsors in the House and 17 in the Senate.

There are at present 59 regional children and youth programs with additional satellites and 56 maternal and infant care programs in existence delivering comprehensive health care to almost half a million children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I have received from the directors of these programs description of the programs in their community and what it would mean if their particular program were terminated. To give our colleagues an insight into these programs, I am placing in the RECORD descriptions of one child and youth program and three maternal and infant care programs.

The material follows:

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT NO. 614-B, BRONX, N.Y.

The Montefiore-Morrisania Comprehensive Child Care Project provides total health care to 3,800 children, birth to 18 years old, 1,300 families in Health Area 34 in the South Bronx in New York City. The Project utilizes the services of pediatricians, dentists, public health nurses, social workers, psychiatrist, psychologist, speech and hearing therapist, nutritionist, and allied health workers such as community liaisons, family health aides, dental hygienist and assistant, nurse's aides and laboratory technician in the provision of continuous, personalized health care for both acute episodic and long-term illnesses.

This multi-disciplinary approach in the provision of health care to the children makes possible a coordinated attack on the abnormalities or illnesses that may affect an individual child. This approach precludes the necessity and lengthy series of visits to different health and social service institutions.

The Comprehensive Child Care Project (Children and Youth Program) departs from the fragmented service patterns of the past and found ways to provide health care geared to the needs of the children as whole human beings.

In addition, this Children and Youth Project had:

a) Increased evidence of well children in Health Area 34 by 34% in 1970.

b) Decreased incidence of communicable diseases in the community, e.g. during epidemics of measles, etc.

c) Lead Poisoning survey and treatment program had been instituted in the community. Last year about 3,000 children were surveyed for lead poisoning; 2% found to have elevated blood lead levels who were treated and given long-term-follow-up care.

d) Project nutritionists have helped the children with their numerous nutritional deficiencies. Groups of mothers were organized to receive guidance in the area of home and family management practices with emphasis on budgeting, marketing, storage, meal planning and preparation.

e) Indigenous people have been employed and have received continuous in-service training.

f) Close working relationships have been developed with various health and social agencies to meet any other needs that are not directly provided by the Project.

g) Project provides comprehensive health care to children in Headstart Programs and Day Care Centers in the community.

h) Special projects such as camp enrollment for over 300 children has been accomplished, Christmas gift giving to children in the community, job recruitment program for teenagers, job training program for adults and summer recreation program.

i) The Maternal and Infant Care Family Planning Program is providing family planning and gynecological services to teenagers and parents in the community.

j) Medical students, nurses and social work trainees are receiving valuable educational experiences as a result of their affiliation with our Project on a rotation basis.

It is my personal opinion that this Children and Youth Project which has performed such important and pioneering work in the provision of health care for all children in the country should have continued Federal support for an additional five years until June 1977.

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, CLEVELAND, OHIO

"In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances, and of no matter what parents, the potentiality of the human race is born again: and in time, too, once more, and of each of us, our terrific responsibility towards human life; towards the utmost idea of goodness, of the horror of error, and of God."—James Agee "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men"

In accepting the philosophy of Agee and acknowledging the potential he describes, the Cleveland Maternity and Infant Care Project seeks to help reduce over time the incidence of morbidity and mortality among those infants born to disadvantaged mothers in the City of Cleveland.

Since 1966, the Project has provided free ambulatory medical care to approximately 9,000 new maternity patients. In 1970, 2200 maternity patients were registered for care, almost 40% of whom were teenage and unwed. While the 1970 infant mortality rate for the City of Cleveland was the lowest ever recorded (23.7 down from 26 in 1965), the infant mortality for the black population is still higher (28.5) than that for the white population (19.8).

In trying to reach the primary objective of the Project, its special nature has been capitalized upon to modify, strengthen and improve the system of delivering health services, especially ambulatory services, to mothers and infants. This improvement of the delivery system has been achieved by coordinating and upgrading existing services thereby eliminating expensive duplication and by adding new dimensions of care and caring thereby eliminating significant gaps in the delivery system. Listed below are some of the services developed and maintained by the Project with funds granted to it under the provision of Title V of the Social Security Act, the Congressional authorization for which expires June 30, 1972. Although the Cleveland Project has attempted to assure the continuation of these services by integrating them into the programs of existing community agencies, many, if not all, will have to be discontinued or reduced to a point of ineffectiveness if the authorization is not renewed. In addition, it will not be possible to continue to develop innovative methods of delivering maternal and child health services without these funds.

1. For the first time in Cleveland's history, comprehensive health and social services are available to maternity patients throughout the maternity cycle in at least four neighborhood health centers. Services include counselling by a public health nurse, opportunities to consult with a social worker and nutritionist as well as home visiting, when necessary.

2. Free pregnancy testing is available at all health centers operated by the Cleveland Health Department, Office of Economic Opportunity and Salvation Army.

3. Restorative and preventive dental services are provided all Project patients by a dental team aboard a Mobile Dental Clinic which makes regularly scheduled stops in the target areas.

4. Prenatal, postpartal and family planning services are provided to teenagers enrolled in two special educational programs, Services to Young Families and the Booth Talbert Clinic and Day Care Center.

5. The development of an effective cadre of community workers integrated into a professional team permits the professional workers to effectively reach more patients and makes more adequate patient follow-up possible.

6. The development of the first Certified Nurse Midwifery Service in the City, operating within the Department of Obstetrics at Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital has made it possible for patients to continue to receive care of the highest quality despite the decline in the number of practicing obstetricians.

7. Family planning services are organized to supplement those already provided in the community, including postpartal bedside counselling. In 1970, 73% of the patients returned home from the hospital after delivery on some method of family planning.

8. Introduction of the Denver Developmental Test into all the well child conferences in the City. The Project trained the staff and supplied the necessary equipment. Project pediatricians interpret the test results and the Project assumes responsibility for the follow-up of infants who do poorly on the test.

9. In an attempt to improve and expand the services rendered to infants in the City's well child conferences, the Project is sponsoring an intensive inservice education program for public health nurses to upgrade their pediatric skills so that the physician has more time to devote to infants needing his expertise. It is hoped that these well child conferences will become comprehensive neighborhood pediatric clinics.

10. A 24 hour answering service manned by three Project pediatricians has been initiated for Project patients in an effort to make medical care more available to young infants on nights and weekends and to reduce the number of unnecessary emergency room visits.

11. Ancillary services designed to alleviate problems which can interfere with the effective utilization of available medical services have been developed and include: Spanish-speaking workers, the provision of transportation, and babysitting services and group counselling.

Because it is extremely unlikely that local funds could be made available to support this lifesaving program, without continued Federal support, care for mothers and infants in Cleveland may revert to that available in 1965 and possibly the infant mortality will also return to that level. We will have denied "our terrific responsibility towards human life."

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, DENVER, COLO.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: The Maternity and Infant Care Project in the City of Denver, Colorado, has been a tremendous aid in bringing prenatal care to that segment of our population which heretofore were unable to avail themselves of proper care. By bringing the medical services to the patient in the establishment of the Neighborhood Health Clinic, many of the obstacles to the delivery of health services have been overcome. This effect has been reflected in the decrease in the number of patients who arrive in labor who have had no prenatal care. Prior to the inception of the program in 1964, 17.6% of the patients who delivered at Denver General Hospital had no prenatal care. This rate has decreased annually and is now 9.8%. From 1948 through 1958 the percentage of premature deliveries at DGH ranged from 14.3% to 18.7%. The rate of prematurity was found to be directly correlated with lack of prenatal care. With the improvement in prenatal care provided by our M.I.C. grant, we have seen a decrease in the prematurity rate to 13.8%

Adequate postnatal care for both mother and child is a very important area and perhaps the keystone to future family well-being. By increasing the incidence of postpartum visits, our project has extended family planning methods to a larger segment of the population needing this type of service.

I believe our statistics fall well within the range of those of other projects, which indicates an improvement in health care extended to underprivileged Americans and further documents a need for extending the program since it is most unlikely that local funds could be made available to support these health programs if Federal funds are not available after June 30, 1972.

Sincerely,

JAMES. J. PARKS, M.D.,
Director, Maternity and Infant Care Project.

A REVIEW OF MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROJECT NO. 545, CINCINNATI, OHIO, FROM ITS INCEPTION—JULY 1, 1966 THROUGH 1969

There is considerable evidence that just being poor adds to the hazards of childbirth and to the probability of failure of the newborn to develop normally both physically and mentally. Logic would suggest that abolishing poverty should reduce the hazards of childbirth and permit more normal development of the newborn. This may well be true, but the methods of abolishing poverty have not yet been provided, or even agreed on.

The 1963 Maternity and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments provided a new authorization in Section 531, Part 4 of Title V of the Social Security Act for project grants for maternity and infant care. The purpose of the legislation was "to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing" by making grants for projects whose purpose was "the provision of necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, *after* childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with child-bearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers and their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and whom the state or local health agency determines will not receive necessary health care because they are from low-income families or for other reasons beyond their control."

Cincinnati has a population of 500,000. It is estimated that about one-third are indigent or medically indigent. About 6000 mothers delivered at Cincinnati General Hospital in 1965. Of these, 90% were residents of Cincinnati. While 22% of the population of Cincinnati is black, nearly 50% of the medically indigent are black. In 1965 it was demonstrated that the incidence of infant mortality, premature births, births out of wedlock and mental retardation was significantly higher in poverty areas than in the balance of the city. While prenatal clinics were widely dispersed—one at General Hospital, five run by the Cincinnati Health Department, two by The Babies Milk Fund Association and five at private hospitals—over 20% of the patients who delivered at Cincinnati General Hospital had not seen a doctor even once during the pregnancy. Patients attending Cincinnati Health Department clinics averaged only 4.1 prenatal visits per patient. (I estimate the average private patient makes 10 such visits). Eighty percent did not return for a postpartum checkup. Discussion of child spacing was sporadic and the official policy was that family planning was referred to only if the patient initiated the question. In the Health Department, there was only one nutritionist and no social worker. Dental care was limited to an occasional extraction. School age girls were dropped from school by decision of principal or counsellor, and their continued education by visiting teachers was minimal. The bulk of the children of the medically indigent were cared for in 14 Cincinnati Health Department and 1 Cincinnati General Hospital pediatric clinics.

On the order of 75% of the medically indigent patients in Cincinnati deliver at General Hospital. The balance deliver in private hospitals as clinic, service or staff patients.

On the basis of the situation I have described the Cincinnati Board of Health, the College of Medicine and the Cincinnati General Hospital applied for and were given a grant of money to establish Maternity & Infant Care Project #545. The project came into being officially on July 1, 1966. The objectives of the project were to:

A. "Provide a program of comprehensive maternal and infant care for mothers and infants of low-income families of Cincinnati.

B. Promote the utilization of the services to be provided.

C. Reduce the incidence of maternal and infant complications which may cause physical and mental defects in infants born to these mothers."

It was "felt that because of the continuing shift of poverty areas that the project area must be considered the City of Cincinnati as a whole, but with concentration of effort in definable 'pockets of poverty'."

The money is channeled through the Ohio Department of Health, and is on a 3 for 1 matching basis which in this case means that the Health Department and the hospital must continue to provide the same services as before but the federal government will provide up to three times as much money for *added* services. The Policies and Procedures manual concerning Maternity & Infant Care grants states that "rigid and unrealistic financial eligibility requirements by hospitals and community agencies are a

major reason why many patients do not obtain prenatal care but are delivered as emergencies. It is one of the objectives of this program to increase the accessibility and use of community health resources by minimizing administrative barriers to care." And also that "services should be available: 1. without any requirement for legal residence except that the patient is currently living in the area served by the project; 2. upon referral from any source including the patient's own application; and 3. with respect for the dignity of the individual, regardless of the patient's social circumstances or ability to pay."

Eligibility for care is determined on the basis of current residence in Cincinnati and according to a sliding scale developed by the Public Health Federation of Cincinnati and the Hamilton County Medical Association. Key factors in the determination are number of people in the household and take-home pay. About half of all the patients who deliver at General Hospital are seen prenatally in Health Department clinics. No patients pay for clinic care or medicines. Currently the hospital bills of selected patients are paid partially or in full by the Project.

It was originally planned that in the beginning the Project would deal only with patients who deliver at General Hospital but that as experience was gained and more money became available, the benefits would be extended to service patients delivering in private hospitals.

To date, because of lack of money, this expansion has been limited to:

1. care in Health Department clinics for newborns and infants of medically indigent patients delivered in private hospitals;

2. family planning services for these patients;

3. occasional dental care; and

4. occasionally supplying a homemaker for a patient confined in or recently delivered in a private hospital.

One nurse is provided to a private hospital pediatric clinic. A medical secretary and a medical social worker are supplied to Babies Milk Fund Clinics.

It should be noted that none of the money may be used for research, or to provide anything other than service (except for medicines, dentures and some accessories such as elastic stockings and maternity corsets).

WHAT THE PROJECT HAS ADDED

1. Nutritionists—Health Department and General Hospital, including one nutrition aide.

2. Social Workers—Health Department and General Hospital.

3. Dental Clinic—1 dentist, 2 chairs (full time—5 days/week).

4. Family Planning.

5. Added one comprehensive clinic; a pill clinic; a pre-registration clinic; and took over Catherine Booth Clinic (3 half-days/week).

6. Psychiatrist.

7. Personnel such as: Nurses, LPN's, clerks, steno's and secretaries, laboratory workers, anesthetists.

8. Equipment—hospital, especially in nurseries and the delivery rooms; and in clinics. Among other equipment, a Corometric Fetal Monitor, an Astrup Microanalyzer and a Sanborn Monitor Hewlett-Packard type 7 channel recorder are in almost daily use.

9. Remodeling: J-1; Kemper Lane; 12th Street; Catherine Booth; OB Clinic at Cincinnati General Hospital.

10. Developed a system for the prompt transmission of information from outlying clinics to the General Hospital labor room.

11. Cooperation with other agencies: Babies Milk Fund Association; Board of Education—special schools, including Family Life Education Courses, exchange of information; Visiting Nurses Association—home visits; Home Aid Service—Community Chest—for homemakers; Welfare Department—indoctrination of their workers and ours; Planned Parenthood Association; March of Dimes—Operation Stork; Catherine Booth—joint operation of clinic; Family Care Clinic (Silberstein); Pilot City; Good Samaritan Hospital; Neighborhood Councils, etc.; 700 Study; Adolescent Clinic; Model City; New Careers Program (Dept. of Labor); Ohio Legislature (care of minors); and, New Family Planning grant.

12. Baby sitter and Homemaker Services.

13. Transportation to and from clinics.

We have been very much interested in the use of nurse-midwives and have encouraged the Hospital to employ them. We urged the Ohio Medical Board to develop a procedure for licensing nurse-midwives. The first examination was held in early February this year. Two nurse midwives at General Hospital passed the examination. It is anticipated that they will be delivering patients shortly. Some administrative problems must first be solved.

About 70% of our patients are black, and 30% white. Over half the patients are not living with their husbands or the father of the baby—they are single, separated, divorced or widowed.

The goals of the infant portion of the M & I Project have been threefold:

1. To improve existing services which have traditionally presented better than average medical care to the pediatric population of the City of Cincinnati.

2. To provide a means of interagency communication.

3. To consolidate those services which were fragmented so that health delivery systems could be more functional.

To accommodate this, funds from the Grant have been utilized at the Cincinnati General Hospital, the Health Department Clinics, the Babies Milk Fund Clinics and Good Samaritan Hospital.

At Cincinnati General Hospital, support has gone to the Newborn Nursery for neonatolofists who are responsible for the intensive care unit and for training medical and paramedical persons in improved techniques of nursery care. In addition to this funds have allowed for a twenty-four hour laboratory service for the neonatal age group and the performance of certain tests that could not have been performed otherwise. (Immunoglobin of cord blood, etc.) Sophisticated equipment has been purchased with M & I funds to monitor and help care for critically ill, high risk infants and those that were considered relatively normal. Two new clinics have been started at General Hospital primarily with M & I funds, and these clinics are:

1. A high risk infant clinic which sees all children born at General Hospital who are considered high risk by virtue of social or physical problems.

2. An evening clinic which is designed to see infants of parents who find it difficult to make day appointments.

Our activity in the Health Department has been limited to two areas:

1. A model clinic in the Kemper Lane area which has innovative health care programs such as the use of Pediatric Nurse Associates, appointments, community workers and a good physical environment, etc.

2. We are also involved directly in the Price Hill clinic where many of the same techniques are used, and are becoming involved in the Winton Terrace-Findlater Gardens area.

The Babies Milk Fund has been able to add a social service department through M & I funds, while Good Samaritan Hospital has a liaison nurse who works with mothers of infants from the nursery to one year of age.

Our interagency communication is being attempted by a computer program which is attempting to record centrally significant data on:

1. Patient history and physicals.

2. Clinic utilization.

3. Problems associated with clinic utilization.

4. Problems involved with follow up and continuing care.

It is hoped that the computer program will allow access to records by any authorized agency for any child within the city.

MAJOR PROBLEMS

1. Personnel:

Changing personnel attitudes from cold, discourteous, typical "clinic" to warm, courteous, helpful, interested.

Finding people for new types of jobs, for jobs which require individual initiative and self-discipline.

Changing personnel attitudes toward social problems:

(1) contraception in the young.

(2) "bad girl."

(3) making pregnancy too glamorous (all the care, the layette, etc.).

MD's—our goal is to have all clinics manned by qualified obstetricians.

intergrating project personnel into existing system.

salary scale governed by scale of local Health Department.

specific problems.

(1) Do blacks work better with blacks?

(2) Do males (Health, education, etc.) work well with female patients?

(3) Do older personnel work well with teenagers?

high level jobs (consultant in social work and nursing) limited by pay scale.

2. Budget:

Fiscal year is July through June, but three to eight months of the fiscal year may elapse before the budget is finally approved. This year it was cut 5% plus absorbing 6 to 7% wage increases.

3. Evaluation:

No official method of evaluation, as was evident in recent meeting in Washington, D.C. Regional and national offices may be evaluating our program without our knowledge.

Self evaluation—previously outlined.

Especially difficult to evaluate mental retardation.

4. Other Agencies:

Pilot City wants (1) to charge and (2) strict geographic limits.

5. Parental consent.

6. Local MD resistance—none.

7. Misuse—minimal.

8. Inability to provide necessities—food, clothing, better housing.

During the life of the project the following changes have occurred:

Total Deliveries: 1965, 3067 (3112); 1969, 2357 (2385).

No Prenatal Care: 1965, 20–25% (est.); 1969, 12.2% (9.5% last quarter).

Gravidity at Registration: 1965, 4.11; 1969, 3.26.

Six-Week Checkup: 1965, 25% (est.); 1969, 60%.

Percent Prematures (1965–1966): 1965, 17%; 1969 13.6% (7% in private hospitals).

Perinatal Loss (1965–66): 1965 4.2%; 1969, 3% (27 babies saved).

Average # Prenatal Visits: 1965, 4.2; 1969, 6.3.

More than a fourth of the patients are less than 18 years old.

It may be of some interest (although the real significance is not known) that in 1969 patients who had no prenatal care had a prematurity rate of 18.8%, those with care only 12.8%. Perinatal loss of babies whose mothers had no care was 7.2%, for those with care 2.1%.

The project has cooperated wholeheartedly with the Board of Education in the develop-

ment of special schools for school age pregnant girls. I believe this is an extremely valuable project.

A preliminary study of unwed fathers suggests this is an area which needs further exploration.

CONCLUSIONS

The Maternity and Infant Care Project as it evolved in Cincinnati has had a significant propitious impact on the outcome of the pregnancies of the medically indigent of Cincinnati and should be continued and expanded.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California, on August 3, for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BIAGGI, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MORSE, for 60 minutes, July 21.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 5 minutes, July 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 60 minutes, July 21.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, July 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ROUSH, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAYDOS during his special order of today to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COUGHLIN) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. MCKINNEY in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. ARCHER in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. PEYSER.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. SHRIVER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in four instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in three instances.

Mr. ASPIN in five instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in six instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in three instances.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. NEDZI in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

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

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. CARTER.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

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

Mr. BEGICH.

Mr. PATTEN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 635. An act to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6072. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pembina Band of Chippewa Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 18-A, 113, and 191, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 421. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide special health care benefits for certain surviving dependents; and

S.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 19, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 169. A joint resolution authorizing the acceptance, by the Joint Committee on the Library on behalf of the Congress, from the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, of preliminary design sketches and funds for murals in the east corridor, first floor, in the House wing of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

977. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of legislation recommended to reduce losses of two insured loan funds of the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 457. Resolution relating to expenditure of funds from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for certain allowances to Members, officers, and standing committees of the House (Rept. No. 92-367). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 9903. A bill authorizing the Director of the Bureau of the Census to undertake a quadrennial enrollment of persons entitled to vote in elections of the President and Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARING (for himself, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9904. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 9905. A bill to amend the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to make municipal governments eligible for technical services under the act, to extend the act through fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 9906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the depletion allowance shall apply in the case of recycled materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9907. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the civil service retirement benefits of employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9908. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 9909. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 9910. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9911. A bill to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the public lands; to provide for the development of federally owned minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.R. 9912. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 9913. A bill to amend title 5, to authorize employees who provide military aid to enforce the law as members of the National Guard or Reserve components to use annual leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9914. A bill to amend the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9915. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 9916. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 9917. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9918. A bill to further insure due process in the administrative discharge procedure followed by the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 9919. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the period within which certain State and local employees who elected not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system may change such election; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 9920. A bill to provide that State and local sales taxes paid by individuals shall be allowed as a credit against their liability for Federal income tax instead of being allowed as a deduction from their gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 9921. A bill to regulate the election of Members of Congress by prohibiting the imposition of durational residency requirements as a condition of voting for such officers, and providing a procedure for absentee voting and registration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KEE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. ROE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 9922. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. McFALL, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.R. 9923. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. STAGGERS):

H.R. 9924. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide training and employment opportunities for those individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, by means of subsidies to employers on a decreasing scale in order to compensate such employers for the risk of hiring the poor and unskilled in their local communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9927. A bill to provide a penalty for unlawful assault upon policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9928. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9929. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide financial assistance for the construction of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the penalties for the unlawful transportation of narcotic drugs and to make it unlawful to solicit the assistance of or use a person under the age of 18 in the unlawful trafficking of any such drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for dependents, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9933. 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. DOW:

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 9935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers and firemen in any taxable year shall not be subject to the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 9936. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9937. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance for State programs of treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9938. A bill to amend section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include certain nonprofit electric cooperative associations in the category of exempt persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 790. 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. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 791. 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. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that prayer on a

voluntary basis shall be permitted in public schools and educational institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Justices of the Supreme Court be reconfirmed by the Senate every 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress relative to certain activities of Public Health Service hospitals, outpatient clinics, and clinical research centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 552. 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.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

246. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Donald T. Pidgeon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Henry P. Seufert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

107. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Collective of the Haberdashery Factory, Romny, Sumskoi, UkrSSR, relative to treatment of Soviet citizens in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. Also, petition of a Dr. Dubo, Crimean astrophysical observatory of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Nauchnyi, Krymskoi, UkrSSR, relative to treatment of Soviet citizens in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, petition of Zarko Rudjanin, Karlsruhe, West Germany, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL CONTRACT GOES TO PHILADELPHIA HEALTH DEPARTMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Mayor James H. J. Tate today announced that the Philadelphia Department of Public Health has been named one of 13 agencies in the Nation—and the only municipal health department—to receive a contract from the Federal Government to develop an experimental health services planning and delivery system.

A $1,225,000 2-year contract has been awarded the health department by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Nearly a hundred proposals from throughout the country were originally submitted for funding, of which 46 received serious consideration prior to the final 13 awards, totaling $10 million.

Mayor Tate hailed the contract—a major accomplishment for the health department—calling the Federal support "great assistance to Philadelphia in developing a comprehensive health care delivery system, foundations of which have been underway for some time in the city."

City Health Commissioner Dr. Norman R. Ingraham said the contract permits the health department to intensify its work with all segments of the community interested in health care:

> Our aim is to develop a partnership between public and private sectors to provide a complete array of personal health care services throughout the city. We anticipate that continuing to work together great strides will be made to improve the health care delivery system in Philadelphia during the next two years.

Dr. Joanne E. Finley, planning director for the city health department, will be coordinator of the program. Dr. Finley is currently staff director for the master planning effort for the Philadelphia health care system, which includes construction of the new Philadelphia General Hospital. Earlier, she was staff director for the mayor's committee on municipal hospital services.

Dr. Ingraham explained that a community health services planning and delivery system should contain the following elements: A defined population to be served; explicit performance standards as to access to service, equity of care, containment of costs, and management of quality of service; a planning system with technological capability including an organized health planning information system; the availability of such resources as facilities and programs, manpower, and operating and capital finances; plus a continuing, management mechanism to interrelate all of the above. He said:

> Many of these elements and resources exist now in Philadelphia, but in isolation or segmentation, serving only parts of the city. A coherent, effective, and effective, and efficient health services system does not exist. Our goal is to work towards this end, in various ways, each inter-relating with each other.

The program will have two major facets. The first will establish a health management mechanism in partnership between the Department and community groups and agencies. This eventual agency will manage health funds from all sources—Federal, State, and local—for all parts of the health care system in the city. The agency's actual establishment will come through deliberations by the Philadelphia Health Forum and its related task force. Two-thirds of the participants in this planning process will be consumers, Dr. Ingraham stressed.

The program's second part will develop four specific technical information packages: A redefinition of health service area boundaries within the city; the development of a health services data system; the economic analysis of all funds coming into the Philadelphia community for personal health services, including a special study of the feasibility of a citywide public health insurance program; and a central inventory of health manpower resources information.

Dr. Ingraham said that an initial step to be taken under the contract will be an open public meeting convened by the health commissioner. Invited to participate will be consumers, providers, payors, political representatives, representatives of State agencies with direct relationships to Philadelphia health services, and the members of the already organized Philadelphia Steering Committee of the Regional Comprehensive Health Planning Agency.

Those in attendance will form the membership of the Philadelphia Health Forum. Meeting once a month in public session, the health forum will have the responsibility of establishing the permanent health services management structure.

The health forum itself will then establish a task force which will have the operational responsibility for developing a proposal for this health management mechanism. Such a proposal would be submitted to the health forum for final approval. The 25-member task force will be formed by the health forum electing the first six members—four consumers elected by the consumers in attendance at the forum meeting, and two providers elected by the health care providers in attendance. These six, plus the health commissioner as the seventh member, will then appoint 13 additional consumer and five additional provider members.

Dr. Ingraham noted that the following groups had formally endorsed the program in the contract proposal submitted to the Federal Government: Model cities program, regional comprehensive health planning advisory committee, Greater Delaware Valley regional medical program, Philadelphia County Medical Society, Delaware Valley Hospital Council, South Philadelphia Health Action, Inc., Inter-County Health Insurance Plan, Inc., Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, comprehensive