

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 22, 1971

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Father Elwyn D. Brown, Christ Church, Rockville, Md., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, author of life, we know that You reveal Yourself in our history. We thank You for Your trust in calling us to be agents in that history. May Your grace be felt today in this deliberative body that choices and decisions made for our welfare may be arrived at according to Your laws. May the spiritual and emotional forces that rob us of our freedom to be, contrary to Your holy will, give way to intelligent reason and wise choice. Enkindle in our hearts fervent affection for our land; affection that has motivated great statesmen in these United States.

"May Your power be our power;
May Your strength, our strength,
Your light, our light,
Your love, our love."

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. 9382. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices 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. 9382) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REV. ELWYN D. BROWN

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we could have the Reverend

Elwyn D. Brown of Christ Episcopal Church in Rockville here today to offer the opening prayer.

Father Brown represents an old and historic parish, established in 1726 on a petition from the Rock Creek Parish. Although it was recently expanded to accommodate the church's growing congregation, much of the church building dates to 1887.

But Father Brown does not rest on the parish's past, but is a leader in the great ecumenical movement of today's churches. Born in Rochester, N.Y., his first years in college were spent preparing for a law career. But World War II, in which he served as a GI, not a chaplain, in Europe, interrupted. After the war, his goals changed and he finished his work for a B.A. degree at Hobart College and then entered the Episcopal Theological School of the Harvard Corp. in Cambridge, Mass. He served at St. John's in Mount Rainier, Md., for 13 years, and was called to Christ Church a year ago.

Father Brown is the bishop of Washington's chairman of Ecumenical Relations and has represented the diocese at discussions at Yale University and the Papal mass in Yankee Stadium. He is a member of the central committee of the International Ecumenical Fellowship and is president of the standing committee of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington.

LOOK HOMEWARD, MR. PRESIDENT

(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, the world wants to look hopefully on the President's projected visit to Red China. It is a dynamic thrust toward better understanding between nations. But it must not be a continuation of the one-sided U.S. effort which has been met with such minimal response. Undoubtedly the Communists already are amazed at the length to which the United States appears willing to go in this action without a requirement for reciprocal action. Nevertheless, we wish the President every success in his undertaking. It is a courageous endeavor.

However, before our country becomes overengrossed in its Red China program, it seems in order to suggest that the President look homeward. Here aggravating problems are gnawing at our Nation's vitals. There are strikes and the strike problems are worsening. Wage and price escalation now is leapfrogging. There remains nagging unemployment. Successful welfare reform must have a stronger base than guaranteed payments to everyone who does not want to work. We are not coming to grips with any of these. Present efforts to solve domestic problems are in reality feeble. They contain nothing new and dynamic.

Would it not be in order for the President to launch an "America first" drive? Should he not say to Congress, to management, to labor: Let us counsel together for our country's needs—not for political advantage, not for higher prices, not for gains for labor—for "America first."

The great power and prestige of the President's office are needed to bring our country's leaders together, to provide a higher degree of assurance for the harmony, the cooperation and the determination needed for a massive attack on these major problems. There are flaws in our domestic structure. The gaps are widening and they must be bridged. The danger is growing. This action may well be more important to the future peace of the world than anything else which might be undertaken—much more than a mission to China.

CONTROL OF DUMPING WASTE MATERIALS INTO COASTAL AND OFFSHORE WATERS

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be voting on a most important piece of legislation. H.R. 9727 is a bill which would control the dumping of harmful waste materials into America's coastal and offshore waters.

This bill has been reported out by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I would like to commend this committee for its prompt action.

In February of 1971, President Nixon outlined his policies on this subject. These policies are now part of H.R. 9727.

The bill recommends that a national policy be set up banning unregulated ocean dumping of all materials and placing strict limits on ocean disposal of any materials harmful to the environment.

It also makes it mandatory that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency must grant permission for any materials to be dumped into our main bodies of waters.

I certainly support this bill and hope that it will soon be the law of the land.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRANSFER OF SOVEREIGNTY OF FLORIDA FROM SPAIN TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 373) to extend greetings and commendations to the people of Pensacola, Fla., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the transfer of sovereignty of Florida from Spain to the United States.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 373

Whereas the month of July 1971 marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the transfer of the sovereignty of Florida from Spain to the United States, and

Whereas it was July 17, 1827, the twenty-three star emblem of America was raised from a flagstaff at Pensacola, Florida, and Whereas that event marked the establishment of Pensacola, Florida, as the territorial capital of this frontier land, and

Whereas Major General Andrew Jackson, commanding United States troops, then became the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and

Whereas the people of Pensacola, Florida, this year observed the sesquicentennial of the occasion by celebrating with community events, parades, festivities, the presence of many dignitaries including representatives of foreign governments, and

Whereas this occasion was marked with a symbolic changing of the flags and the reenactment of the original transfer in 1821, and

Whereas the people of Pensacola, Florida, acted in concert to bring appropriate attention to this significant historic occasion in outstanding manner through various committees and organizations, and

Whereas the Pensacola area, since the original transfer, has become known worldwide for its sound progress, bountiful beaches, pleasant streets, warm hospitality, and for the beauties of nature as well as for the role the area has played in the national defense and history of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That the Congress of the United States extends its greetings and commendations to the people of Pensacola and to all the people of Florida on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the transfer of sovereignty of Florida from Spain to the United States and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the mayor of the city of Pensacola and to the Governor of the State of Florida.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2 strike out all of the whereas clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor to present a concurrent resolution offering the greetings and felicitations of the Congress of the United States to the people of Pensacola and all of Florida on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the transfer of the sovereignty of Florida from Spain to the United States.

The First District of Florida, which I represent, is especially involved in this observance because this historic transfer took place at Pensacola, largest city in the First District.

The highlight of the observance of this occasion took place last Saturday, July 17, just 150 years to the day from the time Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, then in charge of U.S. troops accepted Florida on behalf of the United States and who then became my State's first territorial Governor.

I had the honor of being asked to take part in the pagentry surrounding the Pensacola celebration last week. Pensa-

colans from all walks of life participated in the parades, community events, and other festivities which were climaxed by a reenactment of the original transfer which saw the flag of Spain lowered from its staff and the 23 star flag of the United States hoisted in its place during solemn ceremonies.

It is fitting that the Congress take note of this important anniversary, for the transfer of this magnificent State to the United States has meant much to all Americans who now know Florida as the Nation's foremost vacation land as well as a land steeped in history and tradition.

Those of us privileged to take part in the celebration will not soon forget the pagentry and solemnity of the occasion as well as the enjoyment of being present at this significant occasion.

I invite all my colleagues in the Congress to join with me in the passage of this resolution in honor of my State and the wonderful people of Pensacola who brought to life last week this historic event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9382, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT; SPACE, SCIENCE, VETERANS, AND CERTAIN OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9382), making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for Space, Science, Veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices 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 Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BOLAND, EVINS of Tennessee, SHIPLEY, CHAIMO, PRYOR of Arkansas, ROUSH, MAHON, JONAS, TALCOTT, McDADE, DEL CLAWSON, and Bow.

TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR THE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administra-

tion, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-373) on the resolution (H. Res. 533) to provide for additional compensation for the officers and employees of the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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. 201]		
Abzug	Eckhardt	Melcher
Adams	Edwards, La.	Mikva
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Mitchell
Anderson,	Foley	Murphy, N.Y.
Tenn.	Gallagher	Pepper
Ashley	Goldwater	Powell
Aspin	Hagan	Pryor, Ark.
Badillo	Hanna	Purcell
Baring	Hansen, Idaho	Rallsback
Blanton	Hawkins	Rees
Blatnik	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Brooks	Hogan	Rostenkowski
Caffery	Holifield	Scheuer
Celler	Hosmer	Skubitz
Chappell	Hungate	Smith, Iowa
Chisholm	Jarman	Smith, N.Y.
Clark	Kemp	Springer
Clay	Kuykendall	Staggers
Collins, Ill.	Kyros	Steiger, Ariz.
Conyers	Long, La.	Stokes
de la Garza	Lujan	Tierman
Dellums	McCloskey	Udall
Diggs	McCulloch	Van Deerin
Dingell	McKay	Wilson, Bob
Donohue	McKinney	Wyman
Dorn	Mathias, Calif.	Yatron
du Pont	Mayne	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Is there objection to dispensing with further proceedings under the call?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. HALL. 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 pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Two hundred Members are present, not a quorum.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 371, nays 5, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]		
YEAS—371		
Abbott	Alexander	Andrews,
Abernethy	Anderson,	N. Dak.
Abourezk	Calif.	Annunzio
Abzug	Anderson, Ill.	Archer
Addabbo	Andrews, Ala.	Arends

Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Baker
Barrett
Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Cabell
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dowdy
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley

Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallfanakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Glaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Hollifield
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
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McClure
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKevitt
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Martin
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds

Metcalfe
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Peysner
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Freyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegler
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebellus
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steed

Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Terry
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
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum was established a minute ago.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The Clerk has read the title of the bill in the interim. I renew the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution which increases the amount of money available for the Speaker for staff by \$50,000.

The staff of the majority leader as previously constituted was both too small and too limited in its range of skills to adequately handle the workload of the Speaker's office.

New people have been added and more should be added to give the Speaker the numbers and the variety of special talents necessary to cope with the stature and scope of the office. To date we have identified the need for more staff for research, writing, special projects, case-workers, stenographers, and receptionists. Certain areas where the Speaker has had or should assume responsibility have received only cursory attention because of the shortage of staff support and the demands on the Speaker's time.

To sum up, we have had an increase of about 300 percent in our total workload. We have a greatly expanded volume of mail of all kinds and the same is true of our telephone load and visitor load. We are having to deal with demands from organizations and individuals on the national level, governmental and nongovernmental, individuals who write and call in from all over the country, our State, and district. The official duties and the ceremonial duties, plus the constant stream of activity from the press and academics, and nongovernment persons, call for much broader staff support than afforded by the relatively small staff of the majority leader.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, the newspapers frequently say that the office of the Speaker is the second most important office in the country, second only to the President. I am not making any odious comparison when I point out to the Members that with this increase the Speaker will have about one dollar for every one thousand dollars that it takes to run the White House. I am not saying they get too much money to run the White House. I do not know. That is not within my range of oversight in this Congress. There are committees to deal with it, and I assume they think the President needs the money they are giving him, and if they think so that is good enough for me, but I am using this as a simple basis for comparison to show that the Speaker has a relatively tiny

NAYS—5

Dickinson
Gross

Hall
Landgrebe

Schmitz

NOT VOTING—57

Adams
Anderson,
Tenn.
Badillo
Baring
Blanton
Blatnik
Caffery
Clay
Conte
Conyers
de la Garza
Dellums
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
du Pont
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Findley

Frenzel
Gallagher
Goldwater
Hagan
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Heckler, Mass.
Hosmer
Hungate
Kemp
Kuykendall
Kyros
Long, La.
Lujan
McCloskey
McCulloch
McKay
McKinney
Mathias, Calif.
Mayne

Melcher
Mikva
Mitchell
Monagan
Murphy, N.Y.
Pepper
Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Rallsback
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stokes
Teague, Tex.
Van Deertlin
Wilson, Bob
Wyman
Yatron

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RHODES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR THE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 533

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, effective as of July 1, 1971, in addition to all other amounts provided by other provisions of law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for compensation of the officers and employees of the Office of the Speaker of the House the sum of \$50,000.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will finish reading the resolution.

The Clerk completed the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. HALL. To state a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. At the conclusion of the last rollcall, does not the question recur on the motion to dispense with further proceedings?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must know that that is exactly what we voted on. The result of the vote was 369 to 5.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a

staff to cope with the tremendous responsibilities of the office.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please state to the House, for my edification and for that of other Members who may be interested, the total allowances now for all purposes for the Speaker?

Mr. HAYS. If this resolution passes, he will have \$166,500.

Mr. GROSS. For all purposes?

Mr. HAYS. For the Speaker's staff. Additionally he will have the amount for his district office which we all have.

Mr. GROSS. I have been given a figure of approximately \$307,000 a year. Is that in error?

That is for all purposes as a Member of the House, the allowance for the office of the Speaker, and the increase.

Mr. HAYS. I had my staff check it out, and the figures they came out with are the figures I gave the gentleman, \$116,500, or it will be \$166,500 with the addition, plus the same amount we all have, whatever that is, and I cannot say at the moment. Maybe it adds up to the same amount.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Then the figure of \$1 to \$1,000 still stands.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on House Administration yielding. I have been a personnel officer in years gone by, and I would not want to be in the position of denying adequacy to, of all people, our Speaker, or to his administration. I think there may be some error in comparing that with the duties of the White House, but I well appreciate the Speaker is the number three figure in Government, and he must be adequately provided for. I certainly would not want to be denying him such adequate assistance.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will permit me, I would interrupt him for a second.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman has the time.

Mr. HAYS. The Speaker is the No. 3 man in order of succession, but I think as far as power is concerned he is No. 2 in the country. I referred to his position as far as power.

Mr. HALL. I would accept the distinguished gentleman's comment concerning that, albeit tradition has held otherwise; but, I rue some of the comments about the No. 2 elected official in our scheme of government that have been made. Be that as it may, I have just completed and yielded from the dilatory tactics brought on by my apoplectic amazement that this bill would suddenly be brought up today, so soon after we gave the Committee on House Administration the power yesterday over Members' clerk hire and other allowances exclusive of the Speaker and a few others; and also after having been granted unanimous consent yesterday, prior to a meeting of

the full Committee on House Administration on this matter, to come in here early today and to deal with the matter of the military construction bill, to be brought up by the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. We must presume our Committee on House Administration has adequate justification for this use of taxpayers' moneys, but I would prefer to be reassured.

It was just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order made by this gentleman from Missouri on the Legislative Appropriation Act that I had stricken on a point of order, as sustained by the Chair, a \$40,000 increase for the office of the Speaker.

It was then not authorized. I appreciate that this would authorize it and the resolution would provide it.

I am interested in knowing why there is a 20-percent increase over the \$40,000 that was stricken on a point of order a relatively few days ago.

I am interested in knowing why it is necessary for our new Speaker, as beloved as he is, and as much respect as his neighbor from Missouri has for him, to use four offices in the Capitol and why, as chairman of the House committee, he allows all the political parties to have campaign offices in the Capitol, yet wants a new office building constructed as opposed to the Madison Library.

I am interested in present costs compared with prior Speakers.

I simply believe as I did, as I helped in the fight last year to prevent an increase in pay of the respective employees in the Speaker's office, successfully, and raise those clerk-hire employees, that economy begins at home, that the Speaker should be the paragon of virtue in leading this economy, and that we should have a complete explanation of the difference between the two speakers, the difference between the numbers of offices that they occupy, and that we ourselves should pull the purse strings on this 20-percent increase of the appropriation.

I for one shall vote against it. I hope that I shall be joined by many people who believe the taxpayers have had enough.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYS. I will say this to the gentleman: I want to tip him off to something that will give him an opportunity to offer an amendment. When the bill comes to a vote on the appropriation for the various offices, there is an item of \$720,000 for the Vice President's office downtown in addition to all the allowances he gets for his office up here. The gentleman might want to offer an amendment to knock that out; I do not know.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say, I do not want to make this a partisan matter. I will say if the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Ford, needs more money to operate his office and comes in and justifies it he will get a very sympathetic and receptive hearing from me, as chairman, and I can assure the gentlemen from my committee. There is nothing partisan about this.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield

further, I am sure if I would come in to ask for needed additional personnel or assistance I, too, would get a sympathetic hearing from the Committee on House Administration. "Sympathetic" is a relative matter, I understand.

Mr. HAYS. I would have to have a couple of days to think about this.

Mr. HALL. Who made it a question of "partisan" is a matter of record in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman, I get apoplectic, too, sometimes, but I am not apoplectic about this delay he has caused today; to do the same thing to the military construction bill, which I could—but I am not going to.

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

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

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman.

Not too long ago this House decided it was going to limit the travel that I had for my committee, and other committees of this House. First of all, they created a problem I do not know how to resolve, since they limited it to nine members. I have 17 members of the committee, and I cannot pick out nine even if I give up my slot, which I have done twice.

I should like to read something which is in the public print:

THE VICE PRESIDENT: SAFARI

He had already played golf in Singapore, Korea and Saudi Arabia, and now he stood on the first tee of the best private club in Kenya's capital of Nairobi, swinging his driver like a machete. You guessed it, sports fans. This was no touring pro nor even a salesman of exploding golf balls, but Vice President Spiro Agnew, currently flailing his way around the world in his newest role—as international troubleshooter, diplomat and spreader of goodwill.

Agnew's diplomatic round, whatever its effect, was surely his costliest venture yet. He traveled with a party of 141 persons (not counting 11 newsmen paying their own way), flying in a caravan of four Boeing 707s—plus a cargo plane carrying two bullet-proof Cadillacs for Agnew's dash from airport to hotel to golf course. Eighty U.S. Secret Service men and countless embassy personnel were alerted around the world to aid and protect the Vice Presidential person, and he moved everywhere inside a cocoon of human flesh that never failed to dazzle his hosts. "No head of state arriving in Nairobi ever had such security," marveled the Nairobi Daily Nation of the American No. 2.

Hacking: Whatever the reason, Agnew kept his distance from the natives. "Robert Kennedy addressed us as if he were one of us, and Hubert Humphrey tried to do the same," said a senior at Hailu Selassie I University in Addis Ababa. "Agnew never saw us, and we never saw him." On his arrival in Nairobi, Agnew did not even bother to read a statement of greeting. Instead, he shook hands with Kenya's Vice President and rushed off to his hotel (where the bill for his entourage was \$3,000 a day). Aside from hacking up the local golf course, his main outing was to a nearby hunting lodge, where in company with his private physician and his pretty, red-haired secretary,—

Mr. HAYS. Do not knock that.

Mr. DENT. I do not even knock the next sentence. It is

he watched two rhinos copulating.

The principal advocate of the Vice Presidential tour was his press man, Victor Gold. "This trip wasn't for the benefit of the press;

it's a diplomatic mission." Gold said angrily one day when the newsmen's wisecracks got a little loud. "There seems to be a certain style where you are expected to shake hands with a camel driver or pat cheetahs on the head. Well, the fact is that we don't conduct our diplomacy for the benefit of the mass media. We're conducting it for the benefit of the U.S. Government and the people of the U.S."

All of which would be fair enough, except that Agnew has had little to do with heads of state, or diplomats either. South Korean President Chung Hee Park reportedly refused to talk business with him at all, and the Koreans shunted him off to the links, saying, "This time we just want him to enjoy Korea." Agnew spent under an hour with Haile Selassie and all of fifteen minutes with Kenya's Jomo Kenyatta and his Cabinet, barely enough time to hand over a replica of a George Washington candelabra and rake in his own booty: a monkey-skin robe, a wooden elephant and a wooden rhino. "This suits my personality," said the Veep, admiring the last.

Agnew has not made any serious *faux pas* so far, but he worked in many little ones. He called Arabia's King Faisal "Prince Faisal," referred to Jomo Kenyatta as Yomo Kenyatta, pronounced the name of Kenya itself the colonial way (*Keenya* instead of *Kenya*) and insisted that he is not going to any NATO countries on this round of diplomacy. Not only is the Vice President going to a NATO country this week, he is going to the only one—Portugal—that still has large colonial holdings in Africa.

Agnew saved his major gaffe for the weekend. Holding a news conference aboard Air Force Two as he flew north to Europe from his last African stop in the Congo, he said that "most" U.S. black leaders "could learn much" from the African strongmen he had just seen. Kenyatta, Ethiopia's Emperor Haile Selassie and Congolese commandant Joseph D. Mobutu, all of whom rule virtually unchallenged, "have impressed me with their understanding of the internal problems and their moderateness," the Vice President said—as opposed to "the querulous complaints and constant recriminations" of most black leaders in the U.S.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my friend from Pennsylvania took this time for this purpose. I do not think it has any connection with the matter that is before us. As the gentleman from Ohio knows, I favor the resolution on behalf of the Speaker's office.

As I understand it, those representing the Speaker came before the committee this morning and justified the facts sufficiently to get the committee to act favorably. I think it is poor taste, to say the least, on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) to use the time for the purpose that he just used it.

For example, I do not recall any Member on our side, when former Vice President Johnson took a trip to Pakistan, to arise on the floor and make comments comparable to the ones made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

If I could, let me add another comment at this point: in a special order yesterday one of the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle, on page 26517, used language

in reference to a high official in the U.S. Government that I have never seen used or heard used in this Chamber. I have checked it out, and apparently under the rules of the House, that language of the gentleman from Missouri is not subject to the rules of the House because the Vice President is not a Member of the other body.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I finish my thought? And I appreciate the gentleman giving me this time.

I cannot imagine somebody in this body on either side of the aisle using language of that kind on the floor of the House in reference to the second ranking Member of the U.S. Government in the executive branch. I could appropriately categorize that language in one way or another, but I would have to use language, in my opinion, that would violate the rules of the House.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for having used that language, owes an apology to the House and an apology to the Vice President.

Mr. HAYS. Well, let me say to the gentleman that I do not know what the language is that he is referring to, but whatever it may have been, it would not make any difference to the Supreme Court which sits across the street, because they have ruled several times now that you could say anything about a Member of Congress, you could call him anything, you could tell a lie, you can accuse him of any crime you want to, and nothing can happen to you just so long as you do not do it with malice aforethought. You know, you can have the malice right then, but just so you do not think about it beforehand.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am familiar with those decisions by the Supreme Court, and I disagreed with many of those decisions, as I do with many other decisions of the Court, but it seems to me that we in this body, regardless of our political affiliation, should conduct ourselves with a certain degree of common decency.

As I read that language, I think that language is most shocking, regardless of a person's political affiliation. The language used by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), is degrading to the House.

Mr. HAYS. Well, just let me finish this by saying to the gentleman that sometimes, having been a student of British parliamentary history, I think, perhaps, we have too strict rules here about what Members can say to each other and oftentimes miss some humor. I recall an exchange which I used in paraphrasing a matter on this floor which brought down some criticism on my head but which I thought was quite humorous and I attributed it to the two principals involved.

At one time when Lady Astor was a Member of the House of Commons she

got into an argument with Winston Churchill. She said:

If the right honorable Member was my husband, I would put poison in his coffee.

Churchill replied:

If the lady was my wife, I would drink it.

I do not know what the gentleman is referring to because I have not read the language. However, the Members can decide that for themselves.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution for the reason: First, that it was approved by the House Administrative Committee less than an hour before the House convened and there was no advance notice whatever that it would be considered today; second, and most important, no real justification has been given for a \$50,000 per year increase in the allowances for the Speaker of the House which, I am reliably informed, now total at least \$257,000 a year.

If the latter figure is correct, and if the House approves the \$50,000 contained in this resolution it will mean that the Speaker has been provided annual allowances, exclusive of salary, of some \$307,000. As the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) points out, the House of Representatives ought to set the pace in holding down expenditures and this certainly is not the way to do it.

Only a couple of weeks ago this increase for the Speaker was a \$40,000 item in an appropriation bill. Because it was then unauthorized it was stricken from that bill on a point of order by the gentleman from Missouri. To the question of why it has been increased to \$50,000 in this short space of time there is no valid explanation.

I am opposed to this resolution and I want to be so recorded on the record.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL. 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 pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the last rollcall we were in attendance at the Small Business Committee hearings. The lights and the bells did not work. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

AGNEW VICTIM OF VULGAR DIATRIBE

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be so presumptuous as to rise in defense of the Vice President. He is eminently able to speak for himself.

Nor need I stand in judgment of the Vice President's recent observations that certain leaders unduly occupy themselves with querulous complaints and constant recriminations.

Some of our associates must have felt that sting, or at least they arrogated unto themselves to respond to that observation.

For after all the business of the day was done, and most of us had gone last evening, a few of our colleagues took the floor and went on for an hour, and some 12,000 words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a discourse that at times sank to a vulgar diatribe, and, at best, sounded an awful lot like querulous complaints and recriminations.

REPLACEMENT OF H.R. 6666 ON THE NEXT PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the signed withdrawals of objection to H.R. 6666 by my colleagues Mr. HAYS and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON be entered in the RECORD and that the bill accordingly be permitted to be placed on the next Private Calendar.

The signed withdrawals follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 7, 1971.

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: I am glad that you brought to my attention the Private Calendar bill H.R. 6666 and am writing to tell you that in connection with Congressman Wayne L. Hays I am withdrawing my objections.

Kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

Washington, D.C., July 8, 1971.

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: In reply to your July 6th letter, I will withdraw my objection to your bill, H.R. 6666, and I am sure Mr. Stanton also will.

With kindest regards, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

WAYNE L. HAYS,
U.S. Congressman.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGEN- CIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the

Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9270, AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION PRO- GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on 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.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-376)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9270) "making appropriations for the Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 37, 41, 42 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$173,479,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,934,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$164,068,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,980,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,536,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,867,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$124,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$441,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$132,099,000 (of which \$26,688,000 shall be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 709, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented);"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,113,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,200,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "harvest or knowingly permit to be harvested for illegal use"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 34, and 38.

JAMES L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, JR.,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
FRANK E. EVANS,
GEORGE MAHON,
MARK ANDREWS,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
BILL SCHERLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Department of Agriculture
Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$6,912,000 for the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,932,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Inspector General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$14,354,000 as proposed by the Senate including \$300,000 for additional work on the FHA, school lunch, and meat inspection programs instead of \$14,054,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the conferees expressed their concern with the large number of violations in the food stamp program in which little or no punitive or preventive action is being taken. The conferees direct that all cases of violation of the law by program recipients shall be forwarded to the responsible local welfare office for consideration in administering the program.

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$173,479,500 instead of \$169,532,000 as proposed by the House and \$180,183,000 as proposed by the Senate. The following tabulation lists the changes from the House Bill agreed to by the conferees:

Additional research at pesticide laboratories	+ \$800,000
Research on mosaic resistant and cold tolerant sugarcane varieties, Houma, La.	+ 62,500
Soybean production research	+ 300,000
Research on floricultural crops	+ 100,000
Research on sheep (predator control)	+ 125,000
Research on sheep production, Clay Center, Nebr.	+ 150,000
Research on fowl cholera and other turkey diseases	+ 50,000
Additional research on major swine diseases	+ 250,000
Research on fruit and nut crops, Byron, Ga.	+ 100,000
Special cotton cost-cutting research program	+ 750,000
Research on eradication of Hawaiian fruit flies	+ 250,000
Expansion of nutrition research at Grand Forks, N. Dak.	+ 125,000
Research on restoration and revegetation of strip mined lands in North Central area	+ 65,000
Research on temporary storage of high moisture feed grains	+ 50,000
Research on Appalachian horticultural crops	+ 40,000
Soil and water research in Hawaii	+ 100,000
Research on saline seepage and related soil problems in Montana	+ 60,000
Research on Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis	+ 500,000
Planning a soil and water research laboratory, Beckley, W. Va.	+ 70,000
Net change over the House bill	+ 3,947,500

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$70,000 to remain available until expended for the planning of a soil and water research laboratory at Beckley, West Virginia. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees concur in the language of the Senate report calling on the Department to give special attention to the soil and water conservation research laboratory planned for Akron, Colorado. In addition, the conferees direct that, from available funds, a restudy of the feasibility and need for the proposed soil tilth center be made. The dairy cattle management and forage research laboratory proposed by the Senate has been deleted. The Department should restudy the need for such laboratory on a smaller scale or perhaps in connection with research at other centers.

Amendment No. 5: Provides \$100,154,650 as proposed by the Senate for plant and animal disease and pest control instead of \$99,654,650 as proposed by the House. The additional funds will aid in controlling outbreaks of Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis.

Cooperative State Research Service

Amendment Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Provide \$1,900,000 for the special cotton research program instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 9: Provides \$1,000,000 for rural development work proposed by the House instead of \$2,850,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides \$500,000 for special cotton cost cutting education work instead of \$1,000,000 added by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Adjusts the total payments to conform to Amendment Nos. 9 and 10.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 12: Provides \$20,980,000, including \$1,238,000 for a farm operators expenditure survey, \$30,000 for reports of cattle on feed in Kansas, and an additional \$100,000 to strengthen potato production statistics, instead of \$20,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,430,000 proposed by the Senate. The conferees agreed that the Department should maintain the parity concepts provided in the basic law in recognition of the need to maintain the purchasing power of farmers in an otherwise urban economy.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 13: Provides \$16,252,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 14: Provides \$25,536,000, including \$500,000 for additional overseas marketing work, instead of \$25,036,000 proposed by the House and \$26,036,000 proposed by the Senate. The conferees are disappointed by the failure to break down the many trade barriers to expanded agricultural exports, and call on this service to be more thorough in its reports in this area along with suggestions for possible relaxation of trade barriers.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendment No. 15: Deletes the language pertaining to the further limitation of payments inserted by the House.

This was one of the major items of controversy.

It is to be noted that, 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 per-

son or corporation per crop. These payments 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 their land.

It is apparent that American agricultural producers are dependent upon a stable return and that stability is directly related to the various federal programs to stabilize production.

At any rate, this is a commitment at the present time.

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. The conferees have agreed to carry out the good faith commitment 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.

People are quitting the farms at a rate of 400,000 to 600,000 per year, and have done so for 6 straight years. In 25 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 consumers cannot afford to have them do so.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 16: Provides \$4,213,331,000 for full reimbursement of the net realized losses of the Corporation as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,613,331,000 proposed by the House. Such restoration was requested by the Office of Management and Budget.

TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Department of Agriculture
Rural Development Service

Amendment No. 17: Provides \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$230,000 proposed by the House.

Resource Conservation and Development

Amendment No. 18: Provides \$20,867,000 and 20 planning starts for resource conservation and development projects instead of \$15,691,000 proposed by the House and \$25,421,000 proposed by the Senate.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 19: Provides citation of the Telephone Bank Act added by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Provides new telephone loan authorizations of \$124,100,000 instead of \$118,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$130,000,000 proposed by the Senate. The conferees call on the Administrator not to make loans to telephone companies or associations where there is any indication that such company or association is likely to be purchased by larger corporate interests.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendment No. 21: Provides an appropriation of \$97,665,000 for administrative expenses proposed by the House instead of \$106,250,000 proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Independent Agencies

Environmental Protection Agency

Amendment No. 22: Provides \$441,400,000 for operations, research, and facilities instead of \$425,100,000 proposed by the House and \$458,900,000 proposed by the Senate. In addition to restoring the \$8,800,000 deleted on the House floor, the conferees agreed to provide an additional \$7,500,000 for solid waste disposal grants.

The conferees believe it most important that the various agencies of Government and the Congress, in the review and appraisal of Federal Government programs, projects, and

activities, have full information available not only as to the impact upon the environment but also the significant economic impact on the public and the affected areas and industries.

The conferees, therefore, direct that, in addition to the environmental effects of an action, all required reports from departments, agencies, or persons shall also include information, as prepared by the agency having responsibility for administration of the program, project, or activity involved, on the effect on the economy, including employment, unemployment, and other economic impacts.

The conferees expect the agencies involved to spend such additional sums as may be necessary, out of general funds available, to cover any additional costs of preparing such statements.

This requirement will apply primarily to the environmental impact statements required under section 102 of the Environmental Quality Act, and the reports required under the permit dumping programs based on the Refuse Act of 1899.

National Commission on Materials Policy

Amendment No. 23: Provides \$500,000 for this newly appointed Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000 proposed by the House. At the time of the House action, the Commission had not been appointed. In providing the funds for its operation, the conferees direct that the Congress be kept informed on the progress of such studies as are undertaken.

Department of Agriculture

Soll Conservation Service

Amendment No. 24: Provides \$154,734,000 for conservation operations proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,146,000 proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31: The Senate concurs with the House recommendation to merge the two appropriations "Watershed works of improvement" and "Flood prevention" because of their similarity. The conference agreement includes \$105,411,000 for watershed programs and \$26,688,000 for flood prevention projects.

Amendment No. 32: Provides \$18,113,500 for the Great Plains conservation program instead of \$16,229,000 proposed by the House and \$19,998,000 proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendment No. 33: Deletes language added by the Senate to raise the limitation on payments under the rural environmental assistance program to \$5,000 in connection with practices to reduce pollution by animal wastes. The conference considered this matter and calls on the Department to make a thorough review of the need for such adjustment.

TITLE IV—CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SERVICES

Independent Agencies

Office of Consumer Affairs

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$960,000 for the Office of Consumer Affairs as proposed by the Senate instead of \$950,000 proposed by the House and \$450,000 for the Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center as proposed by the House, for a total of \$1,410,000. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes the separate appropriation for the Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center of \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of a similar amount in combination with the appropriation for the Office of Consumer Affairs as proposed by Amendment No. 34.

Department of Agriculture

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 36: Deletes language exempting the provisions of Public Law 92-32 from the limitations on the section 32 appropriation added by the Senate.

The conferees agree that such language could threaten support for the prices of apples, fruit and other perishable commodities which are dependent upon purchase of surpluses with section 32 funds and donations to schools and needy families. There is no intent to limit the effect of Public Law 92-32 so long as it does not reduce the level of section 32 funds which need to be carried forward as provided in basic law.

Food and Nutrition Service

Amendment No. 37: Provides \$531,594,000 for the child nutrition programs as proposed by the Senate instead of \$518,594,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$25,000,000 for the school breakfast program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,000,000 proposed by the House. Language has been added to place \$6,500,000 of the increase in reserve pending determination of need. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Provides \$16,110,000 for the nonfood assistance program as proposed by the House instead of \$33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Provides \$2,200,000,000 for the food stamp program instead of \$2,001,184,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that the Food Stamp Act makes no provision for providing cash for face value of stamps even in making change. Such a practice has grown up and threatens the success of the Food Stamp Program. Such practice should be stopped and the conferees concur in the language included in the House report requiring that all violations of the Act be forwarded to the responsible local officials for their consideration in connection with the certification of eligible participants.

Independent Agencies

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 41: Provides authority to the Food and Drug Administration for the hiring of necessary consultants as added by the Senate.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 42: Inserts section number.

Amendment No. 43: Prohibits harvesting marijuana or other such prohibited drug-producing plants as proposed by the Senate instead of a prohibition against growing such plants as proposed by the House.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1972 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1971 total, the 1972 budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	-----	\$9,548,907,550
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	-----	12,104,813,850
House bill, fiscal year 1972	-----	12,423,896,050
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	-----	13,621,677,050
Conference agreement	-----	13,276,900,050

Conference agreement compared with:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	-----	+3,727,992,500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	-----	+1,172,086,200
House bill, fiscal year 1972	-----	+853,004,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	-----	-344,777,000

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL JR.,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
FRANK E. EVANS,
GEORGE MAHON,
MARK ANDREWS,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
BILL SCHERLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A SPECIAL RESOLUTION

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a special resolution.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 555 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 555

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. 9844) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 504 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. 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 recommitt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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, House Resolution 555 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9844, the military construction authorization bill. All points of order are waived against section 4 of the bill due to a transfer of funds, which constitutes an appropriation in a legislative bill, and the bill will be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

The purpose of H.R. 9844 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of military departments during fiscal year 1972.

The total authorization in the bill is \$2,133,137,000, which is \$126,307,000 less than the amount requested by the Department of Defense. The total is broken down, as follows:

Army	\$565,930,000
Navy	318,716,000
Air Force.....	222,299,000
Defense agencies.....	19,879,000
Military family housing.....	918,412,000
Homeowners' assistance.....	7,575,000
Reserve components.....	80,326,000

One construction program we are all interested in is the one in Vietnam. It is over 90 percent complete; the DOD cost-plus contractor effort is scheduled for termination by July 1, 1972, and no additional military construction authorization or appropriations are being requested for fiscal year 1972.

According to testimony presented before the Committee on Rules, a determined effort has been made over the past years to continuously reduce the amount of unfunded and unused construction authorization available to the military departments. On data furnished the Committee on Armed Services this year, the residual authorization estimated at the end of the coming fiscal year for all three services is again within acceptable limits.

This authorization contains two distinct parts:

First, the authority to provide and construct new facilities in the amount of \$1,207,150,000 to support the Active and Reserve Armed Forces, and the defense agencies; and

Second, the authority for military family housing and the homeowners' assistance in the amount of \$925,987,000.

All the construction authorized will occur at approximately 256 military installations throughout the world and includes approximately 550 separate projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that this important bill may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question before yielding to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH)?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts care to state the content of the special resolution that he previously referred to, and for which he obtained permission to file?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is House Resolution 538. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) filed the resolution asking that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be able to travel.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has explained House Resolution 555, and I concur in his statements and simply wish to state that the point of order is waived, because there is a transfer of funds in this one particular situation.

Normally, Mr. Speaker, in considering this important subject over the years, I have tried to explain the bill in some detail. I am going to refrain from doing that today because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) made splendid presentations before the Committee on Rules, and they will do the same before the Committee of the Whole today.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few minutes to extend some praise to some of the Members in the House, and some of the former Members.

I remember when Mr. Carl Vinson, of Georgia, was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I did not have the opportunity to become real close or personally associated with him, but he was a fine American, and he did a fine job as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Following Mr. Vinson, after his retirement, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the late Mendel Rivers, became chairman of the committee. He and I were very close friends in many ways. I think he was a great American.

He did an outstanding job as chairman of this committee. I pay tribute to him and I am sorry we lost him. Now we have the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) who has gone into this extremely important position under probably as difficult or more difficult circumstances than any other previous chairman. There is this tremendous and very bad situation in Southeast Asia. He has faced this and all of these problems in a commendable manner. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), all Members, and all the people want to get out of Southeast Asia as soon as we can. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the marvelous job he is doing as chairman of this distinguished committee.

On our side of the aisle, on my side, we had the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Bates, a really likable, able, and fine American who was the distinguished ranking minority member of this

committee. Now we have the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), our minority whip, who is the ranking minority member of this committee. How the gentleman takes all the responsibilities of his whip job and his leadership and his speaking commitments and everything else and as ranking member on this committee is something to behold so far as I am concerned. He is always pleasant and always takes a phone call and always answers your questions. I pay tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to praise all these Members and the members of the Committee on Armed Services for the job they do and, particularly, the staff of this fine committee. We have some excellent staffs on the committees throughout the Congress. Our staff on the Committee on Rules is just as good as any staff here. I do not know whether they are Republicans or Democrats, but any Member can call up and they can talk to any member of the staff any time and get an honest and sincere answer. The same is true with the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and all the rest of them. We pay the staffs reasonable money, pretty good money. I will take any one of the staffs of these committees and put them up against the staff of any corporation in the United States, and I believe that they will do a finer, more efficient, and a harder working job than the staff of the corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from California. Also, I would like to mention the fact that in a 1-minute address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, July 21, 1971, at page 26441, I included a copy of a resolution which was passed by the Massachusetts Legislature. It was a resolution memorializing the Secretary of the Navy to name a nuclear submarine in memory of Congressman William H. Bates.

We all loved Bill. He was one of the most able and valuable Members who have ever served in the House of Representatives. He was a friend of many of us. He was an outstanding Congressman.

I do not know what can be done to prevail on the Secretary of the Navy to name a nuclear submarine after our late colleague, but I echo also the same sentiments the Massachusetts Legislature had in passing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HÉBERT. 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. 9844) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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. 9844, with Mr. STEED 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 Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank my distinguished friend and colleague from California (Mr. SMITH), who is most generous in his commendation of my predecessors and myself, and also the glowing words he had to say in connection with my right-hand man on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

I think the Committee on Armed Services is being conducted under the same principles and the same philosophy it always has been. There are no party lines on the committee. It is a committee composed of Americans in the interest of the security and safety of their country.

Let me say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) that there will be a submarine named in honor of Bill Bates. The Secretary has already informed the committee that a new nuclear-powered submarine to be built will be named the *William H. Bates*.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting H.R. 9844, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1972.

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments, and is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1972.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense requested \$2,259,444,000 for new authorizations. Our committee recommended the approval of \$2,133,137,000. The Department request included \$919,220,000 for all family housing expenditures including 9,684 new family housing units. The request also included \$7,575,000 for the homeowners assistance program involved in base realignments.

Last year the Department requested \$2,069,094,000. The increase requested by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1972 authorizations over the amounts requested in fiscal years 1970 and 1971 was due primarily to additional emphasis on housing for both bachelor and married personnel as well as increases for Reserve Forces facilities and pollution abatement. In compliance with the national policy to improve environmental quality, the program to abate air and water pollution is being accelerated. This year's request included \$129.9 million to abate pollution at defense installations located in the

United States and possessions, and represented a 75-percent increase over the amount requested last year.

For Safeguard, \$172.5 million was included in the Army title of the authorization, exclusive of \$11.1 million for 215 units each of military family housing at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., which was contained in the Defense military family housing title. Within the \$172.5 million in the Army title, \$167.3 million was for major construction of tactical facilities and \$5.2 million for community assistance in helping to reduce local impact of Safeguard installations in North Dakota and Montana as authorized in section 610 of Public Law 91-511. The committee felt that in view of the unobligated balances in the community assistance account, that the \$5.2 million could be safely deferred until programs for the use of the funds could be firmed up. The Secretary of Defense has outlined the objectives of this year's authorization program for continued deployment of Safeguard. Briefly, these include completion of the presently authorized Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Malmstrom, Mont.; and White-man, Mo., sites, and site investigations and planning activities including long lead-time procurement pointed toward deployment for a fourth site at either Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., or in the Washington, D.C., area for protection of the national command authorities.

The Defense family housing new construction program for fiscal year 1972 requested 9,684 new units as opposed to 8,000 new units last year. Together with increases for improvements to existing public quarters, leasing, and maintenance and repair, Defense requested an increase from \$809,038,000 for family housing in fiscal year 1971 to \$919,220,000 in fiscal year 1972. The Secretary of Defense indicated his strong support for this program and we are convinced that a continuing program of building military housing is vital in our effort to improve the morale of our men in service. It is a key factor in retaining qualified personnel on a career basis and moving in the direction of an all-volunteer force. That is the reason that the theme of this year's program with our committee has been "peoples' projects."

Because this committee feels strongly that the inadequacy of military family housing is a primary factor in the loss of many of our most skilled and scarce military specialists, we have fought each year for a sustained program to provide decent homes for our military families. The replacement losses and retraining of these specialists are costly and critical factors in our military budget. The Department of Defense request mentioned above included a per unit average cost limitation increase for family housing which averaged approximately \$1,500 per unit. It was the opinion of our committee in view of the increase from \$19,000 per unit to \$23,000 per unit average cost allowed the Department of Defense over the last 2 years that another increase at this time was not justified. By disallowing this increase, the committee ac-

tually reduced the budget request by some \$15 million.

Instead of reducing the budget by this amount, the committee is recommending that the bulk of the funds saved by this action—\$15,295,000—be used to add an additional 665 housing units to the Department's request. Additionally, the committee authorized 250 units for MacDill Air Force Base which will be funded from prior years' savings. Accordingly, the committee reduced the family housing program by only \$808,000, largely as a result of holding the number of units in the domestic leasing program to 10,000. Thus, of the total reduction effected by the committee, virtually the entire amount was levied against the active forces portion of the program, which was reduced nearly 10 percent of the total request for such facilities.

I know that one of the items this committee would like to be informed of in some detail is the situation in South Vietnam as it relates to the military construction program. The construction program in South Vietnam is over 90 percent complete, and has progressed so well that the DOD contractor effort is now scheduled for termination by July 1, 1972. No additional military construction authorization or appropriations are being requested for fiscal year 1972 as COMUSMACV and the in-country component commanders have made vigorous efforts to cancel or defer lower priority projects in order to free up resources for application against more urgent requirements. The principal elements yet to be completed are construction of operating-training-logistics facilities for the Vietnam Armed Forces, and restoration of the few remaining essential portions of the highway network.

Under current plans, primary highway restoration should be substantially completed by midcalendar year 1972. A small portion of the program, assigned to Vietnamese troops and contractors, will remain for future completion.

In view of the relatively modest size of the fiscal year 1972 program, your Armed Services Committee faced an especially difficult task in effecting substantial reductions in this year's request. However, every member of your Armed Services Committee was determined that the final committee recommendation should be made on the basis of austerity, and reflect only those projects that the committee was fully convinced were essential to our military needs. Including the four military services and the Defense agencies, there were 620 separate projects requested at 270 individual bases and installations.

After hearings by the full committee, and review of each individual project requested by the Department, the committee was successful in effecting reductions of \$126,307,000 in the bill.

The committee bill which we now seek to bring before the House totals \$2,133,137,000 for new authorization. The total reductions effected by the committee represented some 6 percent of the amount requested, however, as mentioned

before, the active forces portion of the program was reduced about 10 percent. The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that these reductions will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the Armed Services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

Let me briefly discuss some of the major segments of this bill because I do not wish to bore you with all the details contained in our report.

Troop housing is one of the most important and vital requirements in the Defense construction program. We recognize the importance of this item in persuading personnel to stay in the military service as a career, and we believe implicitly that improved housing will provide both immediate and long-range benefits through increased reenlistments, heightened morale, and reduced recruitment costs. Again, peoples' projects.

Within the Army's request for troop housing and community facilities, the largest portion, \$48 million, is directed toward providing privacy in existing barracks. The request also includes the construction of 7,420 enlisted barracks spaces and support facilities at \$44 million, alteration of existing barracks at \$13 million, and 1,310 new bachelor officers' quarters for \$16.7 million. Additionally, the Army's request includes \$9.4 million for various community support facilities.

The Navy's programing for bachelor housing totals \$108.7 million and will provide new and modernized quarters for 26,307 bachelor enlisted men and 1,288 bachelor officers. Mess facilities total \$7.7 million and community support items total \$11.4 million. Included in this general category is \$1 million for modernization at the naval home in Philadelphia, Pa.

The Air Force program for this category provides \$39.5 million for troop housing facilities, and \$10.1 million for community facilities. The \$39.5 million will provide 4,980 airmen's dormitory spaces at a cost of \$21 million; alterations and improvements to existing dormitories, \$11.6 million; 424 bachelor officers' quarters, \$0.9 million.

Included in H.R. 9844 are authorizations amounting to approximately \$152.8 million for hospital and medical facilities of all types. These include hospital additions, dispensaries, dental clinics, and two new hospitals to replace the existing obsolescent facilities at Walter Reed General Hospital and Hill Air Force Base, Utah.

Here in the case of medical facilities, the committee found itself in almost complete agreement with the program that the Defense Department submitted. The committee still feels strongly that the pace of replacement for many of the outmoded World War II hospitals and similar medical facilities should be accelerated. Despite the enforced austerity inherent in this fiscal year, the committee is determined that the Defense Department should maintain a minimal but suitable emphasis on priority replacement of vital health facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few general observations concerning this bill. As I stated earlier, we deferred a considerable number of projects totaling \$126.3 million. We did this in spite of the fact that we were working with a relatively austere request, and many of the projects will have to be built in the future. But in view of the pressures on the economy and the need for the fiscal prudence, we deferred for the present those projects which we feel could safely be postponed without seriously impairing our national security. In doing this, I feel the committee fulfilled its responsibility to the American taxpayer.

I do not wish to belabor the point, but I feel that the full Armed Services Committee which has spent many hours on this bill, has refuted again the baseless charge that it blindly approves everything the generals and admirals ask for. I believe that I mentioned earlier that the total reductions effected by the committee comprise some 6 percent of the total request. Actually, that percentage is to some extent misleadingly low when you examine the character and distribution of the cuts imposed by the committee.

One other subject which I think I should bring to your attention is the addition of two new general provisions in title VII. These are a result of experience our committee has recently had regarding Camp Pendleton, Calif. In January 1970, the President established the Federal Property Review Board. This Board directed the Department of Defense to declare excess certain portions of the land now comprising the Marine Corps base at Camp Pendleton, Calif.

The Marine Corps objected, the Navy objected, the Office of the Secretary of Defense objected, but they were forced to forward to our committee a declaration of excess which included 6½ miles of beach frontage and approximately 3,400 acres inland. The inland acreage is now used as a buffer zone between the city of San Clemente and the firing ranges and training areas of Camp Pendleton. Also, there are located thereon water wells, sewage facilities, and helicopter pads. After extensive hearings, our Real Estate Subcommittee recommended that the proposal be disapproved.

Since the present law does not give the Congress any veto power over such transactions, the committee felt it was wise to put a provision in the bill before you—section 708—prohibiting the disposal of any portion of Camp Pendleton unless specifically authorized by law.

Further, during the hearings in connection with Camp Pendleton, the committee learned that less than 24 hours prior to the declaration of excess being sent to our committee, a lease had been executed to the State of California for 25 years at \$1 per year which covered 3½ miles of beach frontage at Camp Pendleton. This type of transaction does not have to be reported to the Congress under existing law. However, we have added a section amending the present law which provides that if the annual fair market rental value exceeds \$50,000, it

must be reported to the Congress regardless of the amount of the lease.

In summary, gentlemen, I feel that your Armed Services Committee has done an outstanding job with this bill and demonstrated conclusively its awareness of the need for fiscal economy and public responsibility. Therefore, I urge your unanimous support of this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am very much interested in the item which the gentleman has just explained to the House. However, I am not quite sure about it because I have not been able to read the bill as yet as to exactly what is involved. But, as I understand it, there will be about 6 or 6½ miles of beach that will be made available to the public; is that correct?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not deeply concerned as to whether it is leased or whether it is sold so long as it is made available. I would like to say that I do appreciate the making available by the committee of this land on any type of basis, whether it is lease or sale, because we are facing a situation in southern California of population density and population occupancy of the beaches, during the weekends particularly, where it is getting to the point of something like the situation which exists at Jones Beach up in New York.

They are lying on the public beaches as close together as they can lie because the population density is so great. And to open up this land farther south so the people who do want to get away from the great crowds around the metropolitan area of Los Angeles is, in my opinion, a great service to the people.

As I understand it, that Marine base has about 176,000 acres. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. HÉBERT. Approximately that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And about 17.5 miles of beach frontage; is that correct?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. These are approximate figures.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that the release of 6.5 miles of beach—and I do not know anything about the back land the gentleman has spoken of—is of great benefit to the people of California, and I want to express my thanks to the committee for going along with this matter. I do not know what the intricacies or the intriguing processes that may have obtained have been, but I would say that considering the number of men that are trained there, and I know that it is an important base, but 176,000 acres is a lot of land, and 17.5 miles of beach frontage is a lot of miles of beach frontage.

The amphibious landings and the numbers of boats used on that beach are not very great. I think that the people of the State who, after all, own the land, along with the people of the United States—and whether you get a dollar for the use of it or \$50,000 for the use of

the land, is taking the money from one pocket and putting it in another. The main thing is that the people of California and the visitors—and we have several million visitors every summer out there from other parts of the United States—will have an opportunity to use beaches that are not as crowded as they are around the metropolitan area of Los Angeles.

I am very grateful for the help of the Committee on Armed Services on this, and for the great leadership of the chairman of that committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman from California that the Committee on Armed Services has always seen the benefit of what the President had proposed, but it could not go along with giving away the land. Remember, we lived through the ill-fated McNamara giveaway programs, and we feel if we give away the military land today we may have to buy it back tomorrow, and sometimes at 1,000 or 2,000 times its price. While the sunbathing is very nice on the beach, and the swimming in the blue waters of the Pacific in the sunshine of California is very beneficial for the people, there are 3,400 acres of land which, if not controlled by the military, could well be used as a beautiful, beautiful housing development.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do not rise to advocate turning this land over to private people.

Mr. HÉBERT. I understand that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman knows that I have supported every military construction bill, and almost every other kind of military bill that has come to this floor in the 29 years I have been here, so I am not antimilitary, as the gentleman knows. I realize the importance of the defense of our Nation. But the density of our population is getting to the point where these large tracts of land, unless they are used, in my opinion, or made available in a more generous way than they have been in the past, that this would be wrong because the push of population itself is occurring.

And just as we have the multiple land use in the Department of Interior's land jurisdiction where people can use the land for recreation, and where it can also be used for forestry and grazing, and things like that, that we should have the multiple land use of these large tracts wherever possible—retaining, always, the right of the military to utilize these tracts if they are needed for proper procedures.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman can be very sure that the Committee on Armed Services will always cooperate in that direction and has the fullest praise for the President's suggestion and his cooperation after he was informed of the facts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, I might point out that in the sale of military lands, there is always a reversion clause, where if it is used for other purposes it reverts to the Government. The gentleman no doubt is going to speak on that matter and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS), the chairman of the sub-

committee takes care of that surplus property that is in the lease.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, as an associate of the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Activities, I have maintained a very long and detailed interest in all surplus land transactions. I have had occasion to take a look at this area that you are discussing. This land is just south, adjacent to the President's house or summer residence. That land is used by the Marine Corps now for amphibious training. To take this land by Executive order without adequate explanation to the Congress or anybody else is not the result of a Marine Corps decision or the Department of Defense. This land is needed by the Marine Corps for training. They utilize the beach. There are many facilities located on the land that the Marine Corps is using.

If we dissipate the real property to the military needs we are going to compromise the defense of this country. Under the theory followed by the President, if they wanted to take all of Camp Pendleton, they could do it. But I want to know where they are going to put the Marine Corps on the west coast?

If we are going to take any more property from the Marines they better not do it until we locate a different site for the Marines—assuming we want to maintain an effective military establishment in this country.

You cannot train thousands of men to use weapons systems on small tracts of land. It takes thousands of acres of land and we have that land and this is an asset that belongs to this country. It just happens to be located in California. At great cost we have developed over the years a fine base. Now they want to take it away.

I hope the committee will continue to look into this—we must not compromise the effectiveness of Marine Corps training operations in California or anywhere else, no matter what the reason may be.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with the gentleman from Texas more.

I assure you no committee with jurisdiction over certain elements of Government disposal other than the House Committee on Armed Service's Real Estate Subcommittee believes more in what you are saying—that you are protecting our interest.

My own opinion is that wrong information was fed into the computer.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the wrong information was fed into the computer and fed into the executive department.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I meant.

Mr. BROOKS. I feel that the President did not have the facts on what kind of profitable real estate venture might come of this. This canyon and frontage on the Pacific Ocean were it ever transferred to a big real estate promoter somebody would get rich out of it.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am convinced that the President had no idea that he received the wrong information out of the computer until the Committee on Armed Services put the correct information in and he received the proper answer. I just hope that somebody down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has learned a lesson that when the House Committee on Armed Services says no, it is spelled "n"—"o" and it means "no" and it does not mean "maybe." It means "no." If they wanted it to mean "yes," it would be "yes." But it is not "maybe."

Mr. Chairman, I have consumed enough time. I have tried to give you the highlights of the bill. I hope it will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I fear that through inadvertence, the House of Representatives may have made a grave error today which could cost the people of southern California the loss of some critically needed recreational lands.

I am referring to the question of the transfer of some 6 miles of prime beachfront and 3,400 upland acres of underutilized lands currently closed to the public as part of the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps base in California.

On July 14, President Nixon announced that he had decided to adhere to his original call for the transfer of these beautiful lands for recreational purposes to the people of California.

The Pendleton transfer was to be the first in a series of actions by the executive branch to transfer to the public a substantial number of parcels of property throughout the Nation.

The new concept would recognize the need to insure the best use of the public lands of the Nation so that the beauty of the mountains, the beaches, and the seas would be preserved for—and opened to—the public wherever possible.

The President had originally announced the transfer of the lands in the spring. Consistent with the statutory requirement, the proposal was submitted to the Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate for their information. Recommendations were made by the House committee. But on the 14th of July, it was announced by the Western White House that the President would follow his original proposal and release all of the lands. The only question which remained was whether the lands would be leased or disposed of by outright transfer. The State of California preferred outright transfer due to the enormous investment required to furnish basic access and facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the people of southern California will be stunned when they hear that the House of Representatives has accepted—perhaps unwittingly—a provision which will attempt once again to bar the transfer of these critically needed lands.

In the military construction authorization bill an amendment was quietly inserted in committee to bar any form of the transaction. Section 708—on page 48 of this 50-page bill, H.R. 9844, the amendment reads as follows:

Sec. 708. Notwithstanding any other pro-

vision of law, none of the lands constituting Camp Pendleton, California, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

Unfortunately, I, like most of my colleagues, was unaware that this provision had been inserted in the bill. The report on the bill, dated July 19, was not available to Members of the House of Representatives until the morning of July 20.

Thus, consideration of the bill today would appear to be a violation of the Legislative Reorganization Act which requires:

No general appropriation bill shall be considered in the House until printed committee hearings and a committee report thereon have been available for the Members of the House for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays).

Particularly unfortunate is the fact that the bill which the House passed today bars not only the outright transfer of these lands to the State of California; the language in the bill would appear to bar any lease arrangement or any other arrangement which would make these lands available to the public.

Mr. Chairman, if this provision becomes law, the Congress will have acted in grave disregard of the public interest. The lands sought by the President and by the State represent a mere 3 percent of the lands under marine control at Camp Pendleton.

Three and one-half miles of beach have already been leased to the State; these lands would not be affected. But passage of this provision will close to the public an area of beach used as an exclusive enlisted men's club and not for any military purpose. It would freeze the entire 3,400-acre upland tract in the hands of the marines and bar turning that beautiful land over to the public for use as urgently needed picnic and campgrounds. The upland acreage is not currently used for military purposes; some of it is leased to private ranchers to grow strawberries.

The Pendleton lands had been thoroughly studied and surveyed by the General Services Administration, the Property Review Board, and the Marine Corps, and Department of Defense. It was agreed that of the 18 miles of choice coastal beachland and 126,000 acres of mountains, lakes, and canyons which comprise the enormous area of Camp Pendleton, a small portion—3 percent—of this could be opened for the use of the people living in the burgeoning areas of southern California.

It is, of course, essential that the entire area be protected from private development and be maintained in as wild and natural a state as possible. The intention is not to create a crowded "asphalt playground" but to make accessible to the public a gigantic nature park. The California State parks director, Mr. William Penn Mott, Jr., has assured us that the State is determined "to preserve both the beach and the upland camping complex in as wild a state as possible."

We must not allow this bold new program to be crippled in its very first step by an arbitrary recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee; we must permit the transfer of these beautiful lands for recreational purposes for the people of California. The Pendleton transfer is, in the President's words, merely the first step in a series of transfers "in all sections of the country, in the East, the North, the South, whereby we will declare excess property that presently is being used by the Federal Government, or some agency of the Federal Government, but in a way that we have determined is not the best use."

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the enthusiastic endorsement of the President's proposal by the people of my district and the rest of southern California for this incomparable beachland and campground area. The people in this area overwhelmingly support the President's program for preserving and making available these lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third major bill that the Armed Services Committee has presented to the House this year. Earlier we presented the draft bill and the weapons procurement authorization bill.

H.R. 9844 provides the authorization for construction at our military installations, both in the United States and overseas. The legislation we bring before you today provides \$2,133,137,000 in construction authorization for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us recognizes twin goals: It provides construction which our committee believes to be absolutely necessary if our Armed Forces are going to retain their capabilities; and, at the same time, it recognizes the President's call for economy and for reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible—calls that are heard frequently in this Chamber as well as elsewhere in our society.

I would like to express my full support of H.R. 9844. It is my belief that our Committee on Armed Services, under the strong and able leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana, has produced a bill that provides a good balance of facilities for each of the military services. In his usual competent fashion our chairman has explained the bill in great detail.

I will not take the time of the House to go into the measure extensively, because I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what our chairman has already said. However, I do want to take the time to comment generally and commend the members of the Armed Services Committee who worked so long and hard going over each item in this bill, project by project.

The committee this year was faced with the same problem that faced the Secretary of Defense and the services in initially developing this program. The services and the committee recognize that many valid requirements must await

authorization in a future year. As the chairman reported to you, this bill represents a reduction of \$126 million below the level of authorization requested in the President's budget.

The reductions the committee made in the bill were not based upon a judgment that the items were not desirable or important. In many cases we were convinced that the items being deferred now will eventually be authorized. We proceeded on the premise that we would defer projects wherever we could because of the pressing demands on our Federal budget, and because of the extraordinary effort that the Government must make in the coming year if the inflationary trends are to be controlled.

There is \$167.3 million included in this bill for construction in support of the Safeguard ABM system. The Safeguard construction in this bill is merely that which is required to support the deployment that the House has already extensively debated and approved. As the chairman pointed out earlier, the authorization for Safeguard includes completion of the presently authorized Grand Forks, N. Dak., Malmstrom, Mont., and Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., sites and site investigation and planning activities, including long lead-time procurement, pointing toward development of a fourth site at either Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., or in the Washington, D.C., area for protection of the national command authorities.

Our committee was certainly pleased that no request for authorization was presented for any further construction in Southeast Asia. Testimony before the committee revealed that our construction effort is over 90 percent complete, and the contractor combine has been notified that their efforts will be no longer needed after July 1, 1972. Bear in mind that the only construction requirement remaining is for the improvement of the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces, which is crucial to our Vietnamization program and further withdrawal of the remaining American boys from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I gave my full support to the recommendation of our committee chairman that the committee reject the Defense Department's request for another increase in the average unit cost limitation for family housing. This recommendation by our chairman resulted in the reduction of approximately \$15,300,000 from the President's budget for family housing construction. However, rather than take credit for saving that amount of money, the chairman recommended, and the committee agreed, that we add 665 housing units to the Department's recommended 9,684. We are all acutely aware of the need for more and better housing facilities for our gallant men in uniform. The committee unanimously supported the chairman in this, and I commend him for his action.

The Air Force testified they would be able to construct an additional 250 units of family housing at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla., using savings from prior-year projects, therefore, not increasing the budget one penny. This makes a total of

10,599 units of family housing that the services will be able to place under contract for the same amount of money they requested for 9,684 units. I urge your support of this committee recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like also to comment on the Marine Corps program for which \$46,752,000 is requested in the fiscal year 1972 authorization request. Of this amount, \$35,235,000 is for the provision of better living quarters for the bachelor marines. The requirement for adequate living quarters is of great importance at this time, when we have a withdrawal of our marines from a combat environment to a position of maintaining combat readiness in a garrison-type situation. Our committee's emphasis on "peoples' projects" is certainly carried out in the Marine Corps program, and I believe it will be of great value in retaining our highly trained veterans. To accomplish the administration's goal of an all-volunteer service requires that these dedicated men be provided living accommodations that will convince them that their country is interested in their well-being.

I congratulate the Marine Corps for devoting so much of their program attempting to get better living quarters.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will support this bill on which our Armed Services Committee has done a great deal of work. We trimmed the very little fat there was to be found in the Department's proposals without getting into the muscle. It may be, with the austere budget that was presented to us, we trimmed too much. However, the committee unanimously voted to report this bill to the House and I urge you to support it.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I noted with a great deal of interest that only a short time ago, there were allegedly 219 Members on the floor dealing with a resolution that called for the expenditure of \$50,000. I sit here and note—and I say it with great interest and regret—the fact that there are all of 25 or 30 Members here now to consider a bill authorizing the expenditure of more than \$2 billion.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois has any suggestion as to whether there ought to be more Members here to take part in the \$2-billion authorization. I do not know whether the gentleman wants to comment on this situation. If not, we will let it rest there, but I did want to call attention to the situation as it now exists.

Mr. ARENDS. I think I know exactly what the gentleman is talking about, and I feel he has a point. As you know, however, these are strange times and this House on occasion is a strange place.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman who just preceded me in the well has indicated, these are indeed

strange days where we have a rather strange misallocation of priorities, and I do not mean to criticize this entire bill. I think this is a good bill. I commend the chairman of the committee for bringing the bill to the floor in this rather unfettered form. It is a clean bill providing for military construction inside and outside the United States. I think the amounts we are authorizing here today are certainly reasonable.

However, I think we have to recognize that there are certain things we are not doing in this bill. I would call attention particularly to the rather disastrous situation in naval shipbuilding. A little bit later I plan to call attention to the expenditures being made for the anti-ballistic-missile system. I do not intend to offer any ABM amendments today, because I think we had a vote on that particular issue a very short time ago, but we are spending \$160 million approximately for the anti-ballistic-missile system. We should be spending this year \$160 million to modernize our naval shipyards instead so we can have a first-class Navy.

A few weeks ago I addressed a letter to Secretary Laird, in which I said:

Originally, the Yards were to be modernized on a 5 year basis. The Department of Defense then revised this program to a 10 year modernization program. \$89.3 million was programmed for expenditure the first year of the revised program, as opposed to \$71.6 million actually appropriated—about 80% funding—

For the funding for the first year. For last year, for 1971, we were supposed to have \$144.4 million to accomplish this modernization in 10 years. In fact there was actually included \$50.6 million, or a modernization program 35 percent of the target.

I said:

For the next '72 fiscal year many of us in the Congress were rather amazed to hear you say on the one hand that you want to exceed the Soviet Union in Naval strength and yet you are recommending appropriations of but \$13.7 million of the revised 3rd year increment of \$161.1 million modernization program, a funding of but 8½%.

I also said:

I wish to advise you that at the current funding level the modernization targets of the Secretary of Defense re-established three years ago will require not 10 years but 100 years to accomplish.

And I said to the Secretary:

As you know, the 10 year *Ship Modernization Program* provided Chairman Rivers by Secretary Nitze in 1966 has turned out to be about 60% myth and 40% actuality. It appears this year that the Shipyard Modernization Program is 92% myth.

Frankly, if you don't know where you are going at the top, how do you expect the sailors and civil servants at the bottom to configure themselves into an efficient work force? Your guidance and leadership is critically required in the interest of the Department of the Navy and national defense.

I was not too surprised to get in my office this morning the reply not from the Secretary but from Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Glenn V. Gibson, wherein he confirms my facts, and he concludes with this analysis of the situ-

ation, which is the total explanation by the Nixon administration:

Please be assured that we share your concern that our naval shipyards are in need of modernization. It is our objective to allocate maximum funding to this purpose consistent with other needs of the Services. In all candor, however, we must state that because of the many competing demands on available appropriations, we see little possibility that, in the foreseeable future, funds provided for shipyard modernization will approach the dollar amounts set forth in the 10-year planning program.

In a word, the Nixon administration is confirming a new revised 100-year shipyard modernization program to keep the American fleet somewhere in the world's top 10 or 20 navies.

I want to congratulate the administration on its foresight and planning, and certainly will await its next revision upward.

I believe that the administration, by being as penurious as it is with the dollar, and lacking foresight as it has, is doing nothing more than exerting a calculated effort to destroy the U.S. naval shipbuilding capability.

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the callous indifference of the Department of Defense to the needs of the Navy amounts to confusion and indecision at the top of our Department of Defense that is bound to reverberate in every ship and repair and construction facility of the U.S. Navy.

The full text of the two letters with accompanying tables follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1971.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: This responds to your letter of 30 June 1971 addressed to Secretary Laird with respect to the Shipyard Modernization Program.

This program was approved in November 1968 and, as you know, was to have been funded in specified annual increments over the 10-year period, FY 70 through FY 79. However, in FY 70 and FY 71, and again in FY 72, higher priority needs for available funds resulted in the necessity to reduce the amounts originally planned for shipyard modernization in these years.

A secondary factor, which already has exerted a constraining influence on the Navy's shore establishment and will continue to do so, is the substantial reduction taking place in the number of ships in the Active Fleet. This is causing a redetermination of the types of facilities which should be acquired and the time schedule for these acquisitions.

Please be assured that we share your concern that our naval shipyards are in need of modernization. It is our objective to allocate maximum funding to this purpose consistent with other needs of the Services. In all candor, however, we must state that because of the many competing demands on available appropriations, we see little possibility that, in the foreseeable future, funds provided for shipyard modernization will approach the dollar amounts set forth in the 10-year planning program.

Sincerely,

GLENN V. GIBSON,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 30, 1971.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you recall, some years ago in 1964 Secretary McNamara emasculated Naval Shipyards under the promise that the survivors would be modernized in a 5 year program. The study was entitled "Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity."

Unfortunately, the targets that had been planned have been ignored by subsequent Administrations of the Department of Defense.

I enclose for your review Table A setting forth the revised 10 year proposed Shipyard Modernization Program for our 8 continental Naval Shipyards and the 9th Shipyard at Pearl Harbor as presented to my House Armed Services Committee by the Navy.

Originally, the Yards were to be modernized on a 5 year basis. The Department of

Defense then revised this program to a 10 year modernization program. \$89.3 million was programmed for expenditure the first year of the revised program, as opposed to \$71.6 million actually appropriated—about 80% funding.

For the current fiscal year, the second year of the revised 10 year modernization program, originally there was programmed \$144.4 million; actually requested and appropriated was \$50.6 million, or approximately 35% of the 10 year target goal.

For the next '72 fiscal year many of us in the Congress were rather amazed to hear you say on the one hand that you want to exceed the Soviet Union in Naval strength and yet you are recommending appropriations of but \$13.7 million of the revised 3rd year increment of \$161.1 million modernization program, a funding of but 8½%.

I wish to advise you that at the current funding level the modernization targets of the Secretary of Defense re-established three

years ago will require not 10 years but 100 years to accomplish.

Tables B and C to support the figures are attached hereto and were provided to my House Armed Services Committee through the Navy Department, all on a non-classified basis.

As you know, the 10 year Ship Modernization Program provided Chairman Rivers by Secretary Nitze in 1966 has turned out to be about 60% myth and 40% actuality. It appears this year that the Shipyard Modernization Program is 92% myth.

Frankly, if you don't know where you are going at the top, how do you expect the sailors and civil servants at the bottom to configure themselves into an efficient work force? Your guidance and leadership is critically required in the interest of the Department of the Navy and national defense.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

TABLE A.—ORIGINAL 10-YEAR PLAN FOR MODERNIZATION OF ALL NAVAL SHIPYARDS, EXCEPT PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Fiscal year—										Total
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	
Boston:											
MCON.....	7.7	25.2	34.5	12.6	21.6	20.3	24.5	24.9	10.1	4.0	175.4
OPN.....	1.4	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.3	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.0	14.7
OMN.....	.5	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.0	.6	.5	.3	.4	8.2
Total.....	9.6	28.2	37.5	15.8	24.0	23.2	16.6	26.6	11.4	5.4	198.3
Philadelphia:											
MCON.....	10.9	6.5	17.6	11.9	16.7	1.7	4.0	1.2	8.5	5.2	84.2
OPN.....	2.1	3.8	3.5	2.2	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.0	1.0	21.1
OMN.....	.5	1.5	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.0	.8	.3	11.8
Total.....	13.5	11.8	23.0	15.8	20.1	5.0	7.1	4.0	10.3	6.5	117.1
Norfolk:											
MCON.....	2.3	24.3	12.7	12.2	8.6	1.5	4.6	4.2	8.8	1.4	80.6
OPN.....	1.9	3.6	2.5	1.9	3.5	2.1	1.4	2.5	1.4	1.2	22.0
OMN.....	.7	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.0	.7	.3	.3	9.7
Total.....	4.9	29.1	16.6	15.5	13.5	4.9	7.0	7.4	10.5	2.9	112.3
Charleston:											
MCON.....	.5	8.8	4.5	8.7	6.5	1.3	1.4	2.6	2.3	13.0	49.6
OPN.....	2.7	3.6	2.5	3.5	1.9	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	3.7	23.7
OMN.....	.7	.9	1.1	.9	.7	.9	.5	.4	.3	.2	6.6
Total.....	3.9	13.3	8.1	13.1	9.1	4.0	3.3	4.3	3.9	16.9	79.9
Long Beach:											
MCON.....	8.3	7.6	10.0	7.9	6.1	20.3	20.9	10.6	4.6	3.2	99.5
OPN.....	.9	7.3	6.4	4.4	1.9	.6	.4	.4	1.9	.3	24.5
OMN.....	.7	1.8	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.3	.8	.6	.4	.2	10.3
Total.....	9.9	16.7	18.2	13.8	9.2	22.2	22.1	11.6	6.9	3.7	134.3
Hunters Point:											
MCON.....	8.7	5.0	16.4	4.7	9.0	9.5	6.2	2.9	1.1	4.4	67.9
OPN.....	3.3	3.9	2.8	2.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	19.6
OMN.....	.5	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1	.9	.5	.4	10.1
Total.....	12.5	10.4	20.8	8.3	11.2	11.9	8.6	5.1	2.8	6.0	97.6
Mare Island:											
MCON.....	5.1	7.9	8.7	16.0	8.7	1.5	14.7	11.8	8.3	10.9	93.6
OPN.....	4.2	3.7	2.4	1.4	2.0	3.3	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1	25.5
OMN.....	.6	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.1	1.4	1.1	.8	.6	.6	14.3
Total.....	9.9	14.0	13.4	19.8	12.8	6.2	17.8	14.8	11.1	13.6	133.4
Puget Sound:											
MCON.....	7.5	6.8	8.0	11.9	6.3	1.2	8.2	3.6	3.6	1.3	58.4
OPN.....	2.7	3.1	3.0	1.3	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.0	19.5
OMN.....	.5	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.1	.8	.7	.5	.4	10.0
Total.....	10.7	11.5	12.5	14.6	9.7	3.8	10.4	5.7	5.3	3.7	87.9
Pearl Harbor:											
MCON.....	8.4	4.3	8.1	16.7	8.6	1.5	5.1	1.9	2.1	3.5	60.2
OPN.....	5.4	3.2	1.2	5.4	1.5	1.0	1.0	.9	.9	.9	21.4
OMN.....	.6	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.2	.9	.7	.5	.2	11.1
Total.....	14.4	9.4	11.0	23.8	11.8	3.7	7.0	3.5	3.5	4.6	92.7
Total all yards:											
MCON.....	59.4	96.4	120.5	102.6	92.1	58.8	79.6	63.7	49.4	46.9	769.4
OPN.....	24.6	34.2	26.0	24.1	16.8	15.5	12.3	13.0	12.1	13.4	192.0
OMN.....	5.3	13.8	14.6	13.8	12.5	10.6	8.0	6.3	4.2	3.0	92.1
Grand total.....	89.3	144.4	161.1	140.5	121.4	84.9	99.9	83.0	65.7	63.3	1,053.5

TABLE B.—HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE, JUNE 10, 1971

[Page 234, following line 11]

SHIPYARD MODERNIZATION AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION DOLLARS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Shipyard and appropriation	Fiscal year—		Shipyard and appropriation	Fiscal year—	
	1970	1971		1970	1971
Boston	MCON	\$7,682,000	0	MCON	\$6,889,000
	OPN	1,294,000	\$1,507,000	OPN	2,991,000
	O. & M.N.	62,000	70,000	O. & M.N.	71,000
Total		9,038,000	1,577,000	Total	9,951,000
Philadelphia	MCON	10,828,000	0	MCON	3,477,000
	OPN	2,013,000	1,783,000	OPN	2,942,000
	O. & M.N.	169,000	87,000	O. & M.N.	87,000
Total		13,001,000	1,870,000	Total	6,506,000
Norfolk	MCON	2,319,000	3,980,000	MCON	7,467,000
	OPN	2,025,000	2,723,000	OPN	2,483,000
	O. & M.N.	65,000	147,000	O. & M.N.	305,000
Total		4,049,000	6,850,000	Total	10,255,000
Charleston	MCON	5,932,000	6,884,000	MCON	3,557,000
	OPN	2,597,000	3,240,000	OPN	2,230,000
	O. & M.N.	304,000	207,000	O. & M.N.	156,000
Total		8,833,000	10,331,000	Total	5,943,000
Long Beach	MCON	1,793,000	8,073,000	MCON	3,557,000
	OPN	1,725,000	1,489,000	OPN	2,230,000
	O. & M.N.	185,000	70,000	O. & M.N.	156,000
Total		3,703,000	9,632,000	Total	5,943,000
				Grand total	71,648,000
					50,686,000

TABLE C.—FISCAL YEAR 1972 SHIPYARD MODERNIZATION DOLLARS REQUESTED BY THE INDICATED REVIEW LEVELS

Activity	NAVSHIPS	CNM	SECNAV	OSD	Activity	NAVSHIPS	CNM	SECNAV	OSD
NSY Boston	0	0	0	0	NSY Mare Island	\$4,019,000	\$4,019,000	\$2,474,000	\$394,000
NSY Philadelphia	\$3,290,000	\$2,390,000	0	0	NSY Puget Sound	5,597,000	3,403,000	2,677,000	2,677,000
NSY Norfolk	3,022,000	3,022,000	0	\$1,880,000	NSY Pearl Harbor	2,049,000	2,049,000	0	1,384,000
NSY Charleston	7,685,000	7,013,000	\$7,195,000	7,372,000					
NSY Long Beach	9,435,000	5,585,000	5,585,000	0					
NSY Hunters Point	4,760,000	3,983,000	0	0					
						39,857,000	31,464,000	17,931,000	13,767,000

Note: The above dollars are military construction only.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure.

It is very gratifying to see the emphasis placed in this bill on "people projects." The Air Force has devoted \$80 million or almost one-third of their request to such things as bachelor housing, morale, welfare, and recreational facilities, and pollution abatement. This high regard for people shown by the Air Force is very commendable. We know that there are many, many things which the Air Force has to build for the direct operation and maintenance of its planes and missile systems, for training and for research. They have shown here that they recognize the importance of their people and consider them to be their most valuable asset. The Air Force is trying to improve the morale of their people and retain them in the service. These projects are needed if we are to achieve our objective of a "zero draft." I fully support the need for "people projects."

I would like to say a few words about these projects. First, consider bachelor housing. The Air Force's request for \$40.4 million for bachelor housing will replace old World War II barracks and modernize such existing buildings as can be done economically. The Air Force is trying to make their bachelor housing more attractive, more spacious and with more privacy. The men and women in our

Armed Forces certainly deserve a decent place to live. This bill is a step in the right direction. There is still a long way to go on this, and I am confident that the Congress will do its part.

Next, we have morale, welfare and recreational facilities. The Air Force request for these is \$15.8 million and includes religious facilities, clubs, gymnasiums, libraries, and a post office. The need for better facilities of this kind is very real. The Air Force has a big complex job to do and its people work hard. Congress has long ago agreed these facilities are important necessities and not luxuries. Our service people require places where they can relax from their strenuous work and feel that they are part of a community. The Air Force has too many old, dilapidated buildings which they use for their religious, recreational, and physical activities and they should be replaced. Each year the Air Force tries to build some of these important projects, and this bill furthers the program.

Last, but not least, we include pollution abatement projects. There is really no need to talk about their importance. These projects are in direct support of people. There is no question about the need to clean up our environment. The Air Force has requested \$24 million for air and water pollution abatement projects at their bases. These include sewage plants, incinerators, and projects for converting heating plants from coal to oil and gas. These projects will not only

benefit the Air Force, but all the people in the country.

May I conclude by saying that there are no projects more important in this bill than the "people projects," and I urge their approval. Also I commend our chairman for his determined and objective leadership.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note the language of the committee report which deletes an earlier authorization of \$2,210,000 for the establishment of administrative facilities at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in behalf of the 5th Army.

Mr. Chairman, the 5th Army Headquarters, which was located at Fort Sheridan from 1968 until 1971, served as the command post for 5th Army needs throughout the 13-State areas of the Midwest prior to the transfer of the 5th Army Headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. Chairman, at the time of the announcement of the headquarters removal, I requested information from the Department of Defense as to other military activities performed in the Chicago area with a view to utilizing to a maximum extent possible the structures and other facilities at Fort Sheridan.

Mr. Chairman, it seems well to recall that Fort Sheridan was established as an Army post in 1889. At that time, a

group of public-spirited citizens, operating through the Commercial Club of Chicago, donated the major portion of the property at Fort Sheridan. In accepting the land, the joint resolution of the House and Senate recited specifically that the land was to be used for military purposes. Since that time—March 13, 1887—Fort Sheridan has served continuously as a military post and has indeed constituted the Army presence in the great metropolitan area of northeastern Illinois and northwestern Indiana. Significantly, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the successor to the same organization whose members made the original donation of the land for Fort Sheridan in 1887, is today actively supporting a retention of the full facilities at Fort Sheridan for military purposes.

At various times throughout her history, Fort Sheridan has served as a recruiting, training, and separation center. Its important missions to Active and Reserve Forces, as well as to veterans and to the civilian community, are legion. In sum, Fort Sheridan is both a beautiful and a highly serviceable military post and has continued as such throughout a period of more than 80 years.

When the 5th Army Headquarters was transferred to Fort Sheridan in 1968, this appeared to be a most logical move. The entire headquarters facility was moved from the south side of Chicago to Fort Sheridan where it remained until the consolidation of parts of the 5th Army Command with the 4th Army Headquarters at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. Chairman, the transfer of elements of the 5th Army Headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, Tex., did not result in the abandonment of Fort Sheridan. Representations that this became a deserted base are without foundation. I should add that the best estimates which I have been able to receive indicate that before the 5th Army Headquarters was located at Fort Sheridan, the total military, civilian, and dependent population at Fort Sheridan was 3,500. The most recent count as of July 17, 1971, was 3,183.

Mr. Chairman, at the time of the announcement of the transfer of 5th Army activities to Fort Sam Houston, Tex., I requested that a study be made of the feasibility of transferring to Fort Sheridan various other Army activities performed at other locations in the general Chicago area. Such a study has now been completed and is awaiting final approval by the Secretary of the Army.

While this study has not been made available to me, it is my understanding that it contemplates the full utilization of the permanent facilities at Fort Sheridan as well as the utilization of 90 percent of the temporary facilities. In addition, I am informed that some 500 students per year will be accommodated at Fort Sheridan where classes of instruction will be provided. A total of some 2,000 military and civilian personnel will utilize these Army facilities. These career men and women, coupled with personnel from nonappropriated funds plus

the dependents of other military personnel will bring the total population at Fort Sheridan to approximately 5,000. This is greater than the population at Fort Sheridan during the time that the 5th Army Headquarters was located there. In addition, the facilities at Fort Sheridan will continue to be available for Reserve officers and men who may be able to fulfill their Reserve requirements at this post. However, Mr. Chairman, let me add that while the civilian and military personnel are not too numerous, Fort Sheridan has not been a military post which has boasted of its numbers, but rather of the quality of its personnel—and the importance of the missions which it performs.

Mr. Chairman, let us look for a moment at the significant missions now performed at Fort Sheridan.

First. The command of the Army Reserve units in a seven-State area is located at Fort Sheridan. This mission is headed by a major general with service to some 135 Reserve units throughout the area of the Midwest. It has never been contemplated that this function could be transferred to such a remote point as Fort Sam Houston, Tex., or elsewhere in the Nation. I for one want this command to remain where it is—where the officers and men and women who perform this mission reside—namely, Fort Sheridan, Ill.

Second. A maintenance command unit charged with the servicing of military equipment in the Midwest is located at Fort Sheridan. The highly skilled personnel which make up this mission provide maintenance for the electronic gear of our sophisticated weapons systems, as well as the repair and maintenance of jeeps, howitzers, and materiel of the important Air Defense Command.

Third. In addition to providing medical and dental care for those within the immediate area of Fort Sheridan, the entire medical and dental care services of the U.S. Army within a seven-State area is administered at Fort Sheridan.

Fourth. The 51st Ordnance Detachment—that highly skilled unit which performs services in detecting explosives and defusing of bombs—is located at Fort Sheridan. While it would seem unthinkable that this mission should be discontinued or transferred to a place far distant from the Midwest, it is, on the contrary, most logical to continue this activity at Fort Sheridan. This unit is also trained to respond to chemical, nuclear, biological, and conventional attacks and works closely with the civilian authorities as a protection to the civilian population.

Fifth. The veterinary food inspection service for Fort Sheridan and numerous other Army posts is commanded out of Fort Sheridan.

Sixth. The 113th Military Intelligence Group with its important missions is commanded from Fort Sheridan.

Seventh. Other missions now performed at Fort Sheridan include a 5th Army maintenance and assistance team, a medical procurement office, a security force, a flight detachment service, and various other activities which contribute

to the effectiveness of Active and Reserve Army units within a wide area of the Midwest and which constitute an invaluable and irreplaceable segment of our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for deleting funds previously authorized which would anticipate the transfer of further administrative duties from the Midwest to Texas—particularly the activities which I have outlined and which can best be performed from a centrally located and fully equipped military post at Fort Sheridan. Let me call attention to the unique location of Fort Sheridan, its proximity to air and rail transportation, its ready access to the entire Chicago metropolitan area. Let me also call attention to the sophisticated communications system installed at great cost to accommodate the 5th Army Headquarters Command and which continues to be available to the post commanders and other personnel at Fort Sheridan.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to give final consideration to the measure extending a selective service law and to phase out the draft and to substitute a completely volunteer military service. One of the principal ingredients of a successful volunteer military force is the attractiveness of military posts and the availability of recreational and other supporting services which will attract and retain men and women in our military forces. To consider the diminution or elimination of Fort Sheridan at this time would be quite inconsistent with our efforts to develop a volunteer military force.

Mr. Chairman, expressions from the city governments of Highland Park, Lake Forest, and from officials of the city of Chicago, as well as many others, should constitute convincing evidence that Fort Sheridan is a vital adjunct to the Chicago area and to the Midwest. The Army can continue to perform its present missions—and additional essential missions at Fort Sheridan. I interpret the language at page 17 of the committee report to be consistent with the views I am expressing here today—views which are borne out by the exchange between the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) and Maj. Gen. E. P. Yates at page 5255 of the committee hearings.

Mr. Chairman, in the passage of this bill today, the importance of Fort Sheridan to the Midwest and to our national security is made eminently clear.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman knows the committee opposed the move of 5th Army Headquarters from Fort Sheridan.

Mr. McCLORY. I appreciate the position of the committee and the language in the committee report deleting funds from a prior authorization, in order to indicate the intent of the House to retain Fort Sheridan.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want the gentleman to know again, as far as the committee is concerned, that it opposed the move

of the headquarters from Fort Sheridan. Mr. McCLODY. I appreciate that very much.

I would just like to add this point on another subject to which the chairman referred earlier. The chairman commented with regard to the beach portion of several other military bases. I want to say I see no reason why the beach portion or portions of the beach at Fort Sheridan might not be made available to the public, providing that they do not interfere with the military operations there and that such public use is consistent with the primary military missions which are performed there.

I might say, too, that I know there is an active study going on at the present time to transfer other military activities to Fort Sheridan to make full and efficient utilization of all of the permanent facilities, and almost all of the temporary facilities at Fort Sheridan.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I am sympathetic with the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois in trying to resolve this matter. Personally I felt that the Army was wrong in removing the command operations from the whole central part of the country and leaving that vast area without a major command post of the Army. I thought it was an unwise move. However, I am hopeful, as the gentleman is, that Fort Sheridan will continue to be utilized in an effective way and that they can make good use of the full potential available again and return this post to the central part of the country in the event that such an objective would be found desirable.

I am very sympathetic with the gentleman. I know the committee seriously considered this. At one time we thought about legislating on the command situation of the Army so that no great parts of the country would be left without a major command post of the Army.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman and commend him on his initiative as well as the interest and support of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDT), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), and the other members of the committee all of whom seem to be in support of the retention of Fort Sheridan as an important Army post consistent with the historic mission it has served for more than 80 years.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and want to point out another aspect of it which I think will be of particular interest to the Members of the House and to the committee. That is the fact that this bill contains very substantial funds for dealing with the problems of water pollution and air pollution.

Mr. Chairman, we have had charges made over the past few years that although the Congress was paying great attention to the cleaning up of water pollution and air pollution, the Federal Gov-

ernment was, in fact, neglecting its own house and that in many communities the major polluters were Federal installations, and not a few of those were military installations.

So, I think that it will be of considerable interest to the members of the committee to realize that this bill contains \$129.9 million to deal with air and water pollution control at some 173 defense installations, both in the United States and overseas.

Of this total amount, \$61.9 million is for the abatement of water pollution at 81 installations, and \$68 million is for the abatement of air pollution at 92 installations.

The water pollution control projects are essentially additions to existing facilities in order to provide for advanced treatment of sewage and waterborne industrial wastes in order to comply with the updated Federal, State, and municipal water quality standards.

Mr. Chairman, I think this points up the fact that the Department of Defense has responded, with our prodding, rather rapidly and remarkably well in dealing with this problem.

We are pleased with the progress that the Department of Defense is making in air and water pollution abatement and feel that the services are truly taking the lead in this Nation's concerted effort to protect and enhance our environment. This year's program again indicates an acceleration of this effort and represents a significant increase over the authorization requested for this purpose last year. The greater emphasis evidenced by this program is in consonance with the national policy declared by the National Environmental Policy Act. This is also in accord with Executive Order 11507, dated February 4, 1970, which requires that necessary actions to abate pollution by Federal agencies be completed or underway by December 31, 1972.

For too long this Nation has regarded its atmosphere and water resources as limitless, free resources. The limits are now in sight and we must move to preserve what is left not only for ourselves but for those who will follow. This committee has been providing authorization for pollution on an accelerated basis at defense installations since fiscal year 1968. From fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1971 these authorizations amounted to approximately \$177 million. This year's program includes \$129.9 million for air and water pollution control at 173 defense installations both in the United States and overseas. Of this total amount, \$61.9 million is for the abatement of water pollution at 81 installations and \$68 million is for the abatement of air pollution at 92 installations. The water pollution control projects are essentially additions to existing facilities to provide for advanced treatment of sewage and waterborne industrial wastes to comply with updated Federal, State, and municipal water quality standards. The air pollution control projects are principally fuel conversions for heating plants to also comply with updated Federal, State, and municipal air quality standards regarding sulfur and fly ash. Other air pollution control projects re-

late to processing industrial exhausts and the construction of incinerators. All of these projects have been coordinated with the Environmental Protection Agency. Full advantage will be taken of the research and development efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense, and industry.

An innovation in this year's program will provide improved visibility and assist in the management and execution of the program. All water pollution control projects have been included in one line item and similarly all air pollution control projects have been included in one line item.

We fully endorse the efforts of the Defense Department in identifying and programming these pollution abatement projects and the full amount requested for authorization is approved. We will expect that the fiscal year 1973 program to be presented by the Department of Defense will essentially complete the initial effort by the services to bring all installations into compliance with existing standards. However, we realize that new legislation and updated quality standards will impose follow-on projects in subsequent years.

I am sure there are, perhaps, Members who will suggest that a pollution problem exists in their particular area which may not have been included in this bill. But, in this bill we have approved the recommendations of the Department, and if some particular problem areas have not been properly brought to the attention of the appropriate military department or to the Department of Defense, that certainly would be the proper way to proceed because insofar as the committee is concerned this is one of the Department's requests that we acceded to completely.

I want to say, too, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, our chairman, with respect to the treatment of the Camp Pendleton area has my full support. I think, as he pointed out, that we have not only recognized the needs of the people of California and the expanding population growth in California—some of it unfortunately at the expense of my own State of New York, I might point out, but we have not been chary with respect to that particular point either. Our committee also recognized that the Marine Corps remains an important fighting arm and we certainly cannot deprive the Marine Corps of its ability to utilize, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS) mentioned a moment ago, certain amphibious training areas when the need requires.

So I think the action which the Armed Services Committee has recommended with regard to Camp Pendleton will meet the needs of both of these aspects of our national policy without harm to either one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on three vital medical projects in the Army section of the Mil-

itary Construction bill that involve about \$115 million and embrace the new Walter Reed Army General Hospital as a part of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center complex.

In addition to the Walter Reed Hospital, which is the principal user of these funds and which was authorized last year, is the addition to the Womack Army Hospital at Fort Bragg, N.C., and air-conditioning and updating the alteration of the Brooke Army General Hospital at the Brooke Army Medical Center, which will bear a great portion of the patient-care burden while the new Walter Reed Center is being built.

These three are important, and I think it suffices to say at this time that these hospitals and additions are being built under the aegis of the former Military Hospital Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services under a new technique involving computers and automatic data retrieval which will allow hospital construction to be updated for the first time, according to planning during the construction, so that at the time the hospital opens for business it will not be obsolete due to the rapid medical breakthroughs in techniques.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on three vital medical projects in the Army section of the military construction bill.

The new Walter Reed General Hospital is urgently required to provide for the replacement of the motley aggregation of pre-World War II and "mobilization type" buildings which are now inadequate to support modern medical equipment, and actively impede efficient medical service. Last year Congress authorized the initial phase of construction to prepare the site for the new hospital. The existing hospital, one of the foremost medical facilities in the world, is the primary Army professional care, training, and teaching hospital. To insure that Walter Reed Army Medical Center continues to provide medical leadership and promote advanced treatment methods for the Armed Services, the new hospital will be the most modern in existence. The Army has taken care to insure that the design will provide maximum flexibility by adopting structural features which can accommodate new medical techniques through minor changes in the building even through the construction period. In addition the hospital facility will have the ability to provide the most modern medical treatment, techniques, training and research activity known to the medical profession. It is the basic building stone of the total and complex Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Walter Reed is the largest of the Army's seven specialized treatment hospitals. In addition to serving the Army medical requirements in the Washington area, special services are rendered to the Office of the President, the State Department, and other designees of the Secretary of the Army. Walter Reed General Hospital is the focal point for worldwide referral of military patients with complex and demanding medical problems. These problems require the ut-

most in modern scientific equipment, professional talent, and health administration. In addition, the hospital provides the primary medical base for the Walter Reed Institute of Research, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Nursing, the U.S. Army Institute of Dental Research, and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology. A look at the current training load consisting of 207 medical resident doctors, 13 dental residents, 32 medical interns, eight dental interns, 70 student nurses, and various other technicians directly related to medical activities, emphasize the importance of this facility.

In order that Walter Reed Hospital continue in the forefront of medical progress in the United States, the new hospital is a most urgent requirement. When completed the new hospital will contain beds for 1,280 patients and will treat over 5,000 outpatients a day as well as providing the primary medical base for teaching as I have already mentioned.

The addition at Womack Army Hospital is required to provide a complete, permanent medical facility at Fort Bragg. The present 500-bed hospital was completed in 1958, and is adequate as far as bed space provided, but the addition is needed to provide clinical and administrative space to the size necessary to accommodate the 142-percent increase in outpatient workload which has been experienced since the hospital was constructed. At the present time the various medical, surgical, and specialty outpatient clinics are either housed in temporary buildings or are not provided at all. The temporary buildings have outlived their usefulness and because of their deteriorated condition present a demoralizing appearance, as well as an oftentimes actual unsanitary and dangerous situation.

The proposed construction is considered urgent because the outpatient clinics are unable to decrease the long waiting time for appointments or keep up with their present work because no additional patient care space is available. In addition to outpatient clinics the construction will provide sufficient space for essential medical activities such as a pharmacy, laboratory, mental hygiene, medical supply, medical equipment maintenance and preventive medicine.

The air conditioning and alteration of hospital buildings at Brooke Army Medical Center is required to support the increased workload at Brooke General Hospital. The number of occupied beds has increased by 21 percent and the number of outpatient visits has increased 81 percent from fiscal year 1965. This project will alleviate the overcrowding conditions in the X-ray facilities and the emergency room as well as providing temperature control in needed areas for electronics and other devices.

I strongly recommend that the Members of Congress support these three needed medical projects for the furtherance of high-caliber medical care to the American serviceman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of the approval of this legislation that has come out of the Committee on Armed Services.

The emphasis in this particular military construction bill for fiscal year 1972 has been placed on quarters and housing of all types, in order to make the service more attractive for the volunteer forces that we expect to come into it. It is a bill that the committee has worked long and hard on, and gone into every item thoroughly. I think it should have the approval of the House this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, we are always striving to improve our Nation's weapons systems. In this regard, the Air Force has perfected a short range attack missile commonly referred to as SRAM. This new weapon is an air-to-ground missile to be carried by the B-52 and FB-111 bomber aircraft, and launched at targets while the aircraft is outside the cone of fire from anti-aircraft defenses. These SRAM missiles carry either nuclear or conventional warheads which can destroy soft to medium hard targets and can be launched with a low or high trajectory. This new weapon will be a welcome addition to our Nation's arsenal. It is scheduled to be operational in the near future.

However, it does require certain minimal support facilities at the aircraft's home base. These facilities are missile assembly shops and igloos, in which the missiles are received, assembled, checked-out and stored until needed in an operational readiness configuration. The reliability of this weapon—the confidence we have that it will perform as designed—is due in large measure to the skill and care of the men in the shops and the environment in which they work on the missiles. The missiles are about 16 feet long, weigh over a ton, and require special equipment to inspect them and to move them about.

Six bases require the special shops and seven bases require igloos in which to store the missiles. These numbers are determined by the production rate taking into account the lead time required for construction and is a continuation of the program which started last year when we authorized shops for the first three bases to receive the SRAM.

In closing, let me state that we must provide reliable equipment and adequate facilities in which to perform maintenance on the SRAM to assure the reliability required of the missile to enhance the strategic capability of our Nation's defense.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on putting in an addition of \$2,076,000 into the item for the Naval Air Station at Alameda, Calif., to complete the facilities or to allow the construction of facilities necessary to take care of the industrial waste at that station. We have no fight with the Naval Air Station at Alameda in disposing of its normal sewage which goes into the city system, but at this place they revitalize

planes and airplanes that come out of the Far East, and these planes must be washed out with acid, and this goes into San Francisco Bay. This has been a source of great embarrassment to the people in the East Bay area that this has taken place. So I am happy that this additional money now has been granted so we can complete those facilities that are planned that will remove this impediment from the Naval Air Station.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 9844, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. Your Committee on Armed Services worked long and hard going over the individual line items in this bill which number 620 individual projects at 275 military installations.

There was not very much fat to trim in this budget; and very frankly, as I stand in the well of the House today I cannot say with certainty to my colleagues that we did not cut too deep—we may have cut too deep. The total cut decided on by the committee amounted to \$126,307,000; and as you have been told, the vote to report this bill to the House was a unanimous vote.

The committee, in general, has not challenged the validity of the requirements for projects which have been deferred, but rather, questioned the timeliness of accomplishing the projects this year under our current budget situation. The point I wish to stress is that the program, which the committee recommends, represents only valid requirements and only those projects, which in the opinion of the committee, must be included in this authorization program.

I should like to address my remarks specifically to title II of the bill, the Navy's program, which totals \$318,716,000. This is an increase of approximately \$50 million in authorization over last year bill. When inflation is considered, the real increase is about \$26 million. I feel that some explanation is in order on this increase.

The naval shore establishment provides support for the seagoing muscle of the U.S. Navy, the ships, aircraft, and their associated weapon systems. The naval shore establishment also provides support for the Marine Corps.

In developing the Navy's program, the Navy's attention is directed at providing the shore facilities needed to support the Navy's four principal missions:

The first mission is strategic deterrence, where the Navy's Polaris/Poseidon combination of strategic forces make a vital contribution to nuclear deterrence. The sea-based systems will probably increase in importance as enemy weapons become more accurate.

The Navy's projection forces, which include attack carriers and amphibious ships, and enable the Navy to extend its power into the Eurasian rimland is the second mission, which is titled "Projection Mission."

The third mission, sea control, insures that our lines of communication overseas are kept open. This is accomplished through a varying mixture of weapons systems including submarines, land- and carrier-based antisubmarine

aircraft and strike aircraft operating from attack carriers.

The fourth mission, overseas presence, which is perhaps the most important, is achieved through both sea control forces and projection forces.

It is the logistic facilities support required by each of the above missions that is evaluated in developing the Navy's annual military construction program. The program is not merely a list of projects, but a vital part of the logistics support needed for the Navy to carry out its worldwide missions.

With today's fast-moving and rapidly changing environment, the Navy faces virtually every management problem that confronts any industrial firm. Plant modernization is a problem that is similar to both industry and the Navy. In the competitive marketplace, today's assets can become tomorrow's liabilities. This is equally true with the Navy and the naval shore establishment.

I also wish to point out that the replacement cost of the existing naval shore establishment is approximately \$26 billion, of which 70 percent represents facilities that are over 25 years old. To meet the requirements of our new and ever expanding technological development, many of these facilities must be replaced or modernized. This is one reason the Navy portion of the bill is larger this year. The other reason and probably the most important one is that the facilities managers in the Navy are making known the serious facilities deficiency problem, and are having some success in obtaining a larger allocation for military construction.

I would like to briefly discuss the categories of facilities which make up title II of the bill and will support our naval and Marine Corps forces.

The first category is operational and training facilities at \$51,195,000. Operational and training facilities make up 16 percent of the program and include 26 projects for aviation, communications, waterfront operational and training facilities. Major training facilities approved are phase II of the engineering studies complex at the Naval Academy and an electronic-communications training building at the Naval Training Center, Orlando. Both projects are vital for strengthening and modernizing programs for training enlisted and officer personnel.

The second category is maintenance and production facilities for \$26,944,000. Six aviation, two shipyard, and two other maintenance and production projects were approved in this category, which comprises 9 percent of the Navy's program.

The third category at \$9,843,000 is for research facilities that will provide space for performing research in the quest for newer and better weapons and equipment. To support and advance the Navy's research and development program, seven projects or three percent of the total program was approved for research, development, test and evaluation facilities. The two major laboratory projects are a vulnerability and hardening facility at the naval ordnance laboratory, White

Oak, Md., and the first phase of two phases of an environmental health effects laboratory at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md.

The fourth category is for supply and storage facilities at \$2,360,000. Supply and storage facilities were limited to the most pressing ordnance storage and warehouse improvements. Supply and storage facilities make up 1 percent of the program.

The fifth category at \$22,957,000 is for medical facilities, which constitute 7 percent of the approved program. The major facility approved is a 220-bed hospital addition at Long Beach, Calif. It is urgently required to supplement the existing 350-bed hospital. The remainder of the medical program consists of three dispensaries and dental clinics and one research laboratory.

The sixth category is for administrative facilities at \$7,490,000. Administrative projects approved cover a wide range of functional requirements, such as an engineering management complex and a data processing facility. These projects make up 2 percent of the Navy's program. The committee believes that the deferral of projects in this category will have the least impact on Navy operations and consequently reduced this category to 57 percent of the requested amount.

The seventh category at \$128,939,000 is the largest and is for troop housing and community facilities. The housing provided here is for bachelor officer and enlisted personnel. Emphasis was placed on bachelor housing, messing facilities, and community support facilities by the Navy. The Navy believes and the committee concurs that retention of personnel will be improved with modern bachelor housing and recreational facilities that compare favorably with those found in the civilian community. The committee approved all of the people-oriented projects, which constitute 40 percent of the Navy's program.

The eighth category is for utilities at \$12,873,000. Adequate utilities are a primary requisite if shore activities are to provide full and effective logistic support to the fleet. Electrical, heating, water, and other utilities projects comprise 4 percent of the approved program.

The ninth category is air and water pollution abatement facilities approved in the amount of \$36,257,000. The pollution abatement projects at the various locations approved this year will continue the Navy's program for reducing and controlling the emission of pollutants from its installations. Approximately \$1 million of the pollution abatement program will be applied to Marine Corps installations. Pollution abatement projects constitute 12 percent of the approved program.

The final category is real estate at \$19,858,000. Real estate includes six land acquisition projects. A major portion of this request is for the purchase of approximately 509 acres in the Sewells Point complex at Norfolk, Va. Real estate represents 6 percent of the program.

I assure you that these are all valid requirements which represent the mini-

mum essential facilities necessary to provide proper working and living environment and a high combat capability for our naval and Marine Corps forces. I wish to stress that it is my belief that the committee has developed a bill that is well balanced between the 10 categories discussed. I recommend without reservation its approval as presented.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, included in the military procurement bill are moneys for Grissom Air Force Base which is located in my congressional district near Peru, Ind.

I want to make special mention of the funding of \$654,000 for Grissom.

This money will be used to fight an air pollution problem in this north central Indiana community. Officials of the Air Force base are doing their very best to be good neighbors and they realize that it is important that this problem be cleared up.

Grissom Air Force Base is to be commended for its actions. This money will be used to convert its huge coal-burning furnaces into oil.

Grissom is a credit to our Nation and its operation is of great interest to all Indiana residents.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this funding for Grissom Air Force Base.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the construction projects included in this bill at Bolling Air Force Base. For many years now we have been aware of the controversy concerning the use of the Bolling Air Force Base land and the requests to turn some of the land over to the District government for their use. Congress has taken the position that this land is required to house and support the military activities which, after much close scrutiny, must remain in the Washington area. Equally important, the land is required to provide housing and community facilities for the Defense personnel assigned in this area.

In the program this year there is a project for 400 units of family housing for the Air Force's people, mostly younger enlisted men who have a very difficult time finding something adequate in the Washington, D.C., area on their very limited income; and a project that will construct bachelor quarters for 500 single enlisted men who are now forced to live off the base or in grossly inadequate buildings on the base. These men and the families who will primarily benefit from these projects find the living expenses, the cost of housing, transportation to and from work, and off-duty entertainment pretty difficult to meet in this area.

Further, in line with much recent activity regarding the future ways the military can recruit and retain a sufficient number of trained and dedicated people, this matter of where and how well a man can live becomes more and more important. I believe we will need to do much more in the housing area, move bachelor enlisted men out of old wooden buildings that are hot in the summer and drafty in the winter, and provide enough family housing for the people.

Another project in this program provides a chapel center at Bolling to ac-

commodate both a new 400-seat chapel for services and some community space for such things as religious education and other church-related activities. The existing facilities are old substandard wooden buildings that are uneconomical to keep any longer and provide only half of the space required for the religious program.

I would like, now, to address the project that will provide a headquarters facility at Bolling Air Force Base. Again we find the activities that will occupy this facility presently located in old World War II wooden buildings that are neither adequate in functional arrangement nor suitable for economical upgrading to make them functional.

The last project at Bolling is an expansion to the base utility systems to provide for these new buildings since the existing systems are inadequate to meet the new requirements.

To summarize, these projects at Bolling Air Force Base are a part of the logical modernization of the facilities necessary to accommodate the continuing Air Force activities in the Washington area.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned about the continued use of Culebra Island, which is part of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as a weapons range for the U.S. Navy's Atlantic Fleet.

For more than 20 years the tiny island of Culebra has been subjected to periodic bombardment by the Navy. The result is that the lives of some 750 American citizens who inhabit that island have been harassed, disrupted, and threatened.

The Navy's continued shelling has had a serious impact upon the island's economy. Its ships destroy lobster traps and fishing nets, and with them the potential development of a prosperous fishing industry on Culebra.

The beaches of Culebra are unparalleled in their beauty, but the continuation by the Navy of its bombardment activity has prevented the development of its natural resources.

The ecological balance of Culebra has been endangered. Fish, lobsters, and birds in large numbers have been killed by detonations of explosive shells. On one occasion in 1967, in fact, 15 tons of dead fish washed up on the Culebran beaches.

In 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt designated the keys off Culebra as national wildlife refuges. And yet, in May 1968, the Navy lodged a massive bombardment against Twin Rock, one of those bird refuges, and thousands of nesting marine birds were killed.

In 1940, a child died as the result of the detonation of a shell. Just last year, six mortar rounds were fired into a bathing area on Flamingo Beach, landing within 200 yards of seven children and an adult. And an errant shell nearly killed the Governor of Puerto Rico while he was relaxing on a supposedly safe yacht.

The will of the people of Culebra—who are without a vote in this House—has been clearly expressed. And it is about time that the Navy began to heed it. It is time for the Navy to withdraw

from Culebra totally, and for the Congress to protect Culebraneses as it would all other American citizens.

Despite the possibility of constructing artificial islands or floating platforms to serve as targets, and despite the availability of alternatives, Secretary of Defense Laird has flatly insisted there is no alternative to Culebra. He came to this conclusion despite the contradictory conclusion of the Advance Research Projects Agency—ARPA—whose scientists have publicly stated that the construction of artificial targets is feasible.

In light of the Navy's continued neglect of the lives and well-being of the residents of Culebra, and in light of its heel-dragging in finding suitable alternatives, the least the Congress should do is to require the Secretary of the Navy to undertake an immediate study to determine suitable alternative sites to which the Navy can transfer all of its shelling and training operations.

This would be a significant step in protecting the people of Culebra from the continued subjection to the insensitive and dangerous practices of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$10,750,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$775,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$5,192,000.
Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,480,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia, \$2,185,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$9,631,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,996,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$437,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas, \$626,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$18,600,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$9,694,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado, \$21,043,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Lewis, Washington, \$3,931,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$2,174,000.
Presidio of San Francisco, California, \$10,498,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, \$2,048,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$4,000,000.
Harry Diamond Laboratory, Maryland, \$9,035,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$319,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$879,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$1,264,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$2,921,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

East Coast Relay Station, Maryland, \$326,000.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$2,580,000.

Pentagon, Virginia, \$1,072,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, \$2,551,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, \$112,500,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, \$305,000.

SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS COMMAND

Various Locations, \$167,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$1,718,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$4,787,000.

MODERN VOLUNTEER ARMY

Various Locations: Barracks Improvements, \$35,500,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations: Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$35,512,000.

Various Locations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$32,791,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Panama Area, Canal one, \$8,026,000.

UNITED STATES SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS COMMAND
Kwajalein Missile Range, \$2,865,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$1,221,000.

MODERN VOLUNTEER ARMY

Various Locations: Barracks Improvements, \$12,500,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various Locations, \$1,652,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$1,946,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct,

convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1972, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 103. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois", strike out "\$2,188,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,391,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802, "\$366,499,000" and "\$453,651,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$366,702,000" and "\$453,854,000", respectively.

Sec. 104. (a) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

With respect to "Fort Hancock, New Jersey", strike out "\$625,000" and insert in place thereof "\$693,000".

(b) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$186,591,000" and "\$290,726,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$186,659,000" and "\$290,794,000", respectively.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

(1) With respect to "Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania", strike out "\$503,000" and insert in place thereof "\$658,000".

(2) With respect to "Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin", strike out "\$1,604,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,234,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511 is amended by striking out clause (1) of section 602 "\$179,717,000" and "\$264,914,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$180,502,000" and "\$265,699,000".

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, and printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: On page 4, line 10, strike out "\$32,791,000" and insert "\$34,191,000: *Provided*, That \$1,400,000 of that amount shall be utilized for participation by Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, and Camp Charles Wood, New Jersey, in the sanitary sewer system program of the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a small, although I believe a very important amendment. What it does simply is to add \$1.4 million to this legislation, added to the large amount that the committee has authorized for pollution abatement in this country.

This deals with the facility at Fort Monmouth, N.J.

This amendment has been before the committee in past years and I am sure this would be in the bill today if we had had the information during the markup of this bill that we have just received within the past few days.

The community surrounding Fort Monmouth has for the past few years been developing the northeast regional sewerage authority, a \$40 million project to combat water pollution. They had urged that Fort Monmouth join with them—that the Fort Monmouth system in a few years would not be adequate to handle the sewage that it has and it would have to put in more money at that time.

The Department of the Army requested this last year and the year before. But at that time the Committee on Armed Services, concerned with the taxpayers' dollar, asked this question. It said:

Is Fort Monmouth polluting the waters with its present sewage system?

At that time there was no proof that Fort Monmouth was in violation of the New Jersey State code so the committee deferred action.

I had this amendment on the floor last year. At that time in concern for pollution abatement, the former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina, stated that if I were to withdraw this amendment, he would have a look at these projects and were he the chairman of this committee today, he would do everything he could to see that this amendment is included.

This year because of recent actions by the Committee on Armed Services, this was not requested by the Department of the Army. But they had requested it last year and the year before.

After the hearings were held—while the bill was being marked up—and after the markup I received two letters. One of them came from the State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection where I asked them, "What is the condition of the Fort Monmouth sewerage system?" They say now—and they did then—and I quote from that letter, and I have already received permission to include this in my remarks when we were in the House—they say:

The evidence obtained as a consequence of these investigations has led us to the conclusion that New Jersey's Water Quality Standards are being violated due to the discharge of treated sewage effluent from the Fort Monmouth installations.

They further talked about the \$40 million operation and the community surrounding the Fort Monmouth area in general to clean up the waters for shellfish and such things it said:

We will be required to maintain the present classification of the Shrewsbury River as condemned for the harvesting of shellfish, even after the completion of the \$40 million Northeast Regional Project, as long as the two Federal treatment plants remain.

In a letter that was received by me just the day before yesterday, which was immediately transmitted to the Committee on Armed Services, as I say after this bill

had been written—I have a letter from the State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection which was sent to the command at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and I quote from that letter which states:

I can assure you that if the sewage discharge from Fort Monmouth were, in fact, originating from a municipality or an industry we would have initiated legal measures to achieve compliance with this State's water pollution control laws.

Mr. Chairman, we in Monmouth County are very, very proud of the facility we have at Fort Monmouth. We believe it has served our area very well over the past few years. We believe the communities have cooperated with the Fort Monmouth and the command. We can remember that installation as the founding area for the Signal Corps back in 1917 during World War I.

Over the years we have had a wonderful relationship. We would hope that this committee, with these new facts and the evidence that we have from the State of New Jersey, would accede to this amendment and add this small amount, so that the \$40 million of taxpayers' money that has been spent in the area of Fort Monmouth will not be negated by the failure of the Congress to come up with this small amount to join with the community and to do a complete job in water pollution abatement in the central New Jersey and seashore area.

I certainly want to thank the chairman of the committee for past considerations and hope that because of this new information that we just have received that Fort Monmouth has not complied at the present time with the State's requirement, the chairman will graciously rise in support of this amendment.

The letter to which I referred is as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

Trenton, N.J., July 9, 1971.

MR. J. P. HOFFMAN,
Special Assistant for Congressional Affairs,
U.S. Army Electronics Command, Fort
Monmouth, N.J.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am enclosing a copy of a report on our investigation of the Parkers Creek Estuary with particular reference to the sewage treatment and disposal facilities at Fort Monmouth.

Our field and laboratory findings confirm the position taken by this Department for the past several years that the waters of the Shrewsbury River and its tributaries can best be restored and protected by Fort Monmouth participating in the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority project which, as you know, is well under way.

I can assure you that if the sewage discharges from Fort Monmouth were, in fact, originating from a municipality or an industry we would have initiated legal measures to achieve compliance with this State's water pollution control laws.

The record of this Department and our Federal counterpart; of the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority and the municipalities it serves points up the unswerving attitude as to how our water resources in this area can be protected and enhanced.

We have no quarrel with respect to the caliber of operation being provided. It is our firm opinion that no sewage treatment plant

should discharge into these critical waterways notwithstanding the type of treatment which is or could be provided.

We would be happy to discuss this matter further with you particularly with respect to the establishment of an abatement schedule leading to connection with the regional authority.

Very truly yours,
ERNEST R. SEGESSER,
Assistant Director for Water Quality.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

June 7, 1971.

HON. JAMES HOWARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOWARD: This is in response to your recent inquiry concerning the continued operation of the Fort Monmouth and Camp Charles Wood Sewerage Treatment Plants and the effect they are having on water quality in the Shrewsbury River. Personnel of our Bureau of Water Pollution Control have made a number of investigations of Parkers Creek, a tributary to the Shrewsbury River, which is the receiving stream for the effluent from the two military treatment plants cited above. The evidence obtained as a consequence of these investigations has led us to the conclusion that New Jersey's Water Quality Standards are being violated due to the discharge of treated sewage effluent from the Fort Monmouth installations. In addition to laboratory data, visual observations have made it quite clear that these waters are being degraded.

There is clear and conclusive evidence that neither Parkers Creek nor the Shrewsbury River provides for proper assimilation or disposal of sewage effluent. The completion of the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority system which serves twelve municipalities will remove all sewage effluent discharges from the Shrewsbury River and its tributaries with the exception of two Federal treatment plants. The continued presence of the discharges into Parkers Creek precludes any possibility of reopening any portion of the Shrewsbury River for the harvesting of shellfish. We will be required to maintain the present classification of the Shrewsbury River as condemned for the harvesting of shellfish, even after the completion of the 40 million dollar Northeast Regional Project, as long as the two Federal treatment plants remain.

It is interesting to note that the Eatontown Sewerage Authority was informed by the State that they could not expand their secondary treatment plant or intensify the degree of treatment with discharge into Parkers Creek. They were required to abandon their facility and connect to the Northeast system even though their plant was completed in 1960 and payment on the outstanding bonded indebtedness had not been completed. In contrast to the Eatontown situation, the two military treatment plants are 28 and 30 years old.

The commitment of local officials to a comprehensive and complete program of regional pollution abatement in this area has preserved the opportunity for Fort Monmouth to connect to the Northeast system. The County of Monmouth provided loan funds under favorable terms and conditions to cover the incremental cost of enlarging the interceptor sewers to provide the capacity to accommodate future sewage flows from the military installations when their treatment plants are abandoned.

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection considers this a most urgent situation which should be rectified through the required appropriation to allow for the abandonment of the two Federal treatment plants serving Fort Monmouth. If

there is any further information which I can provide to you or the Committee, do not hesitate to call on me.

I am sending this same letter to Senator Harrison Williams and Senator Clifford Case because of their continued interest in this problem.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. PIKE,
Director.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee is fully aware of the great contribution that Fort Monmouth has made to the military and the great desire to have this project restored. The gentleman from New Jersey did file with the committee a complete statement while the hearings were being held, and went to great length to present the matter to us.

However, as of now, the Army has not told us a thing about it. We know nothing about it. They did not request the project. I have no doubt that in the last few days the gentleman has gotten in touch with them and they have responded, but this is exactly the type of operation that the Armed Services Committee is determined is not going to continue. It has prevailed in the past; it will not prevail in the future. All of a sudden, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, at the persistence of well-intentioned Members of Congress who are doing their job and doing it well, go over and talk to some of these folks and they say, "Why, sure we need it." But they do not come to the Armed Services Committee and tell us until it is too late.

The construction bill was up for weeks. We were delayed in marking it up for 2 weeks because of the conferences on the draft bill, and yet all of a sudden, the night before the bell strikes 12, they come up with some kind of statement. We are trying to keep the Army, Navy, and Air Force, all of them, honest. We are encouraging them to come and tell us what the "facts of life" are, or forget about it. This is the position in which we find ourselves, and with the exception of one amendment that I know of, I know of no changes that the Army or anyone else has justified to the committee. On behalf of the committee, I say we are trying to keep the bill down. We are trying to stay within the budget. We are trying to discharge our responsibility in that direction.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said. I wholeheartedly agree with him. We cannot change signals at any time during the consideration of a bill without having all facts at our command. Therefore, let me repeat, I strongly support what the gentleman from Louisiana has said and henceforth let us hope that all committee witnesses

from the Department of Defense will have a firm position as to their testimony and not later on change their minds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: On page 3, line 22, strike the figure "\$167,300,000" and substitute the figure "\$172,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the increase of \$5,200,000 in the Safeguard System Command is for the purpose of local impact assistance, to take care of the human needs of the community into which this ABM system is imposed. At the time the Army testified before the distinguished Committee on Armed Services they indicated that they had adequate funds for taking care of these needs for the next fiscal year.

The committee therefore justifiably said in their report on page 14:

The \$5,200,000 request for community impact assistance is deferred. . . Funds previously authorized are expected to be adequate for another year.

Mr. Chairman, this particular area happens to be in the district I am privileged to represent in Congress. I know the reason these funds had not been used was because of delay in transmitting the requests through the proper channels. These are now coming in and based on these changes, I asked the Army to give me an updated report on the needs which they provided yesterday. Based on this report I requested, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Beal, today wrote a letter to Chairman HÉBERT, which he authorizes me to read, pointing out this:

JULY 22, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, House
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is understood that the House Armed Services Committee has recommended the deletion of \$5.2 million for Community Impact Assistance for Fiscal Year 1972. The enclosed facts may have a bearing on that decision.

General Leber, Safeguard System Manager, testified before the House Armed Services Committee on the 24th of June. His testimony at that time is now updated by the attached fact sheet which provides a status report on funding accomplished against the \$11.8 million provided for Community Impact Assistance in Fiscal Year 1971.

As indicated in the information in this attached fact sheet, the amounts transferred to other Federal programs plus the total of known requests not yet submitted to the Army for action, exceeds the \$11.8 million previously authorized for this purpose. Therefore, it is highly desirable to retain the \$5.2 million in the program. These funds will be required for obligation in Fiscal Year 1972.

Processing of these actions which in some

cases has been delayed in the past, has been expedited through improved procedures and liaison with local, State and Federal agencies.

Sincerely,

ASSISTANT SECRETARY BEAL.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Chairman's support in resolving this error brought about by outdated testimony by the Army, and I would certainly hope the Chairman and the Committee would go along with this amendment, which is needed for the human needs in the local area involved in this ABM construction project.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment is a classic example of what I was talking about and trying to say with the previous amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman contains the language which the Army asked for and attempted to make a case for before the committee, but it failed to make a good case, and because of the fact that it did not make a good case and did not submit sufficient evidence, we struck it from the bill. But the case is made now.

In the previous case, in the Monmouth case, no request was made by the Army of the committee, and no attempt was made before now to justify it. In this instance they attempted to make the case, and we got them to justify it further, and they have gotten the information to us at a late hour, but they have gotten it here. They have given us the facts to show this is needed and have presented the facts on the floor.

Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the pending military construction authorization bill contains a total of \$167.3 million for construction of the Safeguard missile system at four sites. Our committee has cut \$17 million this year for ABM construction—this is a slow, but a very good start.

Inasmuch as this House only 1 month ago recorded 129 votes against the deployment of this system—an admitted minority—I do not plan to offer an anti-ABM amendment today.

Considering that the opposition forces have increased 50 percent in the last year alone—the future of the ABM must be considered as foreboding.

In abating the making of a redundant motion today, I am also cognizant that in Vienna today there are important talks progressing looking toward strategic arms ABM limitation.

Some say that the talks would never have occurred unless we voted ABM funds in the past and started deployment. It is also arguable that the same talks could have occurred without expending the \$9.0901 billions that will have been expended on ABM after the 1972 appropriation.

We are talking in the SALT negotiations about limiting manned bombers and we have barely started spending on the B-1 bomber program so I believe this proves that ABM would be a SALT bar-

gaining chip without spending \$9.0901 billion.

Our theory on the ABM has changed many times—first an anti-Chinese weapon, then an anti-Soviet first strike weapon—now in vogue again with the imminent testing of a five-megaton Spartan warhead, is the anti-Chinese weapon.

But our thinking is fuzzy. President Nixon just announced he is going to Peking very shortly.

It is reasonable to assume that if we are going to talk to the Chinese—one of the first things both sides should be talking about is arms limitation.

I commend the administration on arranging the top level Communist talks. Only a Republican administration could do this without splitting the country. Countries that talk—usually trade. Countries that trade together usually do not war on one another.

The danger is that sometimes in a nation as large as the United States the right hand Department of Defense does not know what the left hand State Department is doing.

I would certainly hope that with negotiations blossoming in Europe and Asia, the Defense Department will partially moderate its spendthrift attitude of spending tax defense dollars as quickly as possible on anything and everything contained in the budget regardless of changing world affairs. The policy of the Department of Defense to reprogram and spend every last dime of an appropriation is asinine.

Mr. Chairman, it has become increasingly evident that the Safeguard ABM is not a good defense investment.

First, because it cannot do the job it is designed to do—its radars can be easily and cheaply destroyed by the first wave of a Soviet attack, or by sabotage.

Second, because the land-based ICBM's Safeguard is supposed to defend, are possibly themselves obsolete, we are ill-advised to sink more money into them.

Interservice rivalry notwithstanding, we are going to find ourselves moving more and more toward an underwater deterrent in the future.

I will not now take time to elaborate on these points, but I want to read into the RECORD at this time a brilliant study of the underwater long-range missile system by my California colleague, CRAIG HOSMER. This study is one of the series sponsored by Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. It is remarkable, because in it Congressman HOSMER, long one of the most articulate supporters of Safeguard, says:

By the mid-1980's it may be doubtful whether our land-based forces could survive a pre-emptive strike let alone possess the penetration power necessary to inflict unacceptable damage, even if supplemented by the expensive B-1 bomber and provocative WS-120A, a suggested American counterpart to the Soviet SS-9. . . . In contrast to the land-based elements of our triad deterrent structure, the submarine-launched ballistic missile is neither destabilizing nor vulnerable. A case can be made for ULMS to ultimately replace Minuteman, Safeguard, and

our B-52s as well as our retiring early model Polaris submarine . . . of all the strategic weapons systems now being discussed for possible deployment, only ULMS offers the potential of fulfilling U.S. strategic deterrent requirements in the decades ahead.

I urge everyone to read the full text of this excellent study. The Safeguard is the most cost-ineffective option of our defense arsenal. I would hope that all expenditures on this system could either be terminated or sharply constrained by agreement at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. HOSMER's article follows:

REPORT ON THE UNDERSEA LONG-RANGE MISSILE SYSTEM—ULMS

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

SUMMARY

Previous appropriations totaling approximately \$60 million and another \$110 million sought for FY 1972 will bring research and development of the ULMS (Undersea Long-Range Missile System) concept to a point of sufficient clarity for Congress to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of developing it.

This decision is being forced less by intrinsic potentialities of ULMS than by a possible future need to supplant existing land-based deterrent systems with more survivable forces as they become increasingly vulnerable to larger warhead yields and increasing missile accuracies.

The probabilities within the foreseeable future are quite small that anti-submarine warfare technologies or techniques will be perfected which could impair the relative invulnerability of ballistic missile submarines. ULMS submarines with missile ranges extending to 6000 miles in combination with the Polaris/Poseidon fleet already in being could constitute a stable and powerful deterrent.

Although costly, the ULMS "blue water option" being made available through research and development funding will give the Congress a new strategic defense alternative to consider.

RECOMMENDATION

The full \$110 million requested for FY 1972 ULMS research and development should be appropriated, and the Congress should begin preparing itself to examine and evaluate any requirement for deployment of the system.

DESCRIPTION

The Undersea Long-Range Missile System, frequently referred to by the acronym ULMS, is a proposed follow-on to our Polaris/Poseidon ballistic missile fleet. The ULMS program envisages the development of a more efficient, highly survivable, sea based nuclear deterrent capable of launching missiles with a range equivalent to an ICBM from quieter submarines of improved hull and propulsion designs. As presently conceived, this new system will probably consist of 25 submarines each with 24 missiles as compared to our current fleet of 41 ballistic missile submarines each with 16 missiles.

In FY 1970 \$10 million was funded for ULMS R&D, another \$44 million was appropriated in FY 1971 and \$110 million is sought for FY 1972. These funds will bring ULMS to the point of definitive design and the Congress to the point of a decision on whether and how to produce ULMS.

ULMS will optimize the Navy doctrine upon which the Polaris/Poseidon ballistic missile submarine is based, namely that strategic systems should not only be invulnerable but operate outside the continental United States, removed as far as possible from the institutions they are created to protect. As currently envisioned, ULMS will

augment the United States undersea deterrent forces but will differ from Polaris/Poseidon in the following major areas:

1. Greater survivability due to ICBM range.
2. Greater ABM penetration capability because of ICBM range.
3. Greater on-station availability through decreased transit time.
4. Total integrated system design.
5. Modular construction to decrease maintenance time.
6. Extra quiet operation through incorporation of latest technological advances.
7. More cost effective than restarting Poseidon construction.

Survivability

ULMS will approximately double the 3000 nautical mile range of the Poseidon missile. The major advantage afforded by ULMS' intercontinental range will be increased survivability of the ballistic missile submarine.

The vulnerability of mobile weapons systems is inversely related to the area in which they can maneuver. For submerged ballistic missile submarines within reach of their targets, survivability is enhanced according to the length of the missile's range over deep water. The greater the range of the missile, the further at sea the submarine launch platform can patrol.

For every linear increase in missile range, the area in which the enemy's anti-submarine (ASW) forces must search is increased by the square of the distance. When the Polaris range of approximately 1500 nautical miles was doubled to the 3000 mile range of the Poseidon, the latter became almost four times more difficult to locate. ULMS 6000 nautical mile range will require a further increase in ASW surveillance by another factor of four to encompass a total area of 55 million square nautical miles.

ABM penetration

ULMS' extended missile range which will enhance its survivability also will improve the system's targeting effectiveness.

Shorter range ballistic missile submarines must choose between the survivability of the open sea and the ability to attack multiple, widely separated targets. With an intercontinental range, one ULMS in the Indian Ocean could hit any target in the Soviet Union from eastern Europe to Siberia. Also, while a Poseidon on station in the Pacific could strike only targets in the eastern U.S.S.R., one ULMS in the identical patrol area could retaliate not only against Siberian targets but also against targets as far west as Moscow. ULMS' ability to retaliate against multiple, widely separated areas will provide an excellent means of penetrating even heavy ABM defenses.

The longer range missile planned for ULMS will give the U.S. deterrent coverage over the entire defense perimeter of the Soviet Union. Currently only 9 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s defense perimeter can be penetrated by land based missiles located in the U.S. and less than one-third can be covered by our shorter range Polaris/Poseidon missiles. However, ULMS' all-azimuth penetration capability will greatly complicate the Soviet ABM problem in defending against a U.S. retaliatory strike.

On-station availability

Due to the limited range of Polaris/Poseidon, a portion of its at-sea time may be spent in transit to its patrol area. However, ULMS' ICBM range missile will permit it to operate even from the continental United States and to be within range of some targets immediately upon leaving port. This feature eliminates transit time to and from station, thus more efficiently utilizing ship assets. For example, 85 percent of all ULMS

might be on station at one time compared to 60 percent or less of the Polaris/Poseidon fleet.

ULMS' increased operating range means that our dependence upon foreign basing with all its diplomatic complexities and political uncertainties could be reduced or ended. Travel of crews to deployment sites could then be eliminated and logistics chains reduced in complexity and cost.

Integrated system design

The original Polaris submarine was not designed for a sea based deterrent function but was converted from an attack submarine during its initial construction on a crash basis. Although numerous incremental improvements and refinements have since been made, there has not been a major re-evaluation of the needs and design specifications of long-range ballistic missile submarines in terms of optimum depth, speed and size characteristics as these may differ basically from those of attack submarines and current range ballistic missile submarines.

ULMS is being designed from the keel up for one purpose—as the backbone of the United States' sea based deterrent. Its missiles, hull, propulsion, sonar, communications and other subsystems will be integrated into one entire system. Among other advantages of redesigning the complete system are that it permits the utilization of modular construction and maintenance and the incorporation of the latest and most advanced submarine technology.

Modular construction

The entire ULMS system is being designed to feature ease of maintenance and maximum access to equipment. By means of modular construction, incrementally planned overhauls will be made during brief in-port replenishment periods. Time spent in shipyards will be minimal. Modular component construction will also give ULMS a phenomenally high at-sea-to-in-port ratio, contributing to the need for fewer ships to meet the sea based deterrent mission.

Quiet operation

Quietness of operation is one of the key elements of the ULMS design. Exploitation and incorporation of new technology and total system design is expected to significantly decrease the operational noise of ULMS compared to that of other submarines.

ULMS' propulsion chain is being designed to be as silent as possible, assisted by a pumpless natural circulation pressurized water-cooled nuclear reactor power plant whose fuel will last for the life of the ship. Probably ULMS will be double-hulled to contribute to quieter operation and will also incorporate the latest quieting technology such as air layering, machinery isolation, absorptive materials and the like.

Should our ballistic missile submarines become more vulnerable in the decades ahead, a probable area would be the detection of ship noise. Acoustical energy and particularly sonar are the preeminent weapons of anti-submarine warfare forces. All submarines emit noise while in motion, but to detect the submarine its sound must be differentiated from other background noise in the ocean. Thus, the quieter the submarine's movement, the less vulnerable it is to discovery and preemption.

As presently envisioned, ULMS could be up to three times quieter than the latest model Poseidon at loiter speed and for evasion purposes travel at speeds still maintaining a reduced acoustic level.

Cost effectiveness

ULMS' high survivability, availability and reliability coupled with an effective main-

tenance program and system design will contribute to a lower cost per effectively deployed missile, thereby reducing total system cost. The estimated expense of the entire ULMS system, plus ten years of operation is about \$15 billion—approximately the same amount expended over the same period on the Polaris/Poseidon fleet.

While the ULMS fleet will probably be comprised of fewer submarines than our Polaris/Poseidon force of 41 vessels, it will nevertheless utilize approximately the same number of deliverable warheads. Thus, 20 inflation years after deployment of the first Polaris, ULMS could be deployed at the same cost, with the same number of warheads, but with substantial improvements both in survivability and effectiveness.

RATIONALE

If the United States is to build more submarine deterrent forces, ULMS is obviously the most efficient system. But do we need more ballistic missile submarines? Whatever its technological or institutional merits, no weapons system is self-justifying. In an era of limited resources and salient domestic needs, the rationale for any strategic program depends upon the political structure and international milieu from which it derives its function.

Three principal arguments for developing an Undersea Long-Range Missile System are being put forward:

1. In the event SALT fails, ULMS will provide a nonprovocative stabilizing hedge against the increasing vulnerability of land based systems and maintain U.S. strategic sufficiency.
2. If SALT is successful, ULMS will provide an invulnerable minimum deterrent umbrella under which significant reductions in strategic forces can be made.
3. At a time when sea based deterrent forces are of increasing importance, ULMS is the natural replacement for those Polaris submarines which may reach retirement age in the 1980's.

Land-based system vulnerabilities

The increasing vulnerability of Minuteman and the B-52s has been demonstrated by the admitted need for a Safeguard ABM defense system. Thus, by the mid-1980's, it may be doubtful whether our land based forces could survive a preemptive strike, let alone possess the penetration power necessary to inflict unacceptable damage, even if supplemented by the expensive B-1 bomber and provocative WS-120A, a suggested American counterpart to the Soviet SS-9. Given the mere prospect of such events, it is illogical that we should continue to structure our triad deterrent forces so that 90 percent of our retaliatory capability is vulnerable to preemption and is able to penetrate only 9 percent of the Soviet defense perimeter.

In contrast to the land based elements of our triad deterrent structure, the submarine-launched ballistic missile is neither destabilizing nor vulnerable. There are those who argue against relying more on our sea based deterrent forces for fear that we are putting all our "deterrent eggs in one basket." However, if SALT fails to halt the erosion of our land based systems, a sea based deterrent could be our only invulnerable retaliatory force. Thus, if pessimistic predictions of Soviet intentions are correct, funds will be better spent to improve our most survivable deterrent potential by the development of ULMS than to build or defend more vulnerable systems.

Arms control potential

If an agreement is reached at SALT, the most provocative and vulnerable strategic weapons could be phased out under the protective cover of a sea based deterrent. In fact, as the numbers of retaliatory vehicles

on each side are reduced, their relative invulnerability becomes more acute since minor technological improvements or small violations will have far greater impact.

One settlement that might come at SALT could be a ceiling on the total number of each side's strategic offensive launchers, starting with a freeze at current force levels which would be scaled downward at fixed dates as the older forces on both sides reach retirement vintage. Given a limitation of 2000 launchers per side, which would approximate current force levels, we might want to restructure our deterrent forces by adding 600 ULMS while retaining 500 Poseidon launchers and reducing in numbers manned bombers to 200 and land based missiles to 700.

However, with a reduction to 1000 allowable strategic launchers, the value of ULMS to our deterrent capability would outweigh our other systems since neither land based missiles nor manned strategic bombers would be worth the loss of an equivalent number of invulnerable submarine-launched missiles. Because ULMS can be easily verified yet cannot be used effectively as a counterforce weapon against other ballistic missile submarines, ULMS and its Soviet counterpart might thus provide the means for significant strategic arms limitations coupled with a stable nuclear deterrent in the decades ahead.

Modernization

Of primary importance in the preceding discussions is the emphasis we must place on our sea based forces in the next two decades since they will be imperative for deterrence. The hull life of a ballistic missile submarine has been approximated at 25 years, after which time it becomes too costly and self-defeating to refit it. Therefore, should the oldest Polaris submarines which were not converted to Poseidon become candidates for retirement by the 1980's, the number of submarines in our sea based deterrent force will be decreased from 41 to 31.

Given both the strategic deterrent and the arms control potentialities of sea based forces discussed previously, it would seem ridiculous to eviscerate our most stable strategic system through age obsolescence and not develop a follow-on system. Thus, to meet the needs of strategic stability in the decades ahead, we must have the ULMS option open.

Critique

By offering an efficient system to fulfill sound strategic needs, ULMS has been praised rather than attacked by the traditional watchdogs of military cost effectiveness. Criticisms of ULMS come from two perspectives: (a) those in rival services who, fearing their own project budgets may be reduced by ULMS efficiency, attempt to find strategic weaknesses in ULMS, and (b) those against all military programs who stress their fear of stimulating the arms race or their revulsion against any defense spending. These combined complaints result in five general criticisms of ULMS.

1. **Invulnerability:** Criticism: The possibility of a Soviet technological breakthrough in ASW capability would preclude reliance on a sea based deterrent.
2. **Retaliatory Capability:** Criticism: A minimum deterrent based upon ULMS would not threaten sufficient retaliatory damage to deter the Soviet Union.
3. **Command and Control:** Criticism: Sea based deterrent forces lack the capability to wage a limited nuclear war.
4. **Pacing the Arms Race:** Criticism: Development of ULMS will stimulate the arms race.
5. **Defense Costs:** Criticism: ULMS will cost too much.

It should be noted that while the first

three criticisms argue against exclusive reliance on a sea based deterrent, only the last two challenge the need for continued ULMS research and development.

Invulnerability

The fear of a technological breakthrough which would immediately reveal the presence of all submerged vehicles, although implausible, is often postulated as an argument against reliance on a sea based deterrent.

Acoustics, radio, radar, infrared, magnetism and gravity are the principal physical phenomena currently being explored as means to detect submarines. However, the properties of all but the last two of these are so well understood and their sensory possibilities so thoroughly explored that fundamental breakthroughs in sonar, electro-magnetic or thermal sensing technology cannot reasonably be expected. Incremental improvements in signal magnification, discrimination and interpretation can be expected as well as amplified signal power and some extension in detection ranges.

The "ensonification" of the oceans by high energy transducers generating acoustic power measured in megawatts has been suggested as a potential breakthrough in sonar technology. Even if feasible, "ensonification" would have uneven degrees of reliability. It could be defeated by acoustic countermeasures and mobile decoys. And, should the worst come to pass, U.S. proximity to the ocean would be an enormous advantage over the Soviet Union in the deployment and operation of such a system.

Indeed, any postulated improvement in ASW detection devices will undoubtedly be accompanied by sensing countermeasures. In fact, after two decades of extensive ASW research and funding, the submarine's invulnerability has benefited more through technological advances than it has lost in ASW detection.

The alternative to qualitative ASW improvements based on unexpected breakthroughs in detection would be a quantitative approach, requiring massive deployment of ASW sensors and extensive numbers of hunter-killer submarines, aircraft, destroyers and satellites. Here the laws of probability rather than those of physics handicap ASW efforts.

Without a technological breakthrough, it would be economically and militarily impossible to deploy enough ASW forces to destroy even a fraction of our sea based deterrent force in a first strike. Unless every ULMS could be tracked continuously and destroyed simultaneously, a preemptive attempt would only invite unacceptable retaliation from the remaining missile submarines. Even if the Soviet Union subordinated all other priorities to ASW efforts, this would require such extensive and visible deployment as to provide the United States adequate warning time to take effective countermeasures.

Seemingly more plausible than the threat of preemption is the counterforce by attrition scenario in which a Soviet hunter-killer submarine force would concentrate on one or two ULMS at a time, silently destroying them. By the time America's national decision makers would suspect the Soviet Union, we would be unable to credibly retaliate because it would be tantamount to suicide.

But even if the Soviets could destroy several of our submarines in this manner, counterforce by attrition could never meet even the minimal requirements of a first strike. Any unreported submarines would immediately arouse suspicion and establish the attacker's culpability. A use of nuclear warheads to destroy the submarines would be quickly detected, risking American retaliation and the possibility of nuclear escalation. Even the risk of spotting conventional ASW

weapons explosions in this circumstance would be great. In any event, should attrition be embraced as a strategy, American attack submarines could serve as escorts for their own ULMS, destroying the Soviet hunter-killers as soon as they began tracking and retaliating in kind against Soviet ballistic missile submarines as well.

Retaliatory capability

Two alleged impediments have been cited by some in expressing doubt as to the ability of an undersea based deterrent to fulfill its retaliatory role. One is that submarine-launched ballistic missiles must be fired sequentially, allowing ABM defenses to deal with these incoming warheads individually rather than several at a time. The other is the theoretical possibility of plotting back a sea-launched missile's trajectory to locate, target and destroy the submarine that fired it.

The latter possibility does not exist since the time required to launch all a submarine's missiles is only a few minutes, and the opponent's missile flight times are considerably longer. In the brief minutes involved, the submarine's full load of missiles will have been launched and its retaliatory mission completed before an opponent could possibly locate and destroy it.

Nor does sequential firing present a unique problem to sea-launched warheads. Poseidon and ULMS missiles nest at least 3 and up to 14 or even more individually guided reentry vehicles. Therefore, the moment the missile's nest opens what amounts to a salvo is readied to confront ABM defenses. Additionally, the added thrust of ULMS which gives it intercontinental range and all-azimuth penetration could be employed in such ABM defeating configurations as fractional orbital bombardment and close-in depressed trajectory.

A novel complaint has been lodged against ULMS on the grounds that ultimately it may possess too much firepower rather than too little. Qualitative improvements in missile guidance, it is feared, might upgrade the system and give it a destabilizing counterforce capability against the U.S.S.R.'s land based deterrent.

ULMS would not necessarily degrade the Soviet Union's retaliatory sufficiency. For while the U.S.S.R. has lagged behind the U.S. in deploying strategic deterrent forces at sea, the Soviets have already deployed a ballistic missile submarine very similar to Polaris and are committed to a massive building program besides developing their own underwater long-range missile. In fact, the current Soviet submarine construction program appears to be concentrating less on attack submarines than on the development of a credible sea based deterrent.

If both the Soviet Union and the United States deploy a substantial deterrent at sea, an ULMS counterforce capability against land based missiles will not effect the stability of the strategic balance and Soviet deployment of the provocative SS-9 will prove superfluous.

Command and control

Another criticism against depending mainly upon a submarine deterrent is the possibility of interruptions in command communication, especially during a first strike attack.

Even in the unlikely event part or all of the missile submarine fleet might be out of contact with the national command authority for a few minutes or hours, this would effect only the rapidity of retaliation, a relatively unimportant factor in sea based deterrence. It will not diminish the certainty of retaliation, the fundamental consideration upon which all theories of deterrence are founded.

As our land based missiles become increas-

ingly vulnerable, there will be a greater incentive to launch endangered retaliatory land based forces on warning to avoid preemption. This prospect is exceedingly hazardous.

On the other hand, hair-trigger retaliation is not necessary for sea based deterrent forces which will not be threatened by an impending attack on the continental United States. Thus, delay in reestablishing communications will not impede retaliation but will allow the national command an opportunity to obtain an accurate assessment of the situation and direct a controlled retaliation.

Pacing the arms race

A supposed political disadvantage in committing ourselves to the undersea long-range missile concept is the alleged adverse effect such a decision could have on the current SALT talks. However, of any weapons system now being discussed for deployment in the 1980's, ULMS would be least adverse to SALT.

First, ULMS is not a new spiral in the arms race, either technologically or in numbers of weapons deployed, but is merely a stabilizing improvement of a system which has already proven itself nonprovocative and impervious to rapid technological obsolescence.

Second, the Soviet Union, while participating at SALT, is continuing its own development of an advanced underwater long-range missile system.

Third, the immediate decision is only whether to begin development of ULMS. Therefore, if a comprehensive agreement at SALT, limiting all strategic systems, abolishing ABM and controlling antisubmarine warfare development is reached, ULMS can be halted before deployment.

Defense costs

Any weapons system estimated to cost approximately \$15 billion is not inexpensive. However, as Senator George S. McGovern (D-S.D.) and Representative John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio), in their report on the B-1 bomber to Members of Congress for Peace through Law stated:

"A persuasive case can be made for purchase of a given weapons system regardless of cost, if it can be shown that that system will have a decisive influence on the ability of the United States to deter nuclear war."

Measured by this criteria, ULMS as currently envisioned will be cost effective. A sea based deterrent relying on ULMS will be able to deter any aggressor. The total cost of ULMS is meaningful, then, only if it is compared with the cost of land based offensive and defensive systems, because a case can be made for ULMS to ultimately replace Minuteman, Safeguard, and our B-52s as well as our retiring early model Polaris submarines. Thus, as the National Urban Coalition concluded after an extensive and critical study of U.S. military spending:

"Since sea based missiles seem to offer the most certain deterrent, it is extremely important that we keep exploring technological frontiers in this field. For the most part, this means a high priority for ULMS research."

Noting that the development of an ULMS prototype is not necessarily a commitment to deployment, the Urban Coalition report emphasized "that insufficient priority is being given ULMS research efforts." This point cannot be overemphasized.

Ballistic missile submarines as complex systems are extremely susceptible to cost overruns should they face inconsistent financial commitments for research and development. However, ULMS is being designed and managed for cost effectiveness. If the waste and technological problems resulting from rush jobs to meet last minute threats are to be avoided in the 1980's, we must com-

mit ourselves now to the adequate and consistent development funding needed to keep the ULMS option open.

CONCLUSION

The vulnerability of our land based strategic systems, our growing reliance upon sea based deterrent forces and the ULMS/Poseidon potential to provide unilateral strategic sufficiency seriously indict the current structure of our redundant triad deterrent force. Therefore, with the need to evaluate the currency of our sea based deterrent. Congress should not only reexamine our land based strategic weapons systems but also the assumptions and doctrines by which these systems are justified.

Of all the strategic weapons systems now being discussed for possible deployment, only ULMS offers the potential of fulfilling U.S. strategic deterrent requirements in the decades ahead. We should therefore encourage full steam ahead on ULMS development by approving the full FY 1972 request for \$110 million for this purpose.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to take time to address a question or two to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services with respect to what has happened to the extensive program that was announced by the White House last summer for the closing of a large number of bases and other military installations in this country in the interest of saving money and devoting those savings to the modernization of our military forces. What happened to that closing program?

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I suggest that my dear friend from Iowa must, if he needs to see the truth, go to the top of the mountain and talk to The Man. He can talk for himself. I do not know what happened. I am not in the confidence of the White House and its policies.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me it is more than passing strange that such a program would have been announced a year ago and apparently so little has happened. An installation here and there has been closed, but it is my understanding that the services recommended the closing of a very substantial number of bases, shipyards, and air installations.

Mr. HÉBERT. I personally never saw a list of bases to be closed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. There was one base closed in my district, Edwards Air Force Base, and I did not object to it, because I thought it was superfluous. Now I rather wish I had, because there is the greatest fight going on between the Bureau of Prisons and local authorities and drag strip people and the De-

partment of HEW as to what becomes of that property. Nevertheless, I cite it as an example of one base that has been closed.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman citing me an example, but I am sure he will agree that hardly warrants the continuance of other unneeded bases. I note one which was apparently on the list for closing and which will get \$8 million under this bill. I do not know whether that is for new construction or simply maintenance. As long as it is open it will have to be funded, I am sure, but I would hate to wake up some day and find that millions of dollars have been spent on installations which this administration says are obsolete or which should be closed for other reasons. I would dislike very much to learn that new money has been spent for construction on those bases rather than for simple maintenance until they can be closed. I do not want to discover that this has happened.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will tell the gentleman this: the committee looks very eagerly at any rumor of a base that might be closed. I am familiar with what the gentleman says, and the base closings cannot come too fast. I do not know and I cannot give you an answer as to why the position was changed, but there is no permanent construction in this bill that would be going to a base where there was an indication of the activities of that base being narrowed or of its being closed. I share the gentleman's concern for these moves.

During the ill-fated McNamara "savings" we lost money every time we closed a base, rather than saving money. It will be a long, long time until we catch up with those mistakes.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to reemphasize the fact, that if there are bases surplus to the needs of the defense of this country, if that situation exists—and I do not know in how many instances that may be or whom it may affect—if they are being kept open for political reasons, it is just as wrong as it can be. I am not saying that this is the case. I am only saying that if this is the case, then drastic action ought to be taken against those who fail to close those installations that are surplus to our needs so that the saved money can be used for purposes necessary to the defense of this country.

Mr. HÉBERT. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The gentleman will recall that the first announcement of base closings was by former Secretary of Defense Mr. McNamara when he was in office, and I think I was the first one to rise up and say to close the bases if they are not needed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his response.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendment, to be proposed to title I, the Clerk will read title II.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring constructing,

converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Radio Station, Cutler, Maine, \$161,000.
Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$94,000.
Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island, \$1,660,000.
Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$655,000.
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, \$3,511,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$1,505,000.
Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut, \$668,000.
Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, Bayonne, New Jersey, \$82,000.
Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, New Jersey, \$383,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$991,000.
Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, \$749,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$3,400,000.
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, \$4,500,000.
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, \$1,307,000.
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$321,000.
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland, \$1,397,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$85,000.
CINCLANTFLT Headquarters, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,201,000.
Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$884,000.
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia, \$1,880,000.
Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$19,316,000.
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$6,240,000.
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$2,067,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$1,603,000.
Naval Security Group Activity, Homestead, Florida, \$439,000.
Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida, \$6,930,000.
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$8,525,000.
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$8,380,000.
Naval Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida, \$505,000.
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,520,000.
Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, \$5,656,000.
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, \$3,008,000.
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$3,266,000.
Navy Commissary Store, Meridian, Mississippi, \$270,000.
Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina, \$754,000.
Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$7,372,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$929,000.
Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,770,000.
Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tennessee, \$262,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$90,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$323,000.
Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$3,161,000.
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$2,386,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$447,000.
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, \$1,557,000.
Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, \$137,000.
Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, \$15,092,000.
Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$4,116,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$8,557,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, \$1,886,000.

Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$2,878,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, \$1,349,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$714,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, \$4,716,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, \$1,338,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, \$394,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Francisco, California, \$155,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington, \$2,677,000.

Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington, \$2,496,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$3,294,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii, \$2,202,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$78,000.

Fleet Submarine Training Facility, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$501,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$6,267,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, \$516,000.

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$9,025,000.

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska, \$2,400,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, \$4,434,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$1,783,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$2,610,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$3,607,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$3,364,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$2,417,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, \$1,444,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$2,261,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$678,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California, \$593,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$8,944,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, \$838,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana, California, \$908,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, \$1,497,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twenty-Nine Palms, California, \$6,653,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe, Hawaii, \$2,455,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Naval and Marine Corps Installations: Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$15,474,000.

Various Naval and Marine Corps Installations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$12,883,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, \$3,579,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$4,473,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communications Station, Balboa, Canal Zone, \$200,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone, \$516,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Facility, Grand Turk, West Indies, \$418,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$5,800,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Security Group Activity, Todendorf, Germany, \$377,000.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, \$981,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$4,794,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, \$75,000.

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$12,398,000.

Naval Communication Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,823,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$993,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$3,385,000.

Naval Communication Station, Yokosuka, Japan, \$258,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$1,892,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, \$1,280,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Naval Installations: Air Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$488,000.

Various Naval Installations: Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, \$7,412,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified Navy installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of \$3,733,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occa-

sioned by (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1972, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, strike out "\$1,225,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,825,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802, "\$239,082,000" and "\$245,947,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$239,682,000" and "\$246,547,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, strike out "\$303,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,056,000".

(2) With respect to Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$6,094,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,170,000".

(b) Public Law 91-142, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$276,794,000" and "\$311,848,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$279,623,000" and "\$314,677,000", respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 91-511 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, strike out "\$159,000" and insert in place thereof "\$249,000".

(2) With respect to Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, strike out "\$112,000" and insert in place thereof "\$210,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$245,930,000" and "\$268,898,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$246,118,000" and "\$269,086,000", respectively.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title II? There being no amendments to title II, the Clerk will read title III.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$1,453,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$1,019,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, \$782,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$16,930,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$11,024,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$727,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,476,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$9,404,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$11,760,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$11,427,000.

Various location, \$275,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$1,244,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$1,468,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$3,048,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$4,248,000.

Space and Missile Test Center, Lompoc, California, \$84,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$323,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$2,900,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$2,564,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas, \$78,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$579,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$8,435,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$1,165,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$865,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$2,522,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$7,478,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$1,639,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska, \$441,000.

Various Locations, \$1,092,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$2,013,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$7,185,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, \$369,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston,

South Carolina, \$2,347,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$3,391,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, \$1,556,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$1,004,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, \$2,016,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$665,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, \$1,299,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$1,937,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, \$1,348,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$522,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, \$100,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, \$5,703,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$1,306,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington, \$104,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, \$514,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$95,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$1,431,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine, \$1,980,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$1,564,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$1,640,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$77,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$128,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California, \$925,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, \$456,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, \$440,000.

Various Locations, \$928,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas, \$2,151,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$290,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$547,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$7,067,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, \$1,421,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$1,968,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$150,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona, \$2,292,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$1,156,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$232,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, \$2,060,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$446,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$925,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, \$1,473,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$434,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE
Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, \$2,200,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$15,220,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$7,820,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$2,017,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Philippine Islands, \$129,000.

Ryukyu Islands, \$1,388,000.

Korea, \$478,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, \$850,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$1,254,000.

United Kingdom, \$962,000.

Various Locations, \$996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE
Japan, \$1,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$985,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$11,985,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force or his designees, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1972, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 301 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, New Mexico, strike out "\$3,167,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,410,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$162,287,000" and "\$491,969,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$162,530,000" and "\$492,212,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amend-

ed, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "Military Airlift Command" with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out "\$6,047,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,946,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 802 "\$314,578,000" and "\$400,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "315,477,000" and \$401,849,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 91-511 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command" with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$134,000" and insert in place thereof "\$330,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$191,937,000" and "\$256,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$192,133,000" and "\$256,385,000", respectively.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAUNTROY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAUNTROY: On page 21, strike out lines 9 and 10.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that would delete from the military construction bill a \$7.2 million authorization for the construction of additional military facilities at Bolling Air Force Base. This authorization follows on the heels of an authorization last year of a "little Pentagon" at Bolling Air Force Base that will ultimately cost the taxpayers an incredible \$133.2 million. Fortunately, Congress had the good sense to defer appropriating funds for this undertaking, pending further study of the project. I urge you to show that same good sense now by deleting this authorization for further military construction at Bolling until such time as there are assurances that the entire site will be developed in a balanced fashion so as to meet not only the Federal Government's need for office facilities but also the District of Columbia's need for jobs, economic development, and housing.

Bolling Air Force Base has not been fully operational for several years now. The base is located in the Anacostia section of the city, an area with some of the worst housing and unemployment problems that can be found anywhere. The site is one of the few large tracts of undeveloped land remaining within the District of Columbia, and it offers an unparalleled opportunity for construction of a "new town" within the very boundaries of the city, a chance for new housing and economic growth designed to meet the needs of the people of the city generally and of the long-suffering residents of the Anacostia area in particular.

In the military authorization bill for

1970, Congress specified that Bolling Air Force Base would be kept under military control until 1975. In signing the bill, President Nixon expressed concern with the "provision in the bill which prohibits disposal of any part of the Bolling-Anacostia complex before January 1, 1975." The President noted that the Defense Department was reviewing its need for facilities in the Washington metropolitan area, and he asked that the study specifically consider the Bolling-Anacostia complex. As far as I have been able to determine, that study has not yet been submitted to the President. If it has been given to the President, I think the Congress should have an opportunity to see it before approving this authorization.

I think that there is a great deal at stake today as you decide whether to authorize funds for further military construction at the air base. For many years now, the District government, the National Capital Planning Commission, and community organizations around the city, with the encouragement of the Federal Government, have been actively planning for civilian use of a portion of the facility for more housing and for economic development. The National Capital Planning Commission has developed a detailed plan for a portion of the Bolling-Anacostia site that could result in the building of 8,000 units of housing for all income levels. This could mean decent living conditions for over 30,000 people, many of whom now must endure slum conditions. In addition, the NCPCC plans call for shopping centers and other job opportunities so that an economic base can be established for this area of the city. In this way, millions of dollars can each year be added to the city's tax roles to finance the education, day care, health, and public safety programs that this city so desperately needs. There is enough room for both military use and the city's requirements. It is not a matter of one excluding the other. Both can exist side by side, but only if very careful planning is done. There are 920 acres of land at Bolling-Anacostia, only 416 of which would be needed for the creation of this "new town." This is not a planner's pipedream, but something that could come about in time for the bicentennial celebration, something that could serve as the model for the Nation.

There is real danger, however. The authorization contained in this bill, combined with the "little Pentagon," threaten to preempt Bolling-Anacostia for exclusive military use. This would place in jeopardy the years of effort to use this important facility to provide a decent environment and new job opportunities for thousands of people in this city. We have talked much about reordering our national priorities to stress the social needs of our people. My amendment provides us with the opportunity to strike the balance in this case for the human needs of our society.

In short, what I am asking you to do in deleting this authorization for Bolling Air Force Base is to freeze the present situation until Congress and the com-

mittee have an opportunity to assess the conflicting claims for the use of land available at the base. The great danger is that if we move forward in a piecemeal fashion, approving one military authorization after another at the base, we will lose all opportunity to reconcile the military's needs with the city's pressing needs, and this would be a tragedy. I urge your support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, you will note that when the vote is taken that one voice will not be raised in support of this amendment, and that will be the voice of myself because I do not enjoy the privilege of having a vote on the floor of the House. So I hope that this body, in addition to supporting this amendment that I have offered, will consider providing me a vote to go along with my voice.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

The gentleman from the District of Columbia seems to have been misinformed as to the situation at Bolling Air Force Base, because under the law nothing can be done, not of a military nature, at Bolling Air Force Base, and no portion of the Bolling-Anacostia complex can be disposed of for any purpose until 1975. That is the law. So this question becomes a moot question, but even if it were not a moot question I would oppose it. Authorization was given last year for the construction of what is known as a little Pentagon on part of the site at Bolling. The Bolling-Anacostia complex is being used every day of the week, and is being reserved for military use.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) and ask that it be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read title IV.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$662,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Automatic Addressing System Office, Dayton, Ohio, \$143,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,569,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$487,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$136,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$1,452,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy Annex, Stockton, California, \$100,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, \$432,000.

Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$541,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$134,000.

DSA Subsistence Regional Headquarters, Alameda, California, \$268,000.

Air pollution abatement, various locations, \$1,317,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,638,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title IV? If not, the Clerk will read title V.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand one hundred forty units, \$51,920,000:

Fort Carson, Colorado, two hundred units.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, two hundred units.

U.S. Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, three hundred units.

Malmstrom ABM Site, Montana, two hundred fifteen units.

Camp Drum, New York, eighty-eight units.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred fifty units.

Grand Forks ABM Site, North Dakota, two hundred fifteen units.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, sixty units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, three hundred units.

Fort Hood, Texas, four hundred twelve units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four thousand four hundred seventy-nine units, \$106,417,000:

Naval Complex, East Bay, San Francisco, California, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Long Beach, California, three hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, three hundred twenty-five units.

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, six hundred units.

Naval Complex, District of Columbia, one hundred fifty units.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, three hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, four units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, one hundred thirty units.

U.S. Naval Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, four hundred units.

Naval Complex, Warminster, Pennsylvania, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, two hundred eighty units.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, one hundred units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, seven hundred forty units.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, two hundred fifty units.

Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, three thousand seven hundred thirty units, \$85,790,000:

Beale Air Force Base, California, two hundred units.

U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado, two hundred units.

Ent-Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, two hundred fifty units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, three hundred units.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, four hundred units.

Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, one hundred sixty units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, four hundred fifty units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, three hundred units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, two hundred twenty units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, two hundred fifty units.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, five hundred units.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, five hundred units.

(b) Trailer Court Facilities—

(1) The Department of the Navy, one thousand five hundred spaces, \$4,500,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, eight hundred fifty spaces, \$2,780,000.

Sec. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed \$23,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$40,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$32,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

Sec. 503. Section 401(a)(3) of Public Law 91-441 (84 Stat. 905, 909), is amended by striking out "\$8,800,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$9,200,000".

Sec. 504. Within the limitations contained in sections 501 and 502 of this Act, the Department of the Air Force is authorized to construct 250 units of family housing at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida at a cost of \$5,250,000. This authorization shall be funded from previously authorized, but unused appropriations for family housing.

Sec. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) for the Department of the Army, \$10,367,000.

(b) for the Department of the Navy, \$8,271,000.

(c) for the Department of the Air Force, \$13,825,000.

(d) for the Defense Agencies, \$205,000.

Sec. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, or otherwise acquire, four family housing units in foreign countries at a total cost not to exceed \$106,000. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land and interests in land, and shall be limited to such projects as may be funded by use of excess foreign currencies when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

Sec. 507. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352) as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1971 and 1972" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1972 and 1973", (2) striking out "seven thousand five hundred" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ten thousand", and (3) striking out "\$190" and "\$250" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200" and "275", respectively.

Sec. 508. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326) as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1971 and 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972 and 1973", and (2) striking out "\$185" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$210".

Sec. 509. (a) Sections 4774(f), and 9774(f) of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows: "(f) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at any installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units or five-bedroom units for enlisted men is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of not more than one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet, and one thousand four hundred square feet respectively."

(b) Section 7574(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee,

determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at any installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units or five-bedroom units for enlisted men is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of not more than one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet, and one thousand four hundred square feet respectively."

(c) Sections 4774(g), 7574(e), and 9774(g), of title 10, United States Code, are amended by inserting "or five-bedroom units" after "four-bedroom units".

Sec. 510. (a) Chapter 449 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by repealing section 4775 and by striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(b) Chapter 949 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by repealing section 9775 and by striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

Sec. 511. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$10,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 305), as amended, for the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, five units, \$125,000.

Sec. 512. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$285,200,000; and,

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$633,212,000.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title V? If not, the Clerk will read title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

Sec. 601. In accordance with subsection 1013(i) of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1292) there is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 1013 of Public Law 89-754, including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$7,575,000.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title VI? If not, the Clerk will read title VII.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$527,720,000; outside the United States, \$38,210,000; or a total of \$565,930,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$263,841,000; outside the United States, \$51,142,000; section 202, \$3,733,000; or a total of \$318,716,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$199,758,000; outside the United States, \$10,556,000; section 302, \$11,985,000; or a total of \$222,299,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$19,879,000,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, \$918,412,000.

(6) for title VI: Homeowners assistance, \$7,575,000.

SEC. 703. Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based on bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written

report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

SEC. 704. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction, supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress, shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 705. (a) As of October 1, 1972, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of the Act of October 26, 1970, Public Law 91-511 (84 Stat. 1204), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before October 27, 1970, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisitions, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations, in whole or

in part before October 1, 1972, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605(a) of the Act of October 26, 1970, Public Law 91-511 (84 Stat. 1204, 1223), authorization for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1973:

(a) utilities in the amount of \$2,874,000 at Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island, that is contained in title II, section 201, of the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 373); and

(4) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605(a) of the Act of October 26, 1970, Public Law 91-511 (84 Stat. 1204, 1223), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1973:

(a) Utilities in the amount of \$288,000 at Fort Hancock, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of December 5, 1969 (83 Stat. 293), as amended.

(b) Utilities in the amount of \$545,000 at Fort Wadsworth, New York, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of December 5, 1969 (83 Stat. 293), as amended.

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date; and

(2) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date; and

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provision of section 605(b) of the Act of October 26, 1970, Public Law 91-511 (84 Stat. 1204, 1223), authorizations contained in section 401 of the Act of October 7, 1970, Public Law 91-441 (84 Stat. 905, 909) for the following items which shall remain in effect until fifteen months from the date of this Act:

(a) two hundred family housing units at Malmstrom ABM Site, Montana.

(b) two hundred family housing units at Grand Forks ABM Site, North Dakota.

SEC. 706. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction cost index is 1.0:

(1) \$3,200 per man for permanent barracks;

(2) \$11,000 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, that notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 707. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2674(a) is amended by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof "or for a project which the Secretary

of a military department determines will, within three years following completion of the project, result in savings in maintenance and operation costs in excess of the cost of the project".

(2) The catchline and text of section 2672, and the corresponding item in the analysis are amended by striking out "\$25,000" wherever it appears and inserting in place thereof "\$50,000".

(3) Section 2672 is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "The authority to acquire an interest in land under this section includes authority to make surveys and acquire interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of land owned by the United States, or otherwise."

(4) Section 2677(b) is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

(5) Section 2682 is amended by deleting subsection (a) (3) and inserting in its place the following new subsection:

"(3) A lease or license of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual fair market rental value of the property is more than \$50,000."

SEC. 708. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Camp Pendleton, California, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

SEC. 709. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII, of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1972".

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VII 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HÉBERT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the committee has sent to the desk a technical amendment, which I offer at this time. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: On page 40, line 14, strike out the figure "\$19,879,000,000." and insert in lieu thereof "\$19,879,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed to title VII? If not, the Clerk will read title VIII. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 801. Subject to Chapter 133 of Title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

- (1) For the Department of the Army:
 - (a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$25,686,000.
 - (b) Army Reserve, \$30,300,000.
- (2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$10,090,000.
- (3) For the Department of the Air Force:
 - (a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$9,000,000.
 - (b) Air Force Reserve, \$5,250,000.

SEC. 802. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this Title without regard to Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and Sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of Title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, plan-

ning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under Section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 803. This Title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1972."

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VIII 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title VIII?

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

Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent and that is the purpose of my rising really—unanimous consent to return to title II of this bill because at the time when this bill was up on title II there was a confusion on the floor, not the fault of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO)—and he has an amendment to offer to this bill. I am going to oppose the amendment, but I feel honor bound to ask unanimous consent to go back and consider it because of the fact that if there had not been this confusion in which I was partly involved, I do not think he would have missed having this opportunity.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, 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. 9844) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 555, 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.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 359, nays 31, not voting 43, as follows:

Abbutt	Dwyer	McCollister
Abernethy	Eckhardt	McCormack
Abourezk	Edmondson	McDade
Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	McDonald,
Anderson,	Ellberg	Mich.
Calif.	Erlenborn	McEwen
Anderson, Ill.	Esch	McFall
Andrews, Ala.	Eshleman	McKevitt
Andrews,	Evans, Colo.	McMillan
N. Dak.	Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald,
Annunzio	Fascell	Mass.
Archer	Findley	Madden
Arends	Fish	Mahon
Ashbrook	Fisher	Mailliard
Ashley	Flood	Mann
Aspin	Flowers	Martin
Aspinall	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Baker	Foley	Mills, Ark.
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga
Begich	Ford,	Mazzoli
Belcher	William D.	Meeds
Bell	Forsythe	Metcalfe
Bennett	Fountain	Michel
Bergland	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.
Betis	Prenzel	Mills, Ark.
Bevill	Frey	Mills, Md.
Biaggi	Fulton, Pa.	Minish
Bieber	Fulton, Tenn.	Mink
Blackburn	Fuqua	Minshall
Blatnik	Gallianakis	Mizell
Boggs	Gallagher	Mollohan
Boland	Garmatz	Monagan
Bolling	Gaydos	Montgomery
Bow	Gettys	Moorhead
Brademas	Ghalmo	Morgan
Brasco	Gibbons	Morse
Bray	Gonzalez	Mosher
Brinkley	Goodling	Moss
Brooks	Grasso	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Gray	Myers
Brotzman	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Brown, Mich.	Griffin	Nelsen
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Nichols
Broyhill, N.C.	Gross	O'Beay
Broyhill, Va.	Grover	O'Hara
Buchanan	Gubser	O'Konski
Burke, Fla.	Gude	O'Neill
Burke, Mass.	Hagan	Passman
Burleson, Tex.	Haley	Patman
Burlison, Mo.	Hall	Fatten
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Pelly
Byrnes, Wis.	Hamilton	Perkins
Byron	Hammer-	Pettis
Cabell	schmidt	Peyser
Camp	Hanley	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Harrington	Pike
Carney	Harsha	Pirnie
Carter	Harvey	Poage
Casey, Tex.	Hastings	Poyer, N.C.
Cederberg	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Celler	Hays	Price, Tex.
Chamberlain	Hébert	Pucinski
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Purcell
Clancy	Henderson	Quie
Clark	Hicks, Mass.	Quillen
Clausen,	Hicks, Wash.	Randall
Don H.	Hillis	Rarick
Clawson, Del.	Hogan	Reid, Ill.
Cleveland	Holifield	Reid, N.Y.
Collier	Horton	Rhodes
Collins, Ill.	Howard	Riegle
Collins, Tex.	Hull	Roberts
Colmer	Hunt	Robinson, Va.
Conable	Hutchinson	Robison, N.Y.
Conte	Ichord	Rodino
Corman	Jacobs	Roe
Cotter	Jarman	Rogers
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Roncallo
Crane	Johnson, Pa.	Rooney, N.Y.
Culver	Jonas	Rooney, Pa.
Daniel, Va.	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, N.C.	Roush
Danielson	Karth	Rousselot
Davis, Ga.	Kazen	Roy
Davis, S.C.	Keating	Roybal
Davis, Wis.	Kee	Runnels
Delaney	Keith	Ruppe
Dellenback	King	Ruth
Denholm	Kluczynski	St Germain
Dennis	Koch	Sandman
Dent	Kyl	Sarbanes
Derwinski	Landgrebe	Satterfield
Devine	Landrum	Saylor
Dickinson	Latta	Scherle
Dingell	Leggett	Schmitz
Dow	Lennon	Schneebeli
Dowdy	Lent	Schwengel
Downing	Link	Scott
Drinan	Lloyd	Sebelius
Dulski	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Duncan	McClory	Shipley
du Pont	McClure	Shoup

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—359

Shriver	Stratton	Watts
Sikes	Stubblefield	Whalen
Sisk	Stuckey	Whalley
Skubitz	Sullivan	White
Slack	Symington	Whitehurst
Smith, Calif.	Talcott	Whitten
Smith, Iowa	Taylor	Whidnall
Snyder	Teague, Calif.	Wiggins
Spence	Terry	Williams
Springer	Thompson, Ga.	Wilson,
Stafford	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H.
Staggers	Thone	Winn
Stanton.	Tiernan	Wolf
J. William	Udall	Wright
Stanton,	Ullman	Wyatt
James V.	Vander Jagt	Wylder
Steed	Veysey	Wylle
Steele	Vigorito	Young, Fla.
Steiger, Ariz.	Waggonner	Young, Tex.
Steiger, Wis.	Wampler	Zablocki
Stephens	Ware	Zion

NAYS—31

Abzug	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Badillo	Helstoski	Ryan
Barrett	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Bingham	Mikva	Stokes
Burton	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Clay	Nedzi	Vanik
Conyers	Nix	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Podell	Yates
Fraser	Rangel	Zwach
Green, Pa.	Rees	
Hawkins	Reuss	

NOT VOTING—43

Adams	Hansen, Idaho	Mayne
Alexander	Hansen, Wash.	Melcher
Anderson,	Hosmer	Mitchell
Tenn.	Hungate	Murphy, N.Y.
Blanton	Jones, Tenn.	Pepper
Caffery	Kemp	Powell
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Pryor, Ark.
de la Garza	Kyros	Railsback
Dellums	Long, La.	Smith, N.Y.
Diggs	Lujan	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	McCloskey	Van Deerlin
Dorn	McCulloch	Willson, Bob
Edwards, La.	McKay	Wyman
Goldwater	McKinney	Yatron
Hanna	Mathias, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Mayne.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Kemp.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Railsback.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McKay.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. de la Garza.
 Mr. Donohue with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Dellums.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Mitchell.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Powell.

Messrs. HAWKINS, BARRETT, and HECHLER of West Virginia changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution designating the week of August 1, 1971, as "American Trial Lawyers Week."

The message also 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. 9667. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation 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. 9667) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9667, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9667) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies 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 California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McFALL, BOLAND, YATES, STEED, MAHON, CONTE, MINSHALL, EDWARDS of Alabama, and Bow.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from

Michigan, we have completed our legislative business for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills scheduled.

The only business scheduled for Monday is House Resolution 538, Veterans' Affairs Committee investigation authority. The program for Monday is very light.

On Tuesday, we will have the Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal year 1972.

On Wednesday, we will have:

H.R. 9092, the pay system for Government prevailing rate employees, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 9922, the Economic Development and Appalachian Acts extension, which is subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday, we will have the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972; and

H.R. 9727, the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act, to be considered under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

On Friday, subject to a rule being granted, we will have H.R. 8432, the emergency loan guarantee fund, more popularly described as the Lockheed bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand there will be no conference reports on Monday?

Mr. BOGGS. My information is there will not be conference reports on Monday, and probably there will be a conference report on Tuesday, and conference reports as well as privileged resolutions, will be in order the 4 latter days of the week. Also, any further program will be announced later.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why there is only one small piece of legislation, as there appears to be, on Monday. Is there something of an earth-shaking event I am unaware of that precludes the taking up of a conference report if it is available and moving up the prevailing wage bill or something of that sort on Monday, rather than having a session on Friday of next week?

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the distinguished gentleman, Friday is the regularly scheduled Friday for us to meet. We meet on the first and third Fridays, as the gentleman knows. On Monday there has been some consideration given to what might be considered as an earth-shaking event; namely, the space shot in Florida. A great many Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed a desire to be there. NASA has invited them to go, and I hope all of them can go.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, that helps at least to some extent to explain.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 26

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"MOON WALK," SPACE PROGRAM HAILED IN ST. PETERSBURG

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 20, the second anniversary of man's first historic walk on the moon, leading citizens of St. Petersburg and Pinellas County, Fla., gathered at the Commerce Club for a celebration of that great event and the other progressive accomplishments of the Nation's space program.

This was entirely fitting since some 2,800 citizens of the Tampa Bay area contributed significantly to the success of that famed "moon walk"—and also to every other major step in America's progress in space from the first Explorer missions to Apollo 15, which will be launched on July 26.

These men and women, many of whom are my constituents, are employees of the Aerospace Division of Honeywell, Inc., located in the St. Petersburg area, and controls produced by Honeywell personnel will guide the Apollo 15 craft when it sets down on the moon on July 30.

Their contribution to future developments in the space program will be increased by the imminent transfer and relocation of Honeywell's 170-man space-science team from company headquarters in Minneapolis to the facilities in my district.

A highlight of Tuesday's observance was the unveiling of a unique exhibit produced by Honeywell personnel. It is an 8-foot "Talking Tower" with three striking color panels that revolve while the recorded story of the heritage, benefits, and problems of the U.S. space program is broadcast.

The exhibit will tell its story throughout the Tampa Bay area for the next month—at the Honeywell facilities, shopping centers, and schools—and I would like to share its inspiring message with you and my colleagues:

**FOR ALL MANKIND
"OUR HERITAGE"**

Ours is a heritage of exploration . . . drawn from men with the courage and determination to know the unknown . . . We've sailed the seas with Columbus; crossed the mountains with Daniel Boone and withstood the dangers of the prairies. We opened the West with the "iron horse," and gave man his wings with Wilbur and Orville Wright.

Science is our lifetime; the blood of George Washington Carver, Thomas Edison, Robert Goddard and Albert Einstein flows through our veins. We've shared the loneliness of Charles Lindbergh as he flew the Atlantic . . . and the excitement of John Glenn when he took America's first view from earth orbit.

Our charter has been . . . and remains . . . to use space "for all mankind . . ."

"OUR REWARDS"

In boldly meeting the challenges of space . . . we've produced a bold, new world. Its dividends span the fields of engineering, medicine, communications, environmental sciences, astronomy, geology . . . and even to everyday household products. On July 20th, 1969, Neil Armstrong's first historic step on the Moon freed us as creatures of a single planet . . .

While Project Apollo unlocks the secrets of the Moon, Mariner is erasing the mysteries of Mars. And, our Earth has become smaller.

Communications satellites bring continents and people closer together. Weather satellites, increasing the accuracy of forecasts, saved 50,000 people during Hurricane Camille. We've learned that we can see our earth and our universe far better from space than from the earth itself.

Gemini astronauts mapped 80 per cent of Peru in less than 3 minutes—a task that hadn't been completed after 40 years of earth-bound effort. Meanwhile, unmanned probes are finding answers to questions that have baffled scientists for generations.

AN UNCERTAIN FUTURE

Today America faces the challenge of continued leadership in space, and the crucial decisions needed if we are to reap the harvest of the seeds already planted.

The future, however, is far from certain. Our space program itself is in jeopardy.

Drastic reductions in funding have taken their toll. The last Apollo manned mission comes in 1972 . . . to be followed only by the flight of the Skylab Space Laboratory in '73. America has no other manned space flights scheduled until '78—and then only if the space shuttle is approved. Unmanned programs have also been curtailed. Now we must decide if we'll go forward to pursue the exciting and tremendously rewarding projects that lie ahead.

Space shuttle, which takes off like a rocket and lands like a jetliner, promises to bring space down to earth. With shuttle, we will realize vast savings in the cost of building and launching communications, weather and earth resources satellites.

Skylab and other earth resources programs, with orbiting infrared scanners will permit scientists to see things not visible to the human eye on earth. They'll detect on spills, water pollution and crop diseases and will inventory and help control our dwindling supply of natural resources.

Late in this decade, two electronic explorers can take advantage of a once in a lifetime alignment of the planets and make an 11-year unmanned grand tour of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune and Pluto.

Networks of communications satellites could break the bondage of global illiteracy. A permanent American space station will allow man to live almost indefinitely in space.

The success of our space program belongs to neither the scientists the astronauts nor the government-industry team that made the gigantic undertaking possible . . . but to you . . . the American citizen.

Your courage, your determination, your wisdom has made it possible for America to reach into the unknown . . . the decision to continue to use space "For All Mankind"—is in your hands.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE ON KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable coincidence that in this morning's Washington Post on page A22 the Associated Press dispatch from Tel Aviv dated July 21, 1971 stated that a former Polish citizen now living in Israel claimed that he had talked with several Russian soldiers who took part in the Katyn Massacre of 10,000 Polish officers during World War II.

Abraham Vidra, 64, of Haifa stated that a Soviet major named Joshua Sorokin later told him he was sent to supervise the departure of the Poles from the camp to the massacre site in the Katyn Forest.

On Tuesday in commemorating Captive Nations Week, and along with my remarks made on the floor of the House, I included therein a verbatim copy of the conclusions and recommendations made by the special committee created by Congress in 1951 to investigate this international crime. The findings which I inserted in the RECORD can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 20, 1971, page 26256. The dispatch in this morning's paper from Tel Aviv is a continuation of the avalanche of testimony our committee gathered conclusively connecting Stalin and the Soviet leaders with the massacre of approximately 15,000 Polish leaders in the winter of 1939-40.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include with my remarks the article from today's July 22, 1971 Washington Post:

MASSACRE AT KATYN DESCRIBED

TEL AVIV.—A former Polish citizen now living in Israel claimed today that he had talked with several Russian soldiers who took part in the Katyn massacre of 10,000 Polish officers during World War II.

Abraham Vidra, 64, of Haifa told the newspaper Marav that he knew at least two Soviet soldiers involved in the massacre in the Katyn forest near the Russian town of Smolensk.

Who did the killing has been in dispute for nearly three decades. The U.S. Congress conducted an inquiry and concluded the Soviet government ordered the massacre.

The Soviets say the Nazis were behind it, but they have refused to allow an international, on-the-spot investigation.

The case first came to light in 1943 when the Nazi occupation force announced discovery of a mass grave in the forest.

Vidra claimed he had kept his story secret for 30 years because of a promise to a Soviet Jewish officer.

This is the story he told Marav:

In 1939, the Red Army occupied East Poland and captured thousands of Polish troops. They were sent to several prison camps, including one at Starobelsk, in the eastern Ukraine. Vidra, who had been arrested for "Zionist activities," also was interned at Starobelsk.

At the end of 1940, 10,000 Polish officers were taken from the camp and were never seen again.

At that time Vidra became friends with a Soviet Jewish major named Joshua Sorokin, who was sent to supervise the third and last departure of the Poles from the camp.

After he returned, Sorokin told Vidra that the Polish officers had been shot in the forests of Smolensk.

"What my eyes saw, the world will not believe," he told Vidra.

Vidra was transferred in February 1941 to Talitza, in the Ural Mountains, where his job was to break in new prisoners. Two arrivals with Russian names, Lts. Alexander Suslov and Samyun Tichonov, "behaved in a peculiar way, unlike the other inmates . . . and no one knew why they were imprisoned at Talitza." Vidra was ordered to keep them away from the other prisoners.

One day Suslov, sobbing, told him: "I want to tell you my life. Tichonov and me, we're the most miserable people in the world.

"I killed the Polaks with my own hands. I shot them myself." Suslov became hysterical. He said some of the Russian soldiers ordered to kill the Poles. They committed suicide instead and threw themselves into the mass grave. The other executioners were quickly dispersed around Russia.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow one of our Members will celebrate a historic occasion, a most important time of the year for him, namely, his birthday.

This is normally the time when some men at this ripe age may even be considering retiring. But obviously this gentleman is in the greatest of health. He is full of charm and ability and some bluster, but obviously he is one of the biggest-hearted and one of the best men in the Congress. I refer to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who walks tall and stands tall, like some Texans, but he is one of the really great Members of the House. I think we ought to observe the fact that "Big JOHN" SAYLOR will be celebrating his birthday tomorrow.

OBSCENE MAIL CATEGORY FOR MINORS

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 7, while I was on official business with a delegation from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, this body approved legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to sell, deliver, or distribute obscene matter to those under the age of 17. As a cosponsor of this bill, I regret that I was unable to be present during the debate on the measure. I applaud the action of this body in its overwhelming approval of H.R. 8805 by a vote of 356 to 25.

It remains now for our colleagues in the other body to follow through with action on this legislation. Last year, similar legislation received favorable action here, but was allowed to die in the other body.

The bill which the Post Office and Civil

Service Committee, on which I serve, offered for the approval of our colleagues this year differs only slightly from last year's legislation. The main thrust of the bill remains the same. It would create a category of nonmailable obscene matter with respect to minors; yet, for the first time in law, this legislation would define the term "obscene." The definition of "obscenity" incorporated in the legislation is substantially that proposed by the minority on the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

Mr. Speaker, the traffic in obscenity and pornography is a matter of national concern. I, and my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, are often queried by our colleagues in the House about our response to this widespread problem.

For this reason, I am pleased that we were able to bring to this Chamber H.R. 8805, which is sound legislation to protect minors from obscene mail. However, I feel an even greater sense of satisfaction to learn that the enactment of the postal reorganization bill, which I cosponsored during the last Congress, has resulted in a sharp drop in mail customer complaints about obscenity in the mails. Recent testimony from postal officials indicates complaints have been reduced by over 40 percent.

In addition, the General Counsel of the newly established Postal Service recently said that 37 dealers in obscenity were indicted for violations of Federal statutes during 1969, with 10 convictions during the same period. In 1970, 14 dealers were convicted and 71 indictments were returned.

Some progress, then, is certainly being made in the fight against the use of the mails to purvey pornography. The action of the House on July 7 is testimony to our concern about the problem. Hopefully, our colleagues in the other body will act accordingly, at the earliest opportunity.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PREVENT STRIKES IN RAILWAY INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been guilty of dragging its feet by neglecting to consider legislation to deal with crippling strikes in the railway industry. Thus, once again, the Nation is faced with a crisis in its railway system, with the prospect of vast unemployment looming ominously over the economic horizon. The United Transportation Union has effected a strike against the Southern Railway and the Union Pacific Railroad and although it is at present a regional shutdown, it will have just as disastrous results for these areas of the Nation as would a national strike.

If this were the first such emergency facing the Nation, lack of permanent legislation could be condoned. However, eight times since 1963, the Congress has

been forced—out of necessity—to take temporary emergency measures to keep our railways in operation. Congress should have learned long ago that these temporary solutions do not work and it is more than regrettable that we have not yet formulated an effective permanent measure to settle such disputes. The present strike has been restricted to the beginning stages of the southern and western portions of the country but this geographic limit should not be a deterrent to immediate and positive legislative action to avoid the hurried, last-minute preventive measures the Congress has enacted in the past.

The necessity for permanent legislation in this field cannot be overstressed, and the effect of the stoppage of one of the biggest links in our transportation system on our economy cannot be underestimated. A look at the entire industry shows that American railroads operate 207,000 miles of line serving more than 50,000 communities—moving more than 41 percent of the Nation's intercity freight. The railroads form a vital link for many industries, providing the bulk of such raw materials as lumber, chemicals, steel and paper. A stoppage of this transportation artery for only one week would result in losses to economic output representing 5.8 percent of the gross national product. Unemployment and a shorter work week are inevitably the result of these strikes. Industrial activity is just now picking up from last year's downturn. Business conditions are showing signs of definite improvement and to permit a strike like this to affect wages, working hours and employment is to jeopardize the important gains that have been made over the past year.

Recognition of the disastrous economic impact of a transportation strike has been widely accepted. Unfortunately, the appropriate legal measures to prevent them have not. Two laws, the Taft-Hartley and the Railway Labor Act, currently provide the President with authority to forestall labor disputes before they threaten the national economy. Neither provides the mechanism that will guarantee a settlement. Under the Railway Labor Act, the President is able to postpone a strike for 60 days. The present strike had its beginnings last year and the President used his powers at that time to divert a national emergency but he no longer has legal authority to stop the strike. He can appoint an Emergency Board to hold hearings and recommend a compromise settlement and this has been done. However, one of the parties did not accept the compromise offer. The President can also call on the National Mediation Service to work with both parties in an attempt to encourage bargaining sessions to effect a voluntary settlement. The Mediation Service has been working around the clock to get the current disputing parties to agree. As this strike has so dramatically emphasized, the President has only limited authority under existing laws to deal with strikes that affect the national interest.

The ineffectiveness of this kind of procedure is evidenced by the number of

times a transportation crisis has been thrown into the lap of the Congress, which has hastily and temporarily terminated the strike, only to repeat the procedure several months later. The Congress has already acted three times during this past year to avert a national shutdown, the last two cases going beyond the cooling-off period. The present work stoppage is but a continuation of the strike disputes that the Congress considered last year and only temporarily resolved.

The President, by special message to the Congress, has been urging that the Congress pass new laws to eliminate the need for congressional action in railway disputes. All we have seen from the Congress in response to this plea is inaction and indecisive solutions. Just in the past months, the Nation has witnessed several threatened strikes which have emphasized the need for immediate action. On March 4, 1970, a possible nationwide rail strike was averted only hours before 48,000 workers were to walk off their jobs on March 5. Again, on December 10, 1970, a last-minute congressional compromise halted a rail strike at 2:10 a.m. And most recently, a 2-day strike was ended May 18, 1971, when President Nixon signed a strike ban, directing striking signalman to return to work.

In the last two instances, the Congress went far beyond extending the cooling-off period by law to permit the two sides to reach a voluntary settlement. In addition, the Congress has entered one side of the dispute by granting a pay increase by law. I feel that this is a highly questionable position for the Congress to take and will make it more difficult for normal collective bargaining to take place. The Congress has continually found itself at the bargaining table because it has refused to provide the guidelines these disputes need to encourage their fair solution.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has scheduled hearings on July 27. Congressional action on these bills pending before Congress, however, should have been started long before this stage. What is most desperately needed, and I cannot reiterate this need strongly enough, is meaningful, permanent legislation which would give the President the flexibility he does not now possess to settle these crippling disputes. Many Members, including myself, have introduced legislation to this effect, and we must now set the legislative machinery in motion to find an equitable and effective method of settlement so that we will not have the specter of the shorter work-week and unemployment hanging over us or be forced into future temporary decisions by our own default.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial comment from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1971]

CONGRESS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The railroad strike now under way and its threatened expansion ought to make it crystal clear that the time for Congress to completely overhaul the nation's labor laws is long past. A national rail strike—or a national strike in any of the other transportation industries—is intolerable. Yet the exper-

ience of the last few years has demonstrated conclusively that there is nothing in the existing labor laws that can produce a satisfactory settlement in such complex situations before a strike, or, for that matter, once a strike begins.

Talking about this in London the other day, Secretary of Labor Hodgson said, quite rightly that the real question is whether free collective bargaining can survive. Some semblance of collective bargaining was maintained in the rail industry as long as there was fear on both sides of the table of what kind of settlement Congress might impose if no agreement was reached and a state of national emergency occurred. But that fear has diminished with each congressional intervention and now seems to have disappeared since Congress has never done more than merely put off to another year the really tough questions in these negotiations.

We think that Congress should realize that it has only two options left in dealing with labor problems that can lead to strikes which are unacceptable because of the harm they would do to the national economy. One is to set itself up with the tools necessary to become a fair and final arbitrator. The other is to invent some new mechanisms which can breathe life into collective bargaining in industries, like the railroads, where it is almost dead.

The administration's proposals, which have been before Congress for more than a year, strike us more likely to achieve that latter purpose than anything else now in sight. The most interesting and perhaps the most useful of these is the "final offer selection" option which the President could invoke in transportation emergency situations. Under this proposal, the President would appoint a board which would decide, after hearings, which final offer submitted by management or labor would compromise the contract. The effect of this would be to force management and labor closer together—perhaps close enough to reach agreement themselves—by posing the threat that one side or the other would lose everything because its final offer was unreasonable.

Such a device would not only provide a way out of the current railroad mess but might have provided a way through which the problems would have been settled across the negotiating table. It seems unlikely that the unions would have been so intransigent on the work rules issues if they had feared that their failure to move on these questions might have led to a contract written precisely as the railroads want it.

The failure of Congress to act on this legislation or on some other alternative is inexcusable. The collapse of collective bargaining as we know it in the railroad industry has been obvious for a long time. If the present strike accomplishes nothing else, it serves to remind the public that Congress is as much to blame for it as the railroads or the unions by its refusal to provide some new mechanism through which these labor disputes can be resolved.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence and that of my colleagues, for I have taken the floor today in order to "slam the barn door after the horse has got out." Fortunately, however, our Founding Fathers so structured the Federal legislative process that there remains another gate he must pass through before this particular horse gets clear away. It is in

hopes of securing that gate in a timely fashion that I rise.

I speak, of course, of welfare reform and the fact that, though the House has already struck out a second time in the statesmanship ballgame by voting for counterfeit reform in the guise of H.R. 1, hearings will soon begin in the other body which regrettably is again saddled with the responsibility for bolting the gate on this vicious throwback.

It is, in my opinion, a gross miscarriage of responsibility that the House has twice voted through a measure so thoroughly repugnant to the very essence of our Federal system.

The very least we can do, those of us who recognize the folly of H.R. 1, is to lend encouragement to those in the other body who will be fighting the odds the House has helped create, as they seek to obtain a fair and impartial hearing for legislation that will truly reform our welfare problems rather than merely confounding them.

To our great good fortune there is a notable alternative already proposed which embodies true and meaningful reform. Thanks to Senator CARL CURTIS of Nebraska, the other body need not content itself this time with a delaying action, nor risk the wrath of the voting public by merely killing H.R. 1. No one even slightly familiar with the present welfare debacle could countenance that.

And therein, perhaps, lies the crux of our failure here in the House to deal decisively with H.R. 1 in the way it deserved. The need for reform has become so obvious and so urgent that there should no longer be any need even to discuss it.

Yet, the response to this apparent and compelling need for reform has been to view anything that bore the label of "reform" as desirable and deserving of prompt enactment. Enhancing this unfortunate reaction was the brief time permitted Members of the House to study the revised version of H.R. 1 after it was reported and the determination with which its proponents ignored alternatives and insisted on debating H.R. 1 entirely in terms of the existing program rather than in terms of its own provisions and merits—or lack of them.

But there is plenty of time for the Senate to examine H.R. 1 and expose it for the cruel hoax that it is. To characterize it as welfare reform is like calling pneumonia a cure for the common cold. Although the Curtis-Duncan alternative had been introduced before the House acted, there was admittedly little time to mobilize sentiment for its consideration. No such handicap faces sincere reformers in the other body.

And that, I believe, is the key. Given the persuasive arguments against H.R. 1 which were fielded in the House debate, it is difficult to believe that any rationale could have led a majority of House Members to support it except the conviction that there was no acceptable alternative.

That is why it is imperative that we now go over and over all the arguments again, this time keeping in mind that a thoroughly viable alternative does exist.

The arguments are myriad, but several I think are persuasive enough in them-

selves to render others superfluous. A recent editorial in the *Richmond Times Dispatch* captured what I feel are the arguments which destroy the credibility of H.R. 1 as "welfare reform." Let me, if I may, recap them briefly, with certain supportive detail which has not, to my knowledge, been previously discussed.

First of all, as has been frequently pointed out without satisfactory rebuttal, H.R. 1 establishes the concept of a guaranteed annual income, set under present provisions at a level of \$2,400 for a family of four.

President Nixon has said he does not favor a guaranteed annual income. A substantial cross-section of Members from both sides of the aisle repudiated the concept in debate, and even some who supported the bill, nevertheless voiced reservations about the guaranteed annual income.

What I considered most significant about the debate on this point, however, related to the argument that, once the concept was established, political pressures would begin immediately and inevitably to push the level of guaranteed income upward. This point was made repeatedly and forcefully, and never was the slightest attempt made to refute it, though it was clearly pointed out that any substantial increase would be financially catastrophic.

Lest anyone doubt that such political pressures will be at work, I point out the following quotation from a June 24 article in the *Washington Post*:

(Senator Abraham) Ribicoff yesterday began soliciting Senate support for a plan that would initially pay welfare recipients at least \$2,800 annually for a family of four, and within several years would pay all families at least enough to reach the poverty line, currently just over \$3,600.

Thus, we begin again on the long and futile journey we have made with social security and similar programs. Will we never learn?

A second argument against H.R. 1 is that it "federalizes" the entire welfare program. It is a good argument but a poor choice of words, for what H.R. 1 threatens, in fact, is the final destruction of the Federal concept of government by "nationalizing" welfare. Thus any hope of meaningful partnership between State and National Government—any pretense of preserving the delicate balance so essential to a true federal system—is abandoned. For if welfare is not a program inherently best suited to State design and administration, no program of any significance could so qualify.

It is interesting to me that the Members of this body displayed such high regard for the specious and jerry-built rationale offered in defense of a "constitutional right to welfare" and so little regard for the deeply embedded constitutional principle of "federalism," which is, indeed, the very foundation and cornerstone of American Government.

Equally significant is the fact that nationalizing welfare is not only destructive of the federal system, but is detrimental to the best interests of welfare reform. As the *Times-Dispatch* effectively points out:

The major cause of the present system's
CXVII—1679—Part 20

failure has been the attitude of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which has seemed to pursue policies designed to keep people on welfare rolls rather than to keep them off.

Let me enumerate a sampling of those policies, as I understand them to be and you will see why many States are facing bankruptcy.

For example, for purposes of AFDCU—Aid to Families With Dependent Children, Unemployed—HEW has defined being employed as working 35 hours a week. Thus, anyone who works fewer than 35 hours a week is unemployed and eligible for benefits. Is it any wonder the AFDC caseload is growing by leaps and bounds?

Or take HEW's reaction to a Federal court ruling that States must hold evidentiary hearings before they can terminate assistance to a welfare recipient. HEW promulgated regulations expanding on that ruling by requiring that the States employ special hearings officers to conduct such hearings and prohibiting the use of regular Welfare Department staff members for such work.

Then there are the regulations which prohibit the conditional termination of assistance during the hearings or appeal procedure. Thus, benefits which cannot be recovered must be paid to recipients who may be obviously ineligible but who demand a hearing and appeal the decision to the ultimate. Far more rational would be an approach which allowed termination of assistance after the initial decision of ineligibility, with a requirement for full reimbursement plus payment of a penalty by the Government to the recipient if the decision is not upheld on appeal. This would deal fairly with the taxpayer and, by discouraging unjustified termination decisions and reimbursing of full benefits plus a bonus where mistakes are made, would deal fairly with the welfare recipient as well. But such logic has apparently been beyond the reach of Federal welfare bureaucrats whose primary concern is to keep people on the welfare rolls whenever conceivably possible.

Other instances, such as arbitrary and widely varying staffing requirements from State to State, the mandated "Self-declaration" policy, and reams of mandatory special services to be extended to persons eligible for dollar benefits under the law, could be cited; but the point is made. How can people who have illustrated this sort of a preconceived "mind set" with regard to the present system be expected to improve the system by being given full control over it? This is not to mention the virtually impossible task of trying to administer from Washington every detail of such a vast and complex program, even if a proper attitude prevailed.

The third fundamental argument against H.R. 1 is perhaps the most persuasive: the argument that you do not reform the present welfare program by adding millions of new recipients to the rolls and then looking for ways to get them off.

With all due respect, the "Dupe of the Year" award must go to the fellow naive enough to accept the assurances of H.R. 1's proponents that the tremendous in-

crease in persons on welfare which it envisions will be only temporary. The work incentive programs built into it are supposed to reduce the welfare rolls substantially over the long haul. But, so far, work incentives have never worked—due in large part to opposition they engender in the very people who will be now administering the program—and even if they did, the minimum guaranteed annual income is likely to move up apace of the earned income of the working poor for many years.

Those, then, are the prospects if H.R. 1 is adopted. Conversely, the Curtis bill eliminates the dangers inherent in a uniform guaranteed annual income. It removes the design and administration of the entire welfare program from the hands of the HEW bureaucracy and places it in the hands of State officials who have both the expertise and proximity to tailor the programs to honest needs. It provides Federal financial assistance through the mechanism of revenue sharing, to ease the dollar burden presently handicapping the programs in many States. And through improved administration and elimination of present abuses and cheaters it will result in a substantial reduction in the welfare caseloads while permitting improved benefits for the truly needy.

That is true welfare reform. I urge the other body to give it careful consideration. It will stand on its own merits.

And I urge the administration to study it candidly, in conjunction with the goals for welfare reform outlined by President Nixon. Neither personal feelings, nor professional pride, nor partisan politics; neither convenience nor impatience nor exasperation nor lack of effort nor anything else within our control should keep us from enacting the best possible legislation when dealing with so momentous an issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include the *Times Dispatch* editorial referred to above:

WELFARE REFORM

President Nixon has called the nation's welfare system an "outrage." Governor Ronald Reagan of California has called it "a cancer eating at our vitals." Hardly anyone has a kind word for the system, which is wasteful, demoralizing, flawed by abuses and dismayingly ineffective. Instead of rescuing the nation's poor from the quagmire of poverty, America's welfare system has encouraged the development of a degrading mendicant mentality among certain segments of society. For many persons in this country, which used to preach the virtue of self-reliance, welfarism has become a way of life. Countless young Americans are entering adulthood convinced that as a matter of "legal right" they are entitled to a government dole.

An "outrage" the existing welfare system truly is, and it ought to be tossed onto that garbage dump reserved for society's discarded mistakes. On this much there is wide agreement. But while the need for reform is generally recognized, the most influential reformers, unfortunately, seem to favor a course that would lead to even more welfarism.

This promises to be the effect of the Nixon-backed welfare "reform" measure the U.S. House of Representatives approved late last month. Inspired by President Nixon's sincere desire to develop a plan that might eventually reduce the demand for public assist-

ance, this bill actually threatens to exacerbate the nation's welfare problems.

Consider the measure's key provisions. It would give federal endorsement to the radical guaranteed annual income concept by assuring each family of four a yearly income of \$2,400, a "minimum" that surely would rise constantly. It would federalize the entire welfare program by concentrating responsibility for administering and financing the system in Washington. It would add millions of "working poor" not now eligible for public assistance to the welfare rolls. Within four years, according to prevailing estimates, the number of persons on welfare in the United States would double to about 20 million under the Nixon plan.

True, the bill contains work incentive features designed to encourage welfare recipients to return to a productive role in society, but Washington's previous experiments with such plans have been generally disappointing. Anyway, it is difficult to accept the proposition that the best way to solve the nation's welfare problems is to put more persons on the public assistance rolls, then try to develop programs to get them off.

Is there no alternative to the President's proposal? Fortunately there is. U.S. Senator Carl Curtis, a Nebraska Republican, has introduced an especially appealing welfare reform bill that seems to be aimed directly at the major cause of the present system's failure.

That cause is the attitude of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which has seemed to pursue policies designed to keep people on welfare rolls rather than to keep them off. It is HEW that establishes basic eligibility standards, and woe be to any state or locality that dares defy Washington's edicts. Many states and localities that have sought to move against cheaters have found their way blocked by unrealistic HEW regulations. HEW's unrelenting attitude makes it virtually impossible for any state to adjust its welfare program to suit its own peculiar needs and conditions.

Sen. Curtis would solve the problems created by HEW simply by depriving that agency of most of its authority over welfare programs. The federal government would continue to help finance the nation's welfare programs, contributing more than half the cost in some instances, but the money would go directly to the states, which would be free to establish their own programs and eligibility requirements. Guided not by directives from Washington but by local needs and by local financial conditions, states could develop realistic welfare programs designed to help those genuinely in need of help and closed to professional deadbeats who lie and cheat to obtain public assistance. Certainly it stands to reason that state and local officials, being more responsive to the people than anonymous HEW bureaucrats, should be more vigilant than Washington against extravagance and fraud.

The Curtis bill may not be perfect, but it appears to be vastly superior to the House-approved bill. When the Senate takes up this important subject, it should make a detailed comparison of the two proposals. Those legislators interested in genuine welfare reform, rather than in welfare liberalization, may find the Nebraskan's proposal more to their liking.

OVERSEAS MILITARY CREDIT UNIONS PASS \$150 MILLION LOAN MARK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, I have discussed with this body the outstanding work performed by

credit unions operating on U.S. military installations overseas.

The latest report of these institutions indicates that at the end of May they had leant more than \$152 million to servicemen, ranging from the lowest ranking enlisted man to the highest ranking officer.

Not only is the lending figure impressive because of its dollar size, but it is equally important to consider what would have happened to these servicemen, on a financial basis, if these credit unions had not been in operation.

In 1965, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee conducted hearings into the problems that servicemen face in attempting to obtain loans or finance a purchase. The subcommittee was shocked to learn that it was not uncommon for servicemen abroad to pay interest rates as high as 100 percent on a short-term loan and interest rates of 60 percent were commonplace. The subcommittee made several visits to military installations in both Europe and the Pacific areas to look into the problem and it was suggested that the best solution was to establish credit unions in those countries where the United States had major troop concentrations.

Because of an initial resistance by certain agencies within the Department of Defense, and a myriad of roadblocks, it was 2 years before the credit unions could be established. In late 1967, we were finally successful in opening credit unions in Germany and shortly thereafter, credit unions were opened in Italy and Great Britain and, subsequently, in Korea and the Philippine Islands.

Looking back, it is almost inconceivable that anyone would have opposed the opening of overseas credit unions. But, time after time, the committee met resistance, particularly within certain elements of the Department of Defense and that resistance is still showing up in the form of limited assistance to the overseas credit unions. For instance, one credit union in need of larger office facilities was told that there was no space available. Shortly thereafter, however, the military installation gave a large portion of choice space to a Yugoslavian furniture store.

I am happy to say that the top level officials of the Department of Defense, beginning with Secretary Laird, are firmly committed to a program of overseas credit unions. However, this enthusiasm does not filter down to the various military units.

In spite of these handicaps, the overseas credit unions have performed in an unbelievable manner. For instance, it was suggested by military officials that credit unions were not needed in Korea since no more than 1,600 servicemen would join the credit union, even after it had been in operation for a number of years. Despite this gloomy forecast, the San Diego National Federal Credit Union opened offices in Seoul, Korea, on April 1, 1969. Since that time, its acceptance has been so great that it has had to open five additional offices to keep up with the need for its services. And at the end of May of this year the credit union, which had been told that it would never have more than 1,600 members, had

signed up nearly 23,000 members and had loans outstanding of more than \$13.5 million.

All of the other overseas credit unions have similar success stories, but I picked out the situation in Korea because of the gloomy forecast that had been made by some U.S. military officials in that country. It has been estimated that since the overseas credit unions went into operation, that servicemen using the facilities have saved from \$15 to \$20 million in interest charges of those they formerly paid to high rate credit extenders. For instance, a serviceman borrowing money for a new car can save from \$200 to \$500 in interest costs by dealing with the credit union.

There are still some areas with major troop concentration that are not served by on-site credit unions and it is my hope that the Department of Defense will work to correct this situation. Recently, attempts were made to establish a credit union in Vietnam, particularly in light of "Operation Reunion," a program under which servicemen in Vietnam could fly back to the United States during their leave periods. It was learned that many servicemen were unable to take advantage of this program because they did not have cash in hand when the time came to purchase the airplane ticket. However, the military decided against allowing credit union operations in that country, citing many of the same negative reasons that were used in Korea. In June, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) reported on a special study mission that he made to Asia near the end of last year under the auspices of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During the 90th Congress the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and took part in the overseas investigation, the need for credit unions. He was a valuable member of the committee and was instrumental in helping to establish the credit unions. In discussing the credit union situation in Vietnam in his June report, Congressman WOLFF points out:

This is especially galling since 2 years previously a special mission of the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which the author, then on that committee, was a member, went to Vietnam as part of a broader investigation of credit frauds against servicemen. At that time, we found a deplorable situation in Vietnam, but were assured by MACV that credit unions would be established to give our men a fair chance to avoid the ugly clutches of the loan sharks. . . .

The situation should be rectified without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker, so that all Members will have an opportunity to see just how effective the overseas credit unions have been, I am inserting a copy of the monthly Overseas Credit Union Report provided to me by Gen. Evert Thomas, retired, executive secretary of the Defense Credit Union Council:

DEFENSE CREDIT UNION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1971.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following progress report concerning the operations of credit union sub-offices in Germany, England, the Philippine Islands, Korea, and Italy is submitted for your information.

Andrews Federal Credit Union began operations at Wiesbaden on 11 March 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Frankfurt. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 27,074 members, made loans in the amount of \$34,074,195.22, and received share deposits in the total amount of \$17,006,299.49. During the month of May, 898 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-2	3
E-3	77
E-4	204
E-5	265
E-6	152
E-7	40
E-8	11
E-9	7
W-1	1
W-2	8
O-1	17
O-2	29
O-3	54
O-4	16
O-5	11
O-6	3

Fort Belvoir Federal Credit Union began operations at Wurzburg on 1 February 1968. As of 31 May this sub-office had acquired 4,537 members, made loans in the amount of \$5,714,664.65, and received share deposits in the total amount of \$444,930.65. During the month of May, 183 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-3	5
E-4	29
E-5	69
E-6	45
E-7	14
E-8	3
O-1	4
O-2	4
O-3	6
O-4	2
W-2	2

Pease AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Ramstein on 15 January 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at Baumholder, Bitburg, and Pirmasens. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 33,696 members, made loans in the amount of \$28,722,332.95, and received share deposits in the amount of \$11,225,068.92. During the month of May these sub-offices made 1,196 loans to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-2	31
E-3	261
E-4	283
E-5	291
E-6	197
E-7	95
O-1	15
O-2	23

Lackland AFB Federal Credit Union began operations in Berlin on 26 December 1967. As of 31 May this sub-office had acquired 2,322 members, made loans in the total amount of \$870,281.91, and received share deposits in the amount of \$1,911,882.28. During the month of May this sub-office made 173 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-3	14
E-4	44
E-5	54
E-6	31
E-7	15
E-8	4
O-1	1
O-2	4
O-3	5
O-4	1

Redstone Federal Credit Union began operations in the Mannheim-Stuttgart area on 15 February 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Heidelberg. As of 31 May these sub-

offices had acquired 22,436 members, made loans in the total amount of \$25,760,221.00, and received share deposits in the amount of \$5,053,594.00. During the month of May these sub-offices made 277 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-3	6
E-4	44
E-5	106
E-6	39
E-7	21
E-8	8
W-2	6
W-3	1
W-4	1
O-1	8
O-2	5
O-3	24
O-4	4
O-5	4

Finance Center Federal Credit Union began operations at Furth on 15 February 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at Bamberg, Ansbach, and Illesheim. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 12,943 members, made loans in the amount of \$8,728,811.64, and received share deposits in the amount of \$2,728,107.87. During the month of May these sub-offices made 241 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-2	2
E-3	9
E-4	50
E-5	50
E-6	44
E-7	18
E-8	3
W-2	4
W-3	1
W-4	17
O-1	19
O-2	21
O-3	3

Keesler AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Lakenheath, England on 15 November 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at South Ruislip, Bentwater, RAF Alconbury, and Upper Heyford. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 10,957 members, made loans in the amount of \$13,430,045.87, and received share deposits in the amount of \$2,050,753.60. During the month of May these sub-offices made 1047 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-1	4
E-2	1
E-3	266
E-4	329
E-5	149
E-6	116
E-7	58
E-8	20
E-9	8
O-1	1
O-2	12
O-3	58
O-4	23
O-5	2

Barksdale AFB Federal Union began operations at Clark Air Base in the Philippine Islands on 20 December 1968. As of 31 May this sub-office had acquired 20,487 members, made loans in the amount of \$15,708,316.55, and received share deposits in the amount of \$10,662,863.63. During the month of May this sub-office made 914 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-1	3
E-2	9
E-3	253
E-4	249
E-5	206
E-6	80
E-7	36

E-8	14
E-9	5
O-1	1
O-2	12
O-3	31
O-4	10
O-5	5

San Diego Navy Federal Credit Union began operations at Seoul, Korea on April 1, 1969. It has since opened sub-offices at Taegu, Camp Casey, Osan AFB, 2nd Division, and Kunsan. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 22,628 members, made loans in the amount of \$13,527,587.73, and received share deposits in the amount of \$4,245,933.80. During the month of May these sub-offices made 1,598 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-2	30
E-3	319
E-4	459
E-5	314
E-6	180
E-7	125
E-8	40
E-9	7
W-1	10
W-2	15
W-3	2
W-4	2
O-1	7
O-2	23
O-3	47
O-4	12
O-5	5
O-6	1

Fairchild AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Aviano Air Force Base, Italy on May 19, 1969. It has since opened sub-offices at Vicenza and Camp Darby. As of 31 May these sub-offices had acquired 4,500 members, made loans in the amount of \$5,934,178.88, and received share deposits in the amount of \$2,089,349.17. During the month of May these sub-offices made 273 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

E-2	1
E-3	53
E-4	70
E-5	70
E-6	32
E-7	18
E-8	5
E-9	1
O-1	5
O-2	1
O-3	12
O-4	1
W-1	4

As of 31 May 1971 the sub-offices had signed up 161,580 members, received share deposits in the amount of \$57,418,783.41, and made loans in the amount of \$152,470,636.40.

Respectfully,
Brig. Gen. EVERT S. THOMAS, JR.,
U.S.A., retired,

Executive Secretary.

The overseas credit unions that have compiled such an outstanding record are physically located on the military installations that they serve. This provides our servicemen and women with full service credit union benefits, including loan counseling, and this is particularly helpful for many of our young servicemen, who find themselves in financial difficulty and need someone to talk to to obtain advice.

There is, however, another group of credit unions that are also providing credit union service through the mails. These credit unions, for the most part, are serving members of our armed services at smaller installations where there

are not enough servicemen to justify a full service, on-site credit union facility. However, through the use of air mail and, in some cases, through telegraphic communication, a serviceman in financial trouble is able to obtain a loan in only a few days under such arrangements.

These credit unions are also to be saluted for their desire to help servicemen and it should be a comfort for parents of young servicemen to know that if their son or daughter has financial problems that, no matter where they are stationed, they can get help from a credit union, either directly or through rapid mail or telegraphic service.

No longer will these parents have to worry about their sons or daughters being forced to deal with a loanshark in the case of a financial emergency.

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL DEVOTES TIME TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council devoted 6 days of its program, "Washington Report," broadcast nationwide on the Mutual Broadcasting System—just before and during Captive Nations Week—to the plight of those nations still living under Communist subjugation.

John M. Beinhardt, managing editor, conducted a series of interesting interviews, and I want to take this opportunity to compliment John and the American Security Council for giving time to this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include copies of the program transcripts and call them to the attention of my colleagues:

NEXT WEEK IS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
(Broadcast July 16, 1971)

BEINHARDT. Next week is Captive Nations Week. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Our guest is Congressman Edward J. Derwinski, Republican of Illinois who speaks on the subject of Captive Nations Week, being observed this year July 18th through the 24th.

DERWINSKI. The year 1971 represents a significant development in our foreign policy which makes the emphasis on Captive Nations Week ever more important. Rather than entering into an era of negotiations with the Communist World, it's obvious we have more problems with the Reds than ever before, and not just in Southeast Asia. In the Middle East the movements of the Communists to outflank NATO and the continued complications caused in the Berlin area, all accentuate the fact that rather than mellowing, the designs of Communists for world domination are ever present. We should also make mention of the fact that in the spirit of Captive Nations Week, we hope to produce a world situation whereby freedom under truly legitimate governments would be afforded the people of Eastern Europe whose satellite governments were imposed at the end of World War II by the Russians. The many non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R., Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Armenians, and others have as

much right to self-determination as any peoples served by independent governments.

The states of the captive nations are also affected by the tendency of the ultra-liberals in the press and various organizations throughout our country and the world to believe that there isn't any threat posed to the Western World by Communist expansion. This is a delusion.

Specifically when we look at the Middle East and note that the Communists are not only determined to continue to support radical Arab aggression against Israel, but by their presence in Algeria, Lybia, Sudan, and the latest efforts they are making in the Arabian peninsula in the wake of British withdrawal, we clearly see the effort of the Reds to control Northern Africa. The obvious design is to outflank NATO, which would leave Western Europe in a very untenable position subject perhaps to economic blackmail. Therefore, in the history of the Captive Nations movement, never before have we faced a challenge as difficult and complex as today. We must make every effort to alert our fellow Americans to the true menace of Communism, to the growing complications we have with this false ideology, for the need to be ever alert in defense of freedoms and to develop the progressive foreign policy positions whereby the free world will triumph and freedom and legitimate government will be restored to the present captives of Communism.

BEINHARDT. Thank you Congressman Derwinski. You have been listening to the American Security Council Washington Report.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK REMAINS SIGNIFICANT TODAY

(Broadcast Monday, July 19, 1971)

JOHN BEINHARDT. Captive Nations Week remains significant today. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Our guest today is the man who drafted the original Captive Nations Week Resolution, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is Director of the Institute on Comparative Political and Economic Systems at Georgetown University. Dr. Dobriansky, what brought about the original Captive Nations Week Resolution and what significance does it have for us today?

DR. DOBRIANSKY. The original Captive Nations Week Resolution is really the only resolution that was passed by Congress back in July, 1959. And the main reason for it was to put into conceptual form the state of the world as it was then and as it is now—namely the growth of the Soviet-Russian imperium, out of the Soviet Union and through Eastern Europe, into Asia and then eventually into Cuba. If one reads the Resolution, he will see a clause there which is open ended, namely stating "and others." Thus Cuba was not included. But a year later, Cuba actually became a captive nation. Now the circumstances fundamentally and basically have not changed; on the contrary, the entire Vietnam issue can be viewed from this totalistic captive nations approach. Many in this country think that it was simply a civil war in Vietnam. The so-called civil war there had been repeated time and time again going all the way back to 1917-1918 in areas that are now within the Soviet Union, such as Byelo-Russia, Ukraine, Georgia and elsewhere. And we today apply it to Vietnam by raising the question, "who's next?" And if we were to pursue some of the policies that are being suggested by some of our leaders, well then Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and probably Thailand would be placed on this long list of captive nations. The fact that we must recognize is that the communist conspiracy—the communist drive for world domination—whether out of Peking or out of Moscow—is still presently with us. And they

will use all sorts of techniques to achieve that end. Not necessarily overt military, but also diplomatic and numerous other techniques which they have used in the past, depending on circumstances. I think it's also important to bear in mind that as we consider the admission of Red China into the U.N., that we must remember that we are dealing with 700 million captive Chinese on the mainland of China. This should be brought up on the occasion of Captive Nations Week which we are celebrating in the period of July 18-24.

BEINHARDT. Thank you Dr. Dobriansky.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Broadcast Tuesday, July 20, 1971)

JOHN BEINHARDT. Twelfth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Our guest is the Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan.

Congressman FORD. This year we mark the twelfth anniversary of a testament to freedom, first proclaimed by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This is the twelfth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, authorized by Congressional Resolution in 1959. That resolution empowered American Presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world. Observance of Captive Nations Week points up the dedication of Americans to the nurturing of freedom throughout the world. There is a truth that no arms and no occupation can kill. The truth is that within the hearts of the enslaved people, here burns a love of liberty which is a constant threat to their rulers. A yearning for freedom which will ultimately prevail. And this truth gives meaning to our Captive Nations Week observance. I believe the United States should seek enforceable agreement with the Soviet Union aimed at avoiding a Third World War. But it would be the greatest hypocrisy to close our eyes to the wrongs that the Soviet Union has done to millions of human beings, deprived of individual freedom and national independence. Americans must continue to make known their deep concern about the people of the captive nations and convey this message to the captive world. Americans should continue to make known their refusal to accept the regimes imposed upon these unfortunate victims of tyranny. Americans should continue to promote the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms which are the God-given right of all people. America must never accept that freedom is foreclosed for the now enslaved peoples of the world. Consistent with our own national interests, Americans should constantly explore all avenues that might lead to a lessening of their plight. Let us continue to inform the captive peoples of our full and uncompromising support for their unquenchable goal of national and individual freedom. Let them ever know that Americans are dedicated to the furtherance of freedom throughout the world. Let us keep faith with the people of the captive nations.

BEINHARDT. Thank you Congressman Ford.

WORLD HALF-FREE, HALF-SLAVE CANNOT EXIST

(Broadcast Wednesday, July 21, 1971)

BEINHARDT. World half-free, half-slave cannot exist. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Our guest today is Congressman Philip M. Crane, Republican of Illinois.

Congressman CRANE. At this particular time when all Americans again join in recognizing the plight of those people who still live under captivity in totalitarian societies,

I think it's important for us to re-examine some of those assumptions that were universally accepted by Americans at the end of World War II then they would seem to be today. At that time, one of our primary objectives for going to war—as had been our primary objective in World War I—was to make the world safer for democracy. In Woodrow Wilson's phrase, "to make the world safer in the post world war era for all individuals in the enjoyment of their inalienable rights." We have in recent times however heard an argument gaining force that the Soviets have some kind of a claim to enjoy a sphere of influence, and that sphere of influence of course involves holding many millions of people in subjugation. The American view by contrast, was the basis for the Atlantic Charter, the Charter of the United Nations and the other World War II declarations to which the Soviet Union was a party, and to which the Soviet Union has turned its back. Abraham Lincoln said better than a century ago that this nation could not exist half slave and half free and before the century was out, it would be either all one or all the other. I think in our telescoped world of the twentieth century, one might appropriately say that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. And it must be the continuing commitment of all of those people who cherish liberty to renew their dedication and their consecration to those ideals of liberty for which this nation has got to war in many times past. The imposing reality that there are still people living in captive countries cannot be ignored. There are many that would like to wish it away. But the fact is that in 1968, Czechoslovakia saw a reassertion of Soviet Russian domination; in our country we had, at the end of 1970, the famous Kirdurka case—the Lithuanian sailor who sought asylum and was denied it—an incident which has placed a blemish on our moral conscience. The Polish unrest at the end of 1970 was also an indication of the pertinence and the relevancy of Captive Nations Week. In addition to that the re-emphasis placed on the Brezhnev Doctrine at the 24th Communist Party Congress last March and April was only another way of saying that Moscow is intent upon maintaining its control in Central Europe; in the USSR; among the many non-Russian nations; in Asia; and in Cuba. In conclusion I would like to recite a quotation from the former House Speaker, the Honorable John McCormack who stated "we must never for a moment forget the nations large and small which live under dictatorship. We must never forget the ideals of the people who yearn for freedom, and most of all we must never forget that it is freedom which is the truth they seek, and cannot be forgotten."

BEINHARDT. Thank you Congressman Crane.

CAPTIVE NATIONS STILL HUNGER FOR FREEDOM (Broadcast Thursday, July 22, 1971)

JOHN BEINHARDT. Captive Nations Still Hunger for Freedom. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Our guest is Congressman Lawrence J. Hogan, Republican of Maryland.

Congressman HOGAN. As we again commemorate Captive Nations Week I think it's appropriate that we pause and see what the status is in those countries. For more than 2 decades the Communist regimes have waged an all out effort to subjugate, spiritually as well as physically, the 100 million people of the captive European lands. Yet, in spite of so many set backs, East and Central Europeans still hunger for equal justice, personal dignity and freedom. I think that now we have a particularly opportune time to do something constructive in regard to the problems of Captive Nations. The So-

viet Union and the East European Communist regimes have no fear of being attacked by the peaceful and prosperous nations of the West. I think that's accurate. Whatever instability and threat to peace there exists in Europe today, the roots are in the communist orbit itself. We need to give the people in those captive nations an opportunity to express themselves and I think we have an opportunity to do something about that. The communist economy at this time needs Western help so badly that Moscow is looking for overtures for trade and commerce with the West. As a case in point, Moscow was compelled to reach an accommodation with West Germany in order to get economic aid. Now I think that what we ought to do is to use this need on their part for trade to exert pressure upon them to have free elections in those captive nations. Today when self-determination is a universally accepted right of all nations, the Soviet Union is violating the charter of the United Nations by treating the East and Central European countries as colonies and keeping them in check by military might. We at this point in time can bring pressure to bear, it seems to me, on the communists and convince them that if they want to have an open rapport with free nations in the world, then the least they should do is allow free elections in captive nations and give the people in those countries the opportunity to express their opinion regarding the Soviet domination which has kept them in virtual slavery for so many years.

BEINHARDT. Thank you Congressman Lawrence J. Hogan.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION STILL RELEVANT TODAY

(To be broadcast Friday, July 23, 1971)

JOHN BEINHARDT. The Captive Nations Week Resolution is still relevant today. This is the American Security Council Washington Report, continuing our special programs this week commemorating Captive Nations Week. Our guest today is Congressman Roman Pucinski, Democrat of Illinois. Here by telephone from his office on Capitol Hill is Congressman Pucinski.

Congressman PUCINSKI. My friends, once again for the twelfth consecutive year we set aside a week to honor the people of the world's Captive Nations. These people share with us in America the same hopes and aspirations. The same dreams for a better future. An entire generation has endured the stifling cloak of a system of government that has no faith in the people. After thirty years the people still cannot be trusted with an open and competitive election. Yet, amazingly, even the children born into this repressive form of government are seeking to overthrow it as we have seen in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary and Poland. Decisions that we in the free world take for granted . . . where we will work and live . . . trips with our families . . . things we purchase for our homes and above all who will lead us are unknown behind the iron curtain. Career decisions there are based on government set quota systems. Housing is so scarce as to be almost non-existent and far too many people are crowded into small rooms with no hope of moving. Privacy itself is considered suspect by a regime that indeed has much to fear from the thoughts of the people. This week, as in all weeks, we Americans reach across the oceans and clasp in spirit the outstretched hands of people who share our love of liberty and self-determination. Through our broadcasts, our letters, our contact with those friends and family who remain prisoners in their own nations, we reaffirm our deep affection and our spiritual union. To the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, White

Ruthinia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Tibet, Kossackia, Turkistan, and others. We in the Congress of the United States pledge our continuing efforts to give whatever assistance we can. On behalf of the American people, we solemnly vow never to forget the wrongs that have been committed in the name of the so-called peoples liberation movements of the communist governments.

BEINHARDT. Thank you Congressman Pucinski.

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.

The average person on a U.S. farm had 78.2 percent as much personal income after taxes as the average nonfarm person. This compares with 77.3 percent in 1969 and 74.5 percent in 1968.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that a number of distinguished Members are joining with me today in filing legislation which would establish a Select Joint Committee of the Congress to inquire into the origins of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war and the adequacy of information provided the Congress during the period of that involvement. On the basis of the findings of its inquiry, the committee also would study and determine the current nature of U.S. interests in Southeast Asia and Vietnam.

Cosponsors of this resolution are: Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASPIN of Wisconsin, Mr. ESCH of Michigan, Mr. FRENZEL of Minnesota, Mr. GUDE of Maryland, Mr. HALPERN of New York, Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, Mr. LEGGETT of California, Mr. MCCLOSKEY of California, Mr. NIX of Pennsylvania, Mr. PIKE of New York, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. ROBISON of New York and Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia.

Under this resolution, the chairmen of the House Armed Services Committee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee each would select two members of his committee, one Democrat and one Republican, to serve on the select committee. The committee would report its findings to the current session of the Congress.

The recent publication of classified documents relating to our involvement in Vietnam has given rise to charges that the Executive willfully misled the Congress and the American people regarding our objectives in Vietnam. In the face of such serious charges concerning our

involvement in a war which is now dividing our people as they have never been divided in its recent history, the Congress has a responsibility to seek the facts and to inform the public. As legislators, we must move to confirm, to deny or to place in perspective the serious charges that have been made.

The immediate crisis, then, occasions my resolution. But long before the recent disclosures, it was clear that there was need for the Congress to spell out clearly our vital national interests in that part of the world. For too long the congressional voice on Vietnam has been muted and uncertain. It has constituted an imperfect guide for actions by the executive, which lacks the advantage of an articulated policy by the Congress. In other words, the Congress has not been the active, responsible partner in the formulation of American foreign policy which our system of government requires if there is not to be continuous conflict between the executive and legislative.

What constitutes the U.S. vital interests in Southeast Asia has almost without fail been determined by the White House, the Pentagon, or the State Department. For the past 10 years, the Congress and its committees have asked the Executive for a clear expression of what those interests are and have received a number of views, many of them contradictory. It is time for the Congress to express its opinion.

I believe in this regard that the present crisis presents a valuable opportunity. Public reaction to the disclosures is so strong that the Congress and the Executive can no longer avoid coming to grips with the question of adequate and full information for the Congress on the question of Vietnam. At the same time, on the basis of this information, the Congress should seize the opportunity to formulate and enunciate a statement of congressional policy on Vietnam.

Members will recall the controversy which developed around the Tonkin Gulf resolution in the years following its passage. The executive claimed that the resolution granted the President authority for military actions in Southeast Asia which many in Congress who had voted for the resolution disputed. The resolution thus became the source of bitterness and misunderstanding between the two branches of Government.

About 18 months ago, Senator MATHIAS and I introduced resolutions calling for repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution and other congressional resolutions such as the Formosa Straits resolution which had been interpreted by the executive as a broad grant of authority to intervene militarily around the world. I took this step in the belief that the Congress had to become a more active partner in the formulation of our Nation's foreign policy; and revocation of past resolutions which seemingly bestowed unconditional grants of authority on the executive represented an essential step in that direction.

But I recognized then that it was im-

possible for the Congress simply to scrap the Tonkin Gulf Resolution and conclude that its work was done. For in the absence of a new congressional expression of intent, repeal was subject to two inconsistent interpretations: either as meaning that Congress wished to withdraw all support for the war in Vietnam and force the administration to withdraw immediately without any conditions whatsoever; or that the Congress wished to stand aloof from the issue and leave its entire resolution to the President and his advisers.

Neither view was tenable. At the time, Congress had definite views regarding the conditions of our withdrawal. These particularly concerned the plight of our missing and captured soldiers. At the same time, the Congress was far from unanimous in thinking that the President, as Commander in Chief, had authority to do anything he wished in Vietnam.

In view of the foregoing, Senator MATHIAS and I included language in the original resolution repealing the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which spelled out the necessity for disengagement in Vietnam. The language provided a framework for troop withdrawal, dealt with the need for a viable government in South Vietnam with broad popular support, and proposed steps for postwithdrawal development in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

It was a grave oversight in my opinion that the Congress ultimately decided simply to repeal the Tonkin Gulf Resolution without addressing itself to the major questions posed in the remaining sections of the original resolution.

A majority of the Congress may have preferred policy formulations different from those which the original resolution contained. But this was not the point. What was at issue was the fact that by skirting these important questions Congress once again provided the Executive with what amounted to a blank check. That is precisely what many who voted for the repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution thought the Congress was trying to avoid.

Since then, there have been a number of attempts to enunciate a congressional view on Vietnam. Indeed, even prior to repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, I urged that in view of the drastic changes which had taken place in the nature of U.S. involvement since the passage of that resolution, it was urgent that the Congress articulate more clearly its views on Vietnam. On September 25, 1967, I, therefore, introduced a resolution, upon passage of which the appropriate committees in Congress would "immediately consider and report to their respective bodies their determination as to whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to policies in Southeast Asia."

The latest effort to deal with this problem came in June with the Senate's adoption of an amendment calling for the withdrawal of all American troops within 9 months of its enactment, provided U.S. POW's are released. Senator MANSFIELD, the author of the amendment, stated at the time:

Last session the Senate initiated the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. That resolution had been cited by the previous administration as the functional equivalent of a congressional declaration of war and a justification and endorsement of a policy of escalation in Vietnam. Many of us were aghast at the broad interpretation put on that resolution. Whatever it was—functional or otherwise—it is gone. But with its demise has gone the only expressed Government policy—with respect to U.S. involvement in Indochina. There is no longer an expressed policy with regard to that involvement.

The Senator then argued that his amendment "seeks to fill that void."

Such a claim may be too sweeping, although the resolution's approval certainly represents a welcome consensus in the Senate. It is the first articulation of congressional views on Vietnam adopted by a body of Congress since the repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution; it is also, however, completely silent on our postwithdrawal policy in Southeast Asia. Even if the Congress adopts the Mansfield amendment, in other words, much, if not most of the void will still exist.

Because no issue divides our Nation as does the war in Vietnam, the American people cannot be expected to understand continued congressional inability to articulate a clear national policy on this issue. It is for this reason, and in order to fill the void adequately, that I am introducing a resolution establishing a select committee, composed of Members of both bodies of Congress, to hold hearings and to define with precision, present and future U.S. objectives and interests in Southeast Asia.

Unless the Congress is willing to develop and enunciate an overall framework for U.S. foreign policy in Southeast Asia, it is my judgment that this branch will remain in permanent stalemate on Vietnam. The reluctance of Congress to articulate a national policy may derive in considerable part from general uncertainty regarding the existence or absence of vital U.S. interests in Southeast Asia. But while such hesitation to establish a policy when the stakes involved remain so unclear may be understandable, I would point out again that the ultimate consequence of inaction is to create a policy void which, in effect, grants all initiative to the Executive.

I believe that if those who argue for a policy of definite disengagement were ever convinced that their proposals did violence to the vital interests of the United States, they would willingly moderate their stand in their opposition to the President's policy. Similarly, I believe that if the Congress were to determine that the United States has no vital interests in Vietnam, the President would be obliged at once to accelerate U.S. disengagement.

It may be objected that a congressional determination of present, as well as postwar U.S. interest in Vietnam will prove too lengthy a task. This is simply not true. The documents are before us. We

also have the benefit of 10 years of public debate on this issue. What is required is the political will to tackle a controversial public issue.

Since the original formulation of this resolution, an event of historic importance has taken place. I refer to the President's decision to visit the People's Republic of China before May 1972. It is clear that his trip could alter the diplomatic landscape in Asia for the rest of this century. I submit that this development is all the more reason why the Congress should attempt to grapple with the question of our vital national interests in Southeast Asia. The President will arrive in Peking better prepared for his discussions with Chinese leaders if he has the benefit of Congress expressed views on our policy in Southeast Asia.

Members are aware that the Senate is actively considering the establishment of a select committee to study at least some of the issues I have raised. The problem in question, however, is one which clearly affects the work and relationship of both bodies of Congress with the Executive. In effect, we are dealing with a constitutional issue which cuts to the very nerve center of democratic government in the modern era.

Presently, foreign policy has an impact on our domestic life which our Founding Fathers could not have even dimly imagined when they created our governing institutions. It has become vital, therefore, to insure that the elected representatives of the people in both bodies have a more effective role in the formulation of our foreign policy. Otherwise, a widening area of national life will remain isolated from the influence of democratic practice.

The select committee I am proposing will also consider such questions as the use of "executive privilege" in impeding the flow of information to the Congress about Southeast Asia, and the classification and declassification of documents. Better access to all sources of information is an issue of vital concern not just to congressional committees with foreign affairs responsibilities, but to every congressional committee whose work is hindered when sources of information are limited. We are dealing with questions of principle here which transcend the controversial and important matter of Vietnam itself.

In short, the issues in question are of such paramount interest to the legislative branch as a whole that, in my view, both Chambers should be associated with any suggestions or recommendations which a select committee might bring forward. We cannot allow the Congress to speak with a divided voice on this issue. Nor can we allow one body to speak for the other. We should not abdicate our responsibilities.

The establishment of a joint committee composed of members from both the House and the Senate will contribute to a clearer and more harmonious dialog between the legislative and the executive. It can demonstrate to the American people that the Congress as a whole is prepared to deal responsibly with the

very serious charges that have been made in the public press and will restore to Congress its historic role in the formulation and determination of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) in this special order and as a cosponsor of his bill to create a select Joint Committee on U.S. Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia. The eight-man committee would be charged with the responsibility of investigating the origins of American involvement in South Vietnam; the quality and adequacy of information provided the Congress by the Executive during the period of our involvement, including congressional access to Vietnam documents covered by executive privilege and procedures for the classification and declassification of documents relating to our Vietnam involvement. As a result of these investigations, the joint committee would further be responsible for studying, determining, and enunciating existing vital interests of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that such a committee can provide a very valuable service to the Congress and the American people at this point in time by helping to clear up a number of related issues—by showing us where we have been, how we got there, where we are going, and what adjustments in course, if any, should be made to avoid repeating past mistakes.

I think it is especially important to emphasize that this committee is not being proposed with the purpose in mind of hunting witches or finding scapegoats or for cataloging past mistakes. The primary purpose of this proposed committee is to examine our Vietnam experience and to draw from it those lessons which will serve to guide us in the future—which will enable us to correct and coordinate the clumsy foreign policy apparatus which steered us into Vietnam by subtle jerks and pulls. Central to this overhaul is a thorough examination of the faulty information system which does not seem to be properly plugged in to Capitol Hill. I am referring here, of course, to the fact that the Congress has been forced to take certain actions and make certain decisions without being fully apprised of the facts. Our constitutional machinery which was designed to give the Congress a central function in matters of war and peace just cannot operate properly if there is faulty wiring in the information system. Vietnam is proof positive of that principle: it has brought a near breakdown in that system and in the public confidence in that system.

This resolution recognizes that glaring deficiency and delegates to the proposed joint committee the responsibility of investigating the quality and adequacy of information provided to the Congress and the procedures for classification and declassification of such information. One Pentagon official recently estimated that well over 90 percent of the materials which are classified should not be so

designated. Supreme Court Justice Stewart, in his brilliant opinion in the New York Times case, said that the first principle of wisdom in matters of internal security is to avoid secrecy for the sake of secrecy. In his words:

When everything is classified, then nothing is classified, and the system becomes one to be disregarded by the cynical or the careless and to be manipulated by those intent on self-protection or self-promotion. I should suppose, in short, that the hallmark of a truly effective internal security system would be the maximum possible disclosure, recognizing that secrecy can best be preserved only when credibility is truly maintained.

It is my hope that the proposed Joint Committee can provide some specific guidance in reversing this tendency to overclassify information, and that further, it can devise ways to insure that the Congress does have access to information of a classified nature which is essential in making the most prudent decisions. An ill-informed Congress is bound to take ill-advised actions. There can be no excuse for this.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to lay special emphasis on section 2(b) of this resolution which requires that, "The Joint Committee, in light of the findings of this investigation, shall, in addition, determine and enunciate existing, vital U.S. interests in Southeast Asia." I think this will be particularly helpful in the formulation of the evolving Nixon doctrine as it relates to that part of the world. What are our vital interests? To what extent should we extend military and economic assistance to the nations of Southeast Asia? How broad is our nuclear and conventional military umbrella as a Pacific power? These are the questions to which we must address ourselves as we look beyond Vietnam.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts on his initiative in proposing this select Joint Committee on U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia, I am proud to join as a cosponsor, and I urge prompt action on this legislation.

PANAMANIANS WARN OF APPROACHING RED-LED VIOLENCE

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in recent addresses I have warned the Congress and the Nation of the hate-infected campaign that is now being waged by the present military government of Panama against the United States, especially against our authorities of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal who bear the burden of responsibility for maintaining, operating, and protecting that vital waterway. It seems that everything that the present Panama Government does is aimed at advancing Soviet designs to gain control over the Canal, which has been a Communist objective since 1917.

As a result of my long interest in the canal question, I have received much in-

formation from many persons in various countries familiar with Isthmian problems, including citizens of Panama who for security reasons cannot be identified. From this mounting evidence it is clear that preparations are now being made for the perpetration of more violence of the magnitude of that of January 9-12, 1964, when Red-led Panamanian mobs attacked the Canal Zone and overwhelmed the zone police, requiring Canal officials to call upon the U.S. Army to protect the lives of our citizens and the canal itself.

Recently, I received an unusually thoughtful and well expressed letter from a group of Panamanians who, because of the danger to their lives or livelihood, must remain anonymous. I was touched by their statements that the authors recognize that I am not an enemy of Panama, either No. 1 or otherwise. To them I wish to express my appreciation and to say that I have never thought that the mass of the Panamanian people ever considered me an enemy and I wish them to know this.

Furthermore, much of the information supplied has been confirmed by reports from independent and well-informed North Americans who have recently visited the isthmus.

Mr. Speaker, because of ill-advised policies of appeasement of Panamanian radicals, many of them Red revolutionaries, the position of the United States on the isthmus is in grave danger to which our authorities should be alert. This danger, which could include sabotage, cannot be met by acceding to those who would blackmail the United States with threats of violence as is now being attempted. Most certainly the time has come for our Government to take a proper stand in defense of our justly acquired, treaty-based rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. To this end, I urge prompt adoption by the House of the 33 pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions sponsored by some 100 Members of the body, which are now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As the indicated letter confirms in brief form what I have been stating in the Congress and warns of approaching trouble, I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that it be read by every Member of the Congress, especially members of committees with cognizance over canal matters and all others concerned with the security of the Panama Canal and the Western Hemisphere.

JUNE 1971.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept a greeting from a group of Panamanians who are aware of the true reality in Panama under this communist-type dictatorship which is backed (seemingly) by President Nixon. Honorable Mr. Flood, on behalf of thousands and thousands of democratic Panamanians we request your help so that this country will return to the roads of constitutionality. What evil this government of assassins does both to the people of Panama as well as to the United States government. We, the majority of the

Panamanian people, know perfectly well that you are not enemy number one of the people of Panama; these accusations are made by the communists of the former governments and those in the illegal and unconstitutional government which is ruling us at the present time.

The press, radio and television which are bought off by the Guard daily accuse the government and authorities of the Canal Zone of the sale of drugs, prostitution, discrimination and imperialism, of abuse of Panama's sovereignty, etc. You well know that the propaganda by this communist government of Panama against you hurts United States' prestige outside the country very much; it is especially good fodder for the communist countries.

Now the government of Panama is continually insulting and threatening the United States over the new Canal treaty. This is the same people, politicians and communists backed by the accursed National Guard of Panama, that provoked the violent events in 1964 against the authorities of the Canal Zone and who, at the present time, are indoctrinating the students, labor unions, country communities, etc., against the American Canal authorities, accusing them of being imperialists (a very typical communist slogan) in order to create worse problems and very dangerous violences in the very near future. At the present time the communists hold important and key positions in Panama's government. Mr. Flood, you (plural) have to do something about doing away with this dangerous dictatorial government of Torrijos. Look what happened in Cuba. Only the communists use the word revolution in their propaganda.

We and thousands of Panamanians wonder why Mr. Nixon's government permits this situation in Panama, and receives Mr. Lakas at the White House. He pretends to be the president of the government junta of Panama, a sinister and corrupt person. All of us in Panama have known for a long time that this Mr. Lakas is a dealer in [corruptive practices] and that he is the owner of [unsavory properties] and as customers they have the American soldiers who are stationed in the Canal Zone. Mr. Lakas is the owner of several such places in the city of Colon and Panama City such as the Hotel Ideal, the Llave de Oro. Is Mr. Nixon blind? What a come-down for the august White House to invite such a person. Honorable Mr. Flood, Panama is in great danger. Communism is settling its foundations firmly and with gigantic steps. We wonder is it that there are communists in high positions in the government in Washington who are advising Mr. Nixon wrongly, or are there also communists in the State Department or the Pentagon??? who permit this kind of government in Panama that threatens and insults them daily and is preparing the peasant and student masses against the Zonians, that steals the loans from the International Development Bank. This is another institution which we suspect must be filled with communists because this bank is lending this communist government many millions that are going into private pockets.

Mr. Emilio Ortiz de Zevallos, the present representative of the BID is a great admirer and friend of that communist Torrijos, and through the former the bank has loaned many millions in recent months. It is general knowledge in Panama that Torrijos, the National Guard officers, the officials of the government, and the relatives of all these, are becoming rich, if not millionaires, at the expense of the BID millions. It is suspected that Mr. Ortiz de Zevallos is of communist leanings.

Mr. Flood, some day we will identify ourselves to you, but you must know that there

is no freedom in our country and it is dangerous, and this humble letter might get lost before it reaches you. That day will be when we return to a constitutional regime and you will see that in the face of the great mass of the Panamanian people you are not an enemy, for, as we repeat, that has been created by the communists. But you have to hurry because they are indoctrinating the masses every day.

Sincerely,

THE ANTI-COMMUNISTS.
BALBOA, CANAL ZONE, PANAMA.

LEGISLATION TO TIE COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES TO PERSONAL TAX EXEMPTIONS

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 am introducing legislation that would restore some equity in our Federal income tax system. The bill ties the individual exemption to increases in the cost of living. The fact that the exemption is fixed has created a great deal of inequity in the tax system. The \$600 personal exemption was set in 1948; since then the cost of living has risen over 50 percent, while the exemption has been raised only 4 percent. The 1969 tax reform bill increased the exemption to \$625 for 1970, \$650 for 1971, \$700 for 1972, and \$750 for 1973, a net increase since 1948 of only 25 percent.

The cost of living rose over 6 percent in 1970, requiring \$636 in 1970 to purchase what one could buy for \$600 in 1969. Thus, in a period of inflation the Government's receipts are automatically increased, mostly at the expense of low- and middle-income taxpayers. They keep getting pushed into higher and higher tax brackets when their wages are raised to keep up with the cost of living, in addition to the real value of their exemption decreasing.

On the other hand, most exemptions for businesses are figured on a percentage basis, with their exemptions and deductions increasing as their base increases. For example, depletion and depreciation allowances are computed as percentages of income and costs, and when income or costs increase, the deductions increase. Unfortunately, it does not work that way for individual income taxpayers. For the 10 years from 1961 to 1970 the individual income tax receipts rose from \$41 billion to \$90 billion, an increase of 120 percent, while the corporate tax receipts rose from \$21 billion to \$33 billion, an increase of only 57 percent.

To put it another way, individuals who were paying twice as much as corporations in 1960, were paying three times as much in 1970. My bill would restore some of this lost equity.

The 1969 tax reform bill will increase the personal exemption to \$750 in 1973. From that time forward, my bill would tie the personal exemption to the cost of living in the following manner. The Internal Revenue Service would use the annual percentage change in the cost of living from September 1 of the previous

year to August 31 of the present year, and adjust personal exemption by this percentage, rounding to the nearest \$5. For example, if the cost of living rises 3.1 percent from September 1, 1973, to August 31, 1974, the IRS will multiply the \$750 exemption by 3.1 percent and add \$25 to the individual exemption for the 1974 tax returns—\$750 times .031 equals \$23.25, round to \$25. This would make the personal exemption \$775 on the 1974 tax return. By using September of the previous year to September of the current year, the IRS will have ample time to compute the new exemption and place it in the tax forms to be distributed to the taxpayers.

I believe this bill is a moderate one, which would benefit the great majority of taxpayers.

I hope my colleagues will give it their careful attention.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XIX

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during these past few weeks I have been raising questions about the curious conduct of the Department of Justice in the case of Frank Sharp.

The time has long since passed when answers should have been supplied to these questions. The time has come for Will Wilson to resign his position. The time has come for Anthony J. P. Farris to resign. These are the men who are responsible for a monstrous miscarriage of justice. They are unable or unwilling to answer my charges, and I believe that this is only proof of my charges. And surely these charges are sufficient to cause these men, each of them, to tender their resignations. They have not served the cause of justice; they have created a vast, stinking scandal; and they have no business in holding the jobs they have.

Frank Sharp built a paper empire with the help and advice of Will Wilson. He misused every position he had and he looted any number of companies and banks by the use of tried-and-true shell games. He was nothing but a con man who made it big.

Wilson knew about Frank Sharp's self-dealing loans, his kiting of assets, his fixing of company books, his insider trading, his illicit deals, his phantom companies. Wilson took part in these deals.

Wilson has taken great liberties with the truth, and he has never denied his many ties with Sharp and his involvement with the scandalous, incredible financial manipulations that Sharp used to loot whole companies of millions of dollars in property, assets, and plain, cold cash.

A man who has had a part in such schemes as this has no business in being a chief law enforcement officer of the United States. Wilson is no less a schemer than Sharp, and at the very best he ought to simply pack his bags and leave office.

Wilson may deny knowledge of the

Sharp deals. But how could a man who held the position he did in Sharp's empire have been ignorant? And if he was indeed ignorant, then I say that he was a patsy. A man so blind has no place in the office he now holds.

Whatever the case may be, Wilson ought to resign. He was too much a part of Sharp's questionable deals, too close to the building of the Sharp empire, too involved himself in shady stock transactions to be trusted in the high office he now holds. He can do an honorable thing by resigning.

And I say that the U.S. attorney who arranged the deal that let Sharp off the hook is too small a man to occupy his office. He says that he had no choice but to make a deal with Sharp. Well, Anthony J. P. Farris was taken, that is all. He is not the only guy to get taken in a deal with Frank Sharp. But having been taken, having sold out justice, having sold out even the right of the State of Texas to prosecute Sharp, he ought to be able to recognize the truth and recognize the magnitude of his error.

Anthony J. P. Farris said that he made a deal with Sharp, a deal to let him enter a couple of minor guilty pleas, a deal for complete immunity, so that Sharp could testify against his former associates. Farris seems not to understand that he let the big fish get away so that he could catch a few minnows. He cannot see—incidentally enough—that he is trying to go fishing for Charlie the Tuna with a whale as bait.

Aside from his moral obtuseness in making this stinking deal, Anthony J. P. Farris knows that if he had prosecuted Sharp this would have embarrassed his boss, Will Wilson. He should have ignored that and gone ahead, because that was his plain duty. But Farris wants to play political games.

I say that courts are not the place for political games. U.S. attorneys have no business making deals with men like Sharp. U.S. attorneys are not supposed to be morally blind and mentally inept. But Anthony J. P. Farris is morally blind for making the kind of deal he did with Sharp, and mentally inept too. The least he can do is to protect the public against future repetitions of his great fishing act by resigning. The people should not have to trust their business to him any more.

Incredibly enough, Deputy Attorney General Kleindeinst approved the deal that Farris made with Sharp. Well, in the past this man has amply demonstrated his capacity to blunder, and this instance is only the latest of these. The country has no need to entrust its second highest legal job to such a hack as this. He should quit and go back into helping run political campaigns.

With these men out of the way, justice might have a better chance to prevail in this country. The people have every right to expect them to resign, and I say to them, please, in the name of all that is good and just, leave office now. Give us some reason to believe that justice might yet prevail; give us some rea-

son to believe that you have some concept of decency. You can restore my faith by resigning, and at the same time give somebody else the chance to do what you have failed to do. You have no right to inflict yourselves on this great land any longer.

THE DILEMMA FACING AMERICA'S STEEL PRODUCERS

* 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, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the United States considers its steel industry to be expendable. Today the costs of entry of imported steel are so mild as to severely damage our domestic steel producers and ultimately lead this country to a dependence on foreign steel producers for our own steel needs.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Stewart S. Cort, chairman of the board of Bethlehem Steel Corp., which appeared in the July 1971 issue of Nation's Business.

Mr. Cort describes the dilemma facing America's steel producers with the keen insight of a man who has spent almost his entire working life in the steel industry.

The article follows:

FREE TRADE? YES—BUT!

(By Stewart S. Cort)

There are many "myths" about international trade.

One is that everyone else is playing the game under the same rules we are.

Another is that the benefits of more trade outweigh any possible dislocation of domestic industries—even basic ones like steel. No other nation looks on trade this way, and no other nation considers its steel industry expendable. We cannot afford to do so either.

There are no practical private responses to competition aided and abetted by other governments, especially when foreign labor costs are already much lower than ours.

Certainly the least we can ask is that, until such time as those governments can be persuaded to let their steel industries stand on their own feet, our industry be the recipient of something more than pious exhortations. In fact, we need assurance that we will be allowed to participate in the growth in demand for steel in the United States.

By the same token, foreign producers should also be allowed to share in that growth—but not at a rate in excess of the growth in domestic consumption. Since the beginning of 1969, steel producers in the European Community and in Japan have limited their total steel exports to the United States under arrangements they adopted at the urging of our government. These arrangements expire at the end of this year and we believe they should be extended for another two years, with some improvements.

The present set up provides that their exports can increase by 5 per cent a year—about double the normal growth of steel demand in this country. This provision is very damaging and must be remedied.

Although we believe it had been understood that the European and Japanese producers would maintain existing patterns of distribution among product categories and geographical markets, they have not done so.

Imports of higher-value products, particularly of the very high value stainless and alloy steels, have risen rapidly, and the proportion of imports into West Coast markets has increased substantially. These practices have hurt some American producers badly, and new arrangements should rectify the situation.

Finally, the existing arrangements do not apply to certain countries which export significant amounts of steel to the United States. Some of these countries have increased their exports considerably during the past two years, notably in stainless and alloy categories. We hope additional countries may be persuaded to join in the arrangements for the future.

GUARDING A "GOOD RIGHT ARM"

The measure of "protection" my industry needs and asks is trifling compared to that accorded our competitors by their governments.

It is of a type endorsed by two Administrations committed to liberal trade policies. One reason for this nonpartisan endorsement is that this method of dealing with a trade problem does not provide any basis for retaliation. It is done with the consent of those affected. And, in fact, the voluntary arrangements have not triggered retaliatory measures.

I think it true that this nation must be a leader, if not *the* leader, toward gradual but steady reciprocal dismantling of trade barriers. We should be magnanimous. But it does not follow that our magnanimity should feed the rapacity of less merciful competitors.

To turn the other cheek is admirable, but it is a suicidal gesture if the blow you are dealt is fatal.

What many Americans fail to comprehend is that the blow that threatens our nation's economy *could be*, if not fatal, at least disabling. Can we not agree that the steel industry is the good right arm of our industrialized economy? If we are not willing to agree that this is so we are unique among all the advanced nations of the world.

And if we are willing to agree that a "strong and viable" steel industry is essential to our economy, can we accept the proposition that its strength and vitality ultimately depend on the level of steel imports reaching our shores? This is no myth. It is a fact.

In support of this assertion, look at just a few enlightening statistics. Steel imports rose from about one million tons (1.5 per cent of domestic consumption) in 1957 to a high of nearly 18 million tons (about 17 per cent of consumption) in 1968.

More significantly, those imports had maximum impact in certain vulnerable areas such as the West and Southwest, where they took over 25 per cent of the total market and as much as 90 per cent of the market for some steel products. Obviously, this situation spelled chaos for U.S. producers, especially for those serving the markets under heaviest attack.

Furthermore, during the term of the voluntary arrangements, foreign makers have concentrated on higher-priced grades. For example, they captured about 68 per cent of the stainless wire rod market and 53 per cent of the stainless wire market.

Considering that the steel industry as a whole registered profits on sales in 1970 averaging only 2.7 per cent, it should be obvious that the inroads of imports are taking a fearful toll.

It should be equally obvious that, in the absence of renewed voluntary arrangements or some other form of import restrictions, imports will continue their climb. And finally, it should be obvious that the American

steel industry cannot attain and maintain good health if something in the range of 20 per cent of the total domestic market is captured by imports—and especially if the major impact of those imports is directed at the higher-priced, higher-profit-margin products.

THE CRUCIAL BATTLE

It is true that the steel industry, like most industries, faces many problems. Still, the make-or-break problem is steel imports. Unless we lick that one, all our other battles are being fought in vain.

Now, let us consider how relentless dictates of academic free trade theory would work when applied to our steel industry.

We can start by accepting certain realities. Reality Number One is that steel products can be made in several foreign countries on a basis that permits them to be sold in the United States in a range of \$20 to \$45 per ton under domestic prices.

Unquestionably, those competitors have "comparative advantage." Under free trade theory, then steel is one of those "lines of production in which the United States cannot compete internationally," and, according to the theory, "we must avoid building protective fences around these weak industries."

In other words, free trade theory considers steel to be a "weak" industry, and therefore expendable. I do not agree that our steel industry is really all that "weak," and I most assuredly do not agree that it should be deemed "expendable," but let us continue to explore the avenue down which free trade theory takes us.

What would be the effects on steel consumers and on our nation's over-all economy if our domestic steel industry were to wither as offshore suppliers took over a major portion of the market?

Question One: What would happen to steel prices once foreign suppliers control the market?

Would they exercise restraint? All evidence available to us indicates that ruthless price gouging would be the order of the day.

Every time that domestic steel prices have risen so as to reflect higher costs, have not the prices of imported steels followed—without any cost justification whatsoever? And have we not time and again seen the prices of steel imports rise *above* domestic prices during periods of tight supply in our markets?

Question Two: What assurances would American steel users have of a continuing source of supply in the event of an international crisis?

Within my own lifetime there have been periods when we could not realistically look to any of the major producers in other countries as a reliable source of steel products.

Similarly, one can imagine countries withholding steel so as to enforce high prices here. This possibility is hardly farfetched, considering the recent tactics of the oil-exporting nations of the Middle East.

Even a more innocent development, such as a sudden upsurge in home markets, could impel foreign producers to significantly reduce their steel exports to the U.S. Indeed, this is precisely what happened only a year ago in Western Europe.

Question Three: What about national defense?

How could we gird ourselves to meet a threat to our security without a reliable supply of steel? Are there sufficient ploughshares and pruning hooks available for reconversion into the weapons of defense?

I think not. Granted, military needs have normally represented only a small fraction of total domestic production, but they are

nevertheless vital. These needs embrace highly specialized grades and types which are the products of continuing intensive—and expensive—research. This cannot, however, be supported solely by production for military purposes. A much broader base is necessary.

And what a Looking Glass world this is, when a steel executive is reduced to arguing that a viable steel industry is essential to the security of his country!

So much for our nation's need for a healthy steel industry, even without considering domestic employment, purchases, the colossal investment in the steel industry, or the industry's contribution to meeting the tax burdens of our complex society.

LOSING AN EDGE IN STEEL

Let us consider now how this great industry got into its present fix.

There are those who agree with an unidentified government official who recently explained the plight of the steel industry to a wire service reporter. "The American steel industry," he said, "has let its equipment become obsolete."

That accusation is, to put it bluntly, false. Through the decade of the 1960s, our steel industry's capital expenditures totaled \$16.3 billion, largely for modernization rather than net expansion. If the industry has indeed "let its equipment become obsolete," it has not been because of parsimony.

But I would be the last to argue that we have not lost much of the comparative advantage we once enjoyed. What are some of the reasons?

First, the steel industries of major foreign competitors such as Japan and West Germany have been built largely from the ground up since World War II.

In fact, the expansion of the Japanese industry has been so rapid that half its present facilities are not more than five years old. Obviously, those industries are more modern, on the average, than ours. Nevertheless, steel output per man hour is still higher in this country than in any other, although the margin is not nearly as great as it was and our edge is steadily diminishing.

Second, today's steelmaking technology is world-wide.

American equipment and expertise were primarily responsible for the phoenix-like rise of foreign steel mills from the ashes of war. In fact, it was American tax dollars, in large measure, that paid the bills for the initial revival. And today, even though we readily admit that foreign competitors deserve a great deal of credit for their own innovations, they continue to draw on the technology of our country to improve their steel industries.

For example, we have led the way in iron ore and coal processing and in high-speed rolling mill technology. Industries in other countries have consistently borrowed from us in these fields. In fact, many of the most modern installations of American-designed production facilities are located abroad.

This brings me to my third explanation for our loss of advantage. Only after you realize that steelmaking technology is completely international can you comprehend the simple reality that the availability of funds plus the willingness to spend them is all it takes to have a thoroughly modern and efficient steel industry.

No steel company and no steel industry in any nation possesses magic formulae or arcane "secrets" that can give it any substantial and lasting edge as a steel producer. A commitment of resources is all that is required. And in this regard, our most worrisome competitor is twice blessed.

CAPITAL AND LABOR COSTS

In Japan, virtually unlimited capital is made available (however indirectly) by the

government, and the installed cost of integrated steel plants is about one third in the United States. This great additional comparative advantage in capital costs results from low hourly employment costs in construction.

Labor is a major factor in the installed cost of steel plants. In other words, the much lower hourly employment costs of foreign producers give them a double advantage—both in capital costs and in operating costs.

Lower capital costs mean less invested capital per ton of steel products shipped. And this, in turn, translates into a higher rate of return on investment for offshore producers despite a lower profit per ton.

To give you a better idea of what we are up against when we gaze westward across the Pacific, it would be well to take a look at Japan's national goals in steel. Japan wants an output matching that of the United States (and doubling our per capita production) by 1975! Further, this expansion contemplates doubling steel mill exports every four years. Clearly, the Japanese nation recognizes the desirability of a strong and growing steel industry.

My fourth and final point relating to our reduced competitive edge in comparison with foreign producers lies in the decisive matter of unit costs.

It is not wage levels *per se* that determine competitiveness, but unit costs. High wages can be, and often are, offset by greater productivity. In fact, that is why American wages rose so far above those in other countries in years gone by without affecting our competitive position.

Unfortunately, our competitors now boast both wage scales far lower than ours and productivity approaching our level. Thus Japanese steel wage costs (which vary between one fourth and one third of ours), coupled with relatively high productivity, yield unit labor costs \$40 to \$45 per ton under ours, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Similarly, European steel producers are favored by unit labor costs typically \$20 to \$25 per ton under ours.

Putting it another way, we would have to reduce our labor input (man hours per ton shipped) by 70 per cent in order to nullify the Japanese advantage in unit labor costs, assuming no change in current hourly employment costs.

The significance of the competitive cost advantages can be better appreciated when one realizes that the average U.S. price for a ton of steel is on the order of \$175. It does not require much knowledge of cost accounting to see that a cost advantage of \$20 to \$25, much less one of \$40 to \$45, is decisive when the product sells for about \$175.

There is no technology by which we can overcome the cost advantage enjoyed by offshore competitors. Nor can we offset it by cutting prices, considering that our net income before taxes averages less than \$10 per ton.

At least one third of the world steelmaking capacity outside the U.S. not only is favored by "government supports," but is government-owned, wholly or in major part. And, might I add, nationalization represents the ultimate in subsidization of an industry. If free trade theorists object so strongly to the mild "protection" we ask, would they prefer the vastly more comprehensive protection that a nationalized industry requires? I think not.

Most of the remainder of steelmaking capacity in other countries is government-supported and nourished to a degree unheard of in the United States. Mergers and cartels are condoned if not actually encouraged. Steelmakers are insulated from some or all of the rigors of domestic free capital markets.

Tax policies are designed to assist growth and to enhance export of steel.

THEIR BARRIERS ARE HIGH

And virtually all of these countries have erected nearly insuperable barriers to unwanted steel imports. To cite a typical example, the "cost of entry"—total of duties, taxes, etc.—to get \$100 worth of U.S.-made carbon steel bars into France is over \$33; but it's only \$7 to bring \$100 worth of French-made bars into the United States.

What is the answer? At this point I wish to reassure the advocates of free trade and all readers that I, too, prefer a solution that conforms as closely as is possible with the ultimate achievement of truly free—and fair—international trade. But what is the situation now?

Some say that "producers must learn to stand on their own feet without government supports."

I wholeheartedly agree.

But the principles that apply to our own steel industry must apply equally to all others as well, if we are to compete on a fair basis.

This is not the case today.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF RETIRED 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 2 days I have been discussing some of the many financial problems that face elderly Americans once they retire. Many who have lived decent, hard-working lives find in retirement that they are now poverty stricken—crippled by a fixed income in a highly inflationary period. Moreover, illness or large, regular medical expenses quickly eat up savings.

Today, I would like to talk about three of the eight bills I am circulating for cosponsorship. These three would provide needed tax relief for the elderly.

The first bill would provide a \$5,000 retirement income exemption. A person who has worked all his life should not be forced to live in poverty because inflation has reduced the purchasing power of his savings and pension or social security payments. With such a tax exemption we could provide quick assistance to the over 5 million elderly Americans who live in poverty. An additional 5 million would also directly benefit since the median income of older American families is around \$4,500 and the median income of elderly persons living alone or with nonrelatives is about \$1,800. These are shameful statistics. We should bow our heads in shame that the elderly Americans who helped build the vast technological giant that is today's America must live out their final years in poverty, unable to enjoy the fruits of their efforts.

A second bill I am proposing would provide for a full medical expense deduction for taxpayers over the age of 65. This provision was in the law prior to the passage of medicare. At that time the 3-percent deductible provision was reinstated for all Americans based on the argument that medicare would take care

of the needs of the elderly Americans and thus the tax deduction was unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to explain to my colleagues that medicare has not proved to be the panacea for the elderly that it was heralded to be. It has helped, without question, but there are still many elderly Americans who must pay large sums for prescription drugs, optometrists' services, and chiropractors' services—all of which are not covered by medicare.

This bill, H.R. 7922, would provide some modicum of tax relief for our senior citizens who find themselves in a financial bind because of medical expenses. As I pointed out yesterday, almost seven out of every eight over-65 Americans suffer from some sort of chronic ailment. Let us help ease their suffering somewhat by partially relieving the financial burden of poor health.

Mr. Speaker, the third bill I would like to discuss today is directed at the faithful son, daughter, or relative who has taken upon themselves the burden of caring for an elderly person close to them. This bill would give them a tax exemption regardless of their dependent's income, provided that the taxpayer provides over 50 percent of the dependent's income.

I would point out to my colleagues that this is the same provision that is in the law with respect to children under 19 or who are in college.

Today, if your mother were living with you, had an income of say \$2,000 and received 50 percent of her support from you, you could not claim an exemption for her without your mother losing her exemption. Yet, if your daughter were living with you under the same conditions, both you and she could claim a personal exemption.

Enactment of this bill would provide a small incentive for persons to help their ailing relatives rather than let them go on welfare. It would be the margin of difference in many cases between the welfare check and the cost of support. I strongly believe that this inequity should be corrected immediately.

These three bills combined with the three bills I discussed yesterday and the two I will discuss next Tuesday will help greatly to relieve the financial burdens of our elderly Americans. We cannot continue to ignore the over 20 million Americans over the age of 65. With over half of these earning less than \$5,000 annually, they are truly one of the great blocks of American poor. But the worst aspect of the situation is that many of these people did not know poverty until retirement. It was then that restrictive laws, rampant inflation, and a lack of public concern took over to condemn them to a demoralizing way of life.

To recapitulate, the three bills I discussed today and am circulating along with five others for cosponsorship are:

H.R. 7920, a bill to provide a \$5,000 retirement income tax exemption for civil servants at retirement and for all taxpayers at age 65;

H.R. 7922, a bill to provide a full de-

duction of all medical expenses for taxpayers over age 65; and

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.

LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE USE OF RECYCLED PAPER IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD WOULD HELP ESTABLISH PROGRESSIVE POLICY THROUGHOUT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the 92d Congress there has been an increasing interest in the use of recycled paper by the Federal Government in general and by individual Congressmen and Senators, in particular.

There is one positive step we in Congress can take to set the example in the use of recycled paper. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is published each day that a House of Congress is in session and uses approximately 5,000 tons of newsprint each year. This is the equivalent of a medium-sized daily newspaper in one of our country's cities.

Many arguments have been put forth raising the environmental advantages to use of recycled material. By encouraging greater use of products made from recycled material we can help ease the increasing solid waste burden. It has been the experience of newspapers in the 27th Congressional District of New York which I represent that recycled newsprint is less expensive. In fact 100 percent recycled newsprint cost about \$7.50 a ton less than the virgin newsprint."

For this reason I am introducing legislation today with 65 cosponsors to require substantial use of recycled paper in the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As publishers of a major journal in Congress should take this leadership role.

Recently the Environmental Protection Agency urged newspaper publishers across the country to increase their use of recycled fibers in the newsprint they purchase. Several newspapers in my district—particularly the Newburgh Evening News and the Poughkeepsie Journal—are using recycled newsprint and it is time that we in Congress took the same step.

The legislation I am introducing today would require that 50 percent of the paper purchased by the Government Printing Office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be made from recycled fibers.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Moss and more than a score of his colleagues.

There are solid environmental reasons for making this policy decision by Members of Congress. More important there are solid economic reasons which are proven by the prestigious newspapers

across the country that have moved in this direction. Among those newspapers are the New York Daily News, Washington Post, Baltimore Sun, New York Post, Boston Globe, and the Newark News. Also using recycled newsprint are the Gannett Newspaper Group and the McClatchy Newspapers.

Many Members of this House are already aware of the potential uses for recycled paper.

Earlier this year I was the first Congressman to print his constituent newsletter on recycled paper to demonstrate that such paper was available at comparable cost and quality to paper produced with only virgin fibers.

Many other Congressmen and Senators have followed this lead with their newsletters. Others have started using recycled paper in their stationery and for other purposes.

To its credit the House Stationery Room has made recycled paper in many forms available to Members. I am using it for news releases and also in photocopying office documents.

Such new uses for recycled paper bring attention to the problem and offer positive steps toward resolution of the growing solid waste crisis.

On May 3, I introduced legislation—H.R. 8005-8007—with 40 bipartisan cosponsors which would require greater use of recycled fiber in all paper purchased by Federal agencies. Such a policy would open a tremendous market for paper with recycled fiber and spur the efforts to eliminate the millions of tons of scrap paper which clutter our town dumps, litter the highways and fill the air with noxious smoke when incinerated.

Enactment of my first two bills and this new legislation dealing with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will set a progressive farsighted policy for the Federal Government. I strongly urge other Members to join me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a list of the cosponsors of this legislation and a copy of the bill:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug, New York; John B. Anderson, Illinois; William R. Anderson, Tennessee; Bill Archer, Texas; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; Les Aspin, Wisconsin; Herman Badillo, New York; Benjamin B. Blackburn, Georgia; Jack Brinkley, Georgia; Phillip Burton, California; Shirley Chisholm, New York; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; William R. Cotter, Connecticut; R. Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania; Ronald V. Dellums, California; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; John G. Dingell, Michigan; Robert F. Drinan, Massachusetts; Don Edwards, California.

Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania; Marvin L. Esch, Michigan; Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey; Bill Frenzel, Minnesota; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Ella T. Grasso, Connecticut; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; Seymour Halpern, New York; Michael Harrington, Massachusetts; Ken Hechler, West Virginia; Henry Helstoski, New Jersey; Frank Horton, New York; William L. Hungate, Missouri; William J. Keating, Ohio; Edward I. Koch, New York; Peter N. Kyros, Maine; Robert L. Leggett, California; Clarence D. Long, Maryland; Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky; Abner J. Mikva, Illinois; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii.

William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; F.

Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; John E. Moss, California; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Claude Pepper, Florida; J. J. Pickle, Texas; Charles B. Rangel, New York; Howard W. Robison, New York; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania; J. Edward Roush, Indiana; William F. Ryan, New York; Paul S. Sarbanes, Maryland; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; John F. Seiberling, Ohio; Robert H. Steele, Connecticut; Robert O. Tiernan, Rhode Island; Jerome R. Waldie, California; G. William Whitehurst, Virginia; Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas; Jim Wright, Texas.

H.R. 10034

A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 911. Congressional Record: use of recycled paper

"Paper used in the printing of the Congressional Record shall contain not less than 50 per centum recycled paper. For the purpose of this section, the term 'recycled paper' means any paper which after sale to, and use by, a consumer of that paper, has been (1) discarded or collected as an element of solid waste; and (2) has been recovered in whole or in part and reprocessed into a new raw material for use in the manufacturing process of new papers; except that such term shall not include any waste materials generated by the paper manufacturing process and reused as part of such process.

(b) The analysis of that chapter is amended by adding below item 910 a new item as follows:

"911. Congressional Record: use of recycled paper."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall become effective thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

STEEL IMPORTS—INDUSTRY LEADER CITES FACTS TO CONTEMPLATE

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Nation's Business, Stewart S. Cort, chairman of Bethlehem Steel Corp., takes a long, hard look at the damage steel imports are doing to our domestic industry. I bring this article to our colleagues' attention because there is almost a total news blackout concerning the detrimental effects of imports on American business and labor.

The author does not shy away from the goal of free international trade—he asks only that the term "free" be understood to include the term "fair." That position is one that I have taken for lo these many years with the introduction of bills to provide for fair and equitable international marketing in a multitude of products. Unfortunately, the Congress has not acted to halt the increasing flow of imports into the American market with the result that industries we have traditionally counted upon to be the very

backbone of our way of life, find themselves instead with their backs to the wall.

Mr. Cort's article takes the current-day free-traders' principal arguments for unrestricted imports apart one-by-one. He points out that capital and labor costs of foreign steelmakers are nowhere near those of domestic costs. He repeats that which many of us in Congress have concluded for years:

Virtually all of these countries have erected nearly insuperable barriers to unwanted steel imports.

He then cites specific examples of what the American exporter faces in trying to market his goods in a foreign land and explains the pricing differences which give rise to other competitive advantages for the foreign producer. But the most telling point of all, Mr. Speaker, is the point he makes about governmental intervention in the marketplace. These words are worth repeating verbatim:

At least one third of world steel making capacity outside the U.S. not only is favored by "government supports," but is government-owned, wholly or in major part. And, I might add, nationalization represents the ultimate in subsidization of an industry. . . .

Most of the remainder of steelmaking capacity in other countries is government-supported and nourished to a degree unheard of in the United States. Mergers and cartels are condoned if not actually encouraged. Steelmakers are insulated from some or all of the rigors of domestic free capital markets. Tax policies are designed to assist growth and to enhance export of steel.

The position of most foreign steelmakers vis-a-vis their government is that of the "favorite child." Foreign governments realize the importance of steelmaking to the health and stability of their economies so they do everything in their power to preserve, expand, and enhance those industries. Over the past few years, the U.S. Government seems bent on a course exactly opposite to that. Unless the prevailing State Department philosophy changes—and soon—the U.S. Government may be faced with having a "revitalization" problem on its hands.

What a pity that would be. The American steel industry is quite willing and able to meet foreign competition, if only the Government would allow it on an equitable basis. I sincerely hope it does not take more displacements of America's skilled labor to convince the administration and Congress that the steel import problem is near the crisis stage with respect to domestic American production.

The article follows:

FREE TRADE? YES—BUT!

(By Stewart S. Cort, Chairman, Bethlehem Steel Corp.)

There are many "myths" about international trade.

One is that everyone else is playing the game under the same rules we are.

Another is that the benefits of more trade outweigh any possible dislocation of domestic industries—even basic ones like steel. No other nation looks on trade this way, and no other nation considers its steel industry

expendable. We cannot afford to do so either.

There are no practical private responses to competition aided and abetted by other governments, especially when foreign labor costs are already much lower than ours.

Certainly the least we can ask is that, until such time as those governments can be persuaded to let their steel industries stand on their own feet, our industry be the recipient of something more than pious exhortations. In fact we need assurance that we will be allowed to participate in the growth in demand for steel in the United States.

By the same token, foreign producers should also be allowed to share in that growth—but not at a rate in excess of the growth in domestic consumption. Since the beginning of 1969, steel producers in the European Community and in Japan have limited their total steel exports to the United States under arrangements they adopted at the urging of our government. These arrangements expire at the end of this year and we believe they should be extended for another two years, with some improvements.

The present setup provides that their exports can increase by 5 per cent a year—about double the normal growth of steel demand in this country. This provision is very damaging and must be remedied.

Although we believe it had been understood that the European and Japanese producers would maintain existing patterns of distribution among product categories and geographical markets, they have not done so.

Imports of higher-value products, particularly of the very high value stainless and alloy steels, have risen rapidly, and the proportion of imports into West Coast markets has increased substantially. These practices have hurt some American producers badly, and new arrangements should rectify the situation.

Finally, the existing arrangements do not apply to certain countries which export significant amounts of steel to the United States. Some of these countries have increased their exports considerably during the past two years, notably in stainless and alloy may be persuaded to join in the arrangements for the future.

GUARDING A "GOOD RIGHT ARM"

The measure of "protection" my industry needs and asks is trifling compared to that accorded our competitors by their governments.

It is of a type endorsed by two Administrations committed to liberal trade policies. One reason for this nonpartisan endorsement is that this method of dealing with a trade problem does not provide any basis for retaliation. It is done with the consent of those affected. And, in fact, the voluntary arrangements have not triggered retaliatory measures.

I think it true that this nation must be a leader, if not the leader, toward gradual but steady reciprocal dismantling of trade barriers. We should be magnanimous. But it does not follow that our magnanimity should feed the rapacity of less merciful competitors.

To turn the other cheek is admirable, but it is a suicidal gesture if the blow you are dealt is fatal.

What many Americans fail to comprehend is that the blow that threatens our nation's economy could be, if not fatal, at least disabling. Can we not agree that the steel industry is the good right arm of our industrialized economy? If we are not willing to agree that this is so we are unique among all the advanced nations of the world.

And if we are willing to agree that a "strong and viable" steel industry is essential to our economy, can we accept the proposi-

tion that its strength and vitality ultimately depend on the level of steel imports reaching our shores? This is no myth. It is a fact.

In support of this assertion, look at just a few enlightening statistics. Steel imports rose from about one million tons (1.5 per cent of domestic consumption) in 1957 to a high of nearly 18 million tons (about 17 per cent of consumption) in 1968.

More significantly, those imports had maximum impact in certain vulnerable areas such as the West and Southwest, where they took over 25 per cent of the total market and as much as 90 per cent of the market for some steel products. Obviously, this situation spelled chaos for U.S. producers, especially for those serving the markets under heaviest attack.

Furthermore, during the term of the voluntary arrangements, foreign makers have concentrated on higher-priced grades. For example, they captured about 68 per cent of the stainless wire rod market and 53 per cent of the stainless wire market.

Considering that the steel industry as a whole registered profits on sales in 1970 averaging only 2.7 per cent, it should be obvious that the inroads of imports are taking a fearful toll.

It should be equally obvious that, in the absence of renewed voluntary arrangements or some other form of import restrictions, imports will continue their climb. And finally, it should be obvious that the American steel industry cannot attain and maintain good health if something in the range of 20 per cent of the total domestic market is captured by imports—and especially if the major impact of those imports is directed at the higher-priced, higher-profit-margin products.

THE CRUCIAL BATTLE

It is true that the steel industry, like most industries, faces many problems. Still, the make-or-buy problem is steel imports. Unless we lick that one, all our other battles are being fought in vain.

Now, let us consider how relentless dictates of academic free trade theory would work when applied to our steel industry.

We can start by accepting certain realities. Reality Number One is that steel products can be made in several foreign countries on a basis that permits them to be sold in the United States in a range of \$20 to \$45 per ton under domestic prices.

Unquestionably, those competitors have "comparative advantage." Under free trade theory, then, steel is one of those "lines of production in which the United States cannot compete internationally," and, according to the theory, "we must avoid building protective fences around these weak industries."

In other words, free trade theory considers steel to be a "weak" industry, and therefore expendable. I do not agree that our steel industry is really all that "weak," and I most assuredly do not agree that it should be deemed "expendable," but let us continue to explore the avenue down which free trade theory takes us.

What would be the effects on steel consumers and on our nation's overall economy if our domestic steel industry were to wither as offshore suppliers took over a major portion of the market?

Question One: What would happen to steel prices once foreign suppliers control the market?

Would they exercise restraint? All evidence available to us indicates that ruthless price gouging would be the order of the day.

Every time that domestic steel prices have risen so as to reflect higher costs, have not the prices of imported steels followed without any cost justification whatsoever? And have we not time and again seen the prices

of steel imports rise above domestic prices during periods of tight supply in our markets?

Question Two: What assurances would American steel users have of a continuing source of supply in the event of an international crisis?

Within my own lifetime there have been periods when we could not realistically look to any of the major producers in other countries as a reliable source of steel products.

Similarly, one can imagine countries withholding steel so as to enforce high prices here. This possibility is hardly farfetched, considering the recent tactics of the oil exporting nations of the Middle East.

Even a more innocent development, such as a sudden upsurge in home markets, could impel foreign producers to significantly reduce their steel exports to the U.S. Indeed, this is precisely what happened only a year ago in Western Europe.

Question Three: What about national defense?

How could we gird ourselves to meet a threat to our security without a reliable supply of steel? Are there sufficient ploughshares and pruning hooks available for reconversion into the weapons of defense?

I think not. Granted, military needs have normally represented only a small fraction of total domestic production, but they are nevertheless vital. These needs embrace highly specialized grades and types which are the products of continuing intensive—and expensive research. This cannot, however, be supported solely by production for military purposes. A much broader base is necessary.

And what a Looking Glass world this is, when a steel executive is reduced to arguing that a viable steel industry is essential to the security of his country!

So much for our nation's need for a healthy steel industry, even without considering domestic employment, purchases, the colossal investment in the steel industry, or the industry's contribution to meeting the tax burdens of our complex society.

LOSING AN EDGE IN STEEL

Let us consider now how this great industry got into its present fix.

There are those who agree with an unidentified government official who recently explained the plight of the steel industry to a wire service reporter. "The American steel industry," he said, "has let its equipment become obsolete."

That accusation is, to put it bluntly, false. Through the decade of the 1960s, our steel industry's capital expenditures totaled \$16.3 billion, largely for modernization rather than net expansion. If the industry has indeed "let its equipment become obsolete," it has not been because of parsimony.

But I would be the last to argue that we have not lost much of the comparative advantage we once enjoyed. What are some of the reasons?

First, the steel industries of major foreign competitors such as Japan and West Germany has been built largely from the ground up since World War II.

In fact, the expansion of the Japanese industry has been so rapid that half its present facilities are not more than five years old. Obviously, those industries are more modern, on the average, than ours. Nevertheless, steel output per man hour is still higher in this country than in any other, although the margin is not nearly as great as it was and our edge is steadily diminishing.

Second, today's steelmaking technology is world-wide.

American equipment and expertise were primarily responsible for the phoenix-like rise of foreign steel mills from the ashes of

war. In fact, it was American tax dollars, in large measure, that paid the bills for the initial revival. And today, even though we readily admit that foreign competitors deserve a great deal of credit for their own innovations, they continue to draw on the technology of our country to improve their steel industries.

For example, we have led the way in iron ore and coal processing and in high-speed rolling mill technology. Industries in other countries have consistently borrowed from us in these fields. In fact, many of the most modern installations of American-designed production facilities are located abroad.

This brings me to my third explanation for our loss of advantage. Only after you realize that steelmaking technology is completely international can you comprehend the simple reality that the availability of funds plus the willingness to spend them is all it takes to have a thoroughly modern and efficient steel industry.

No steel company and no steel industry in any nation possesses magic formulae or arcane "secrets" that can give it any substantial and lasting edge as a steel producer. A commitment of resources is all that is required. And in this regard, our most worrisome competitor is twice blessed.

CAPITAL AND LABOR COSTS

In Japan, virtually unlimited capital is made available (however indirectly) by the government, and the installed cost of integrated steel plants is about one third that in the United States. This great additional comparative advantage in capital costs results from low hourly employment costs in construction.

Labor is a major factor in the installed cost of steel plants. In other words, the much lower hourly employment costs of foreign producers give them a double advantage—both in capital costs and in operating costs.

Lower capital costs mean less invested capital per ton of steel products shipped. And this, in turn, translates into a higher rate of return on investment for offshore producers despite a lower profit per ton.

To give you a better idea of what we are up against when we gaze westward across the Pacific, it would be well to take a look at Japan's national goals in steel. Japan wants an output matching that of the United States (and doubling our per capita production) by 1975! Further, this expansion contemplates doubling steel mill exports every four years. Clearly, the Japanese nation recognizes the desirability of a strong and growing steel industry.

My fourth and final point relating to our reduced competitive edge in comparison with foreign producers lies in the decisive matter of unit costs.

It is not wage levels *per se* that determine competitiveness, but unit costs. High wages can be, and often are, offset by greater productivity. In fact, that is why American wages rose so far above those in other countries in years gone by without affecting our competitive position.

Unfortunately, our competitors now boast both wage scales far lower than ours and productivity approaching our level. Thus Japanese steel wage costs (which vary between one fourth and one third of ours), coupled with relatively high productivity, yield unit labor costs \$40 to \$45 per ton under ours, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Similarly, European steel producers are favored by unit labor costs typically \$20 to \$25 per ton under ours.

Putting it another way, we would have to reduce our labor input (man hours per ton shipped) by 70 per cent in order to nullify the Japanese advantage in unit labor costs,

assuming no change in current hourly employment costs.

The significance of the competitive cost advantages can be better appreciated when one realizes that the average U.S. price for a ton of steel is on the order of \$175. It does not require much knowledge of cost accounting to see that a cost advantage of \$20 to \$25, much less one of \$40 to \$45, is decisive when the product sells for about \$175.

There is no technology by which we can overcome the cost advantage enjoyed by offshore competitors. Nor can we offset it by cutting prices, considering that our net income before taxes averages less than \$10 per ton.

At least one third of world steelmaking capacity outside the U.S. not only is favored by "government supports," but is government-owned, wholly or in major part. And, might I add, nationalization represents the ultimate in subsidization of an industry. If free trade theorists object so strongly to the mild "protection" we ask, would they prefer the vastly more comprehensive protection that a nationalized industry requires? I think not.

Most of the remainder of steelmaking capacity in other countries is government-supported and nourished to a degree unheard of in the United States. Mergers and cartels are condoned if not actually encouraged. Steelmakers are insulated from some or all of the rigors of domestic free capital markets. Tax policies are designed to assist growth and to enhance export of steel.

THEIR BARRIERS ARE HIGH

And virtually all of these countries have erected nearly insuperable barriers to unwanted steel imports. To cite a typical example, the "cost of entry"—total of duties, taxes, etc.—to get \$100 worth of U.S.-made carbon steel bars into France is over \$33; but it's only \$7 to bring \$100 worth of French-made bars into the United States.

What is the answer? At this point I wish to reassure the advocates of free trade and all readers that I, too, prefer a solution that conforms as closely as is possible with the ultimate achievement of truly free—and fair—international trade. But what is the situation now?

Some say that "producers must learn to stand on their own feet without government supports."

I wholeheartedly agree.

But the principles that apply to our own steel industry must apply equally to all others as well, if we are to compete on a fair basis.

This is not the case today.

HEARINGS ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings August 3 on all housing and urban development legislation.

There are three principal bills before the subcommittee:

First, the administration's proposal for special revenue sharing for urban community development (H.R. 8853);

Second, the administration's "Housing Consolidation and Simplification Act of 1971" (H.R. 9331); and

Third, the proposed "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1971," which contains the proposals of the three

Housing Subcommittee panels (H.R. 9688).

Taken as a whole, these bills will, I am certain, be the basis for the most far-reaching housing and urban development legislation since the landmark Housing Act of 1949.

At this time, I wish to announce the witnesses for our first week of hearings and also our general schedule after the August recess. On August 3 and 4, the subcommittee will receive testimony from Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney. Mr. Romney will present the administration's case for special revenue sharing for urban development and for a consolidation and simplification of our Federal housing programs; provide us with the administration's views on the proposals of the Housing Subcommittee panels; and briefly review the current housing scene by summarizing the President's third annual housing goals report recently submitted to the Congress.

On August 5, a series of witnesses will present the general case for the proposals made by the Housing Subcommittee panels. These witnesses will be as follows:

First, Prof. George Sternlieb of Rutgers University on the need for preserving the existing housing stock and the subcommittee's proposal to stem the abandonment of housing units;

Second, former FHA Commissioner Philip Brownstein on the subcommittee's proposals for improved homeownership counseling and management of federally subsidized housing;

Third, Donald Kummerfeld, director of the Center for Political Research, on the subcommittee's proposal for housing block grants to State and metropolitan housing agencies;

Fourth, Prof. Morton Schussheim of the University of Pennsylvania on the subcommittee's proposal for community development block grants; and

Fifth, Prof. Warren Smith of the University of Michigan on the subcommittee's proposal for an Urban Development Bank (Urbank).

On that date, the subcommittee will also receive testimony from Mr. P. E. H. Brady, of Toronto, Canada, former chairman of the Province of Ontario Housing Corp. Mr. Brady will comment on the subcommittee's proposal for Federal aid to State and metropolitan development corporations.

The subcommittee will resume hearings after the summer recess on Wednesday, September 8, and conclude on Friday, September 17. During that period, the subcommittee will receive testimony from Governors, mayors, homebuilders, realtors, and other organizations affected by the proposals. In addition, one session of the hearings will be set aside for testimony on the implementation of title VII of the 1970 Housing Act, the Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970. We will also set aside one afternoon for testimony from Members of the House who have expressed a desire to testify on bills they have introduced.

For the benefit of House Members and the general public, I will provide the

House with a definite schedule of witnesses for the September 8-17 portion of our hearings as soon as possible.

ALCO STANDARD CORP. SUCCESS STORY

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is inspiring and encouraging to know that even in today's market the old-fashioned success story still is being enacted. It took the imagination, initiative, and genius of Tinkham Veale and Myron Gelbach to create Alco Standard, a unique company dedicated to preservation of independent entrepreneurs, backbone of our free enterprise system.

From a modest beginning just a few years ago, Alco Standard has burgeoned into a half-billion-dollar enterprise. It is a tribute to the ingenuity of Tink Veale and Mike Gelbach that, in the words of the Wall Street Journal, small businessmen who have joined Alco Standard have found "profits and happiness." Alco's member companies, operating autonomously under their former owner-managers, appear to have no way to go but up the ladder of success.

The Wall Street Journal last Monday, July 19, presented a graphic picture of the growth and operations of Alco's remarkable record. The article follows:

ALCO STANDARD KEEPS GROWING AND PROFITING, DEFYING THE FATE OF OTHER "MULTI-COMPANIES"

(By James MacGregor)

GATES MILLS, OHIO.—Can a small businessman find profits and happiness in a conglomerate that has 200 partners, 80 presidents, nine annual reports and a chairman who works in a stable?

John Kaiser did. He sold his growing little Tempo Products Co. to Alco Standard Corp., three years ago. Since then, sales have risen 65%, profits have doubled and Mr. Kaiser, who is still running his company is delighted. "I always had some reason why I couldn't add to the plant or build up inventory," he says. "Alco took away my excuses. I've never had more fun than I'm having now."

Although conglomerate stocks are enjoying a modest comeback these days, many of them fell on hard times in the past two years. The acquisitions they tried to turn around didn't turn. Antitrust regulators surged to the attack. A recession arrived. Earnings, already diluted, evaporated. James Ling lost a job.

Meanwhile, almost unnoticed, Alco Standard racked up a remarkable record. Forbes Magazine's 1971 report on American industry places Alco first of the 43 "multicompanies" in return on the total capital and gain in stock price, second in per-share earnings growth, and third in sales growth and return on equity over the past five years. Alco is still gobbling up companies while other conglomerates are spinning them off. George Morris, a securities analyst at Cleveland-based Prescott, Merrill Turben & Co., says he expects Alco's sales and earnings to grow at least 15% a year for the next five years.

NO TURNAROUND CANDIDATES

As Alco people tell it, the reason is a concept called the "corporate partnership," which really includes all those partners and presidents. Alco acquires only small, profit-

able, privately held companies that are still owned and managed by the entrepreneurs who built them. Publicly owned concerns are taboo. Turnaround candidates are verboten.

The owner gets Alco stock (never cash) for his company, thus becoming a "partner." He must keep managing his company, too. That's where the 80 presidents come from. From then on, Alco leaves him alone. He leans on the 30-man corporate staff for financing and staff work (computers, insurance, accounting) and does everything else just as he did before. About the only thing that changes is that "partners" supply certain operating figures to the parent company. "I've been in Alco two years now," one partner-president says, "and I'm the only Alco person who's ever set foot inside the door of my plant."

Many conglomerates promise the same thing, but it doesn't usually happen, says William E. Cox, chairman of the marketing department at Case Western Reserve University's school of management. "If you go into the typical conglomerate, the first thing they do is overhaul your financial system. It's not very long before their systems replace yours. Many of these businessmen look on their companies like children, and they can't take the new systems. So they walk away. When the top guy leaves, the business always suffers, no matter how strong its patents and market positions are."

Adds George Greene, an analyst at Philadelphia-based Janney Montgomery Scott Inc., "I know of no other company that carries the idea of autonomy as far as Alco Standard does."

THE CHAIRMAN AND HIS STABLE

Understanding how the "corporate partnership" works begins with Tinkham Veale II. He's the chairman who works in a stable, which is on a well-manicured 200-acre estate here in Gates Mills. He works in his stable because with sales last year of \$456 million and earnings of \$12.8 million, or \$1.53 a share, Alco is getting too large to run from his den. That's what he used to do five years ago when sales were only \$35 million and profits \$749,000, or 37 cents a share.

How do Alco and its partners get together? In many ways, Mr. Kaiser and Tempo are typical. Tempo was having its problems when Mr. Kaiser bumped into Tink Veale at a college reunion four years ago. Mr. Kaiser had built Tempo, a distributor of sprays and marine products, from scratch, and he saw growth opportunities ahead. But Tempo needed funds to expand, and Mr. Kaiser didn't cotton to the notion of "having to put up all my personal assets as pledges" for loans, especially since, at 55, he wanted "some liquidity for estate purposes."

Mr. Veale had heard that line before. After a varied and successful business and investment career, he retired in 1951 to raise racehorses. "But each year it was less fun," he says. "I needed more to do." After hearing his businessmen friends bemoaning their estate worries, undercapitalization and distractions from their sales or manufacturing fortes, he decided to pattern a company after a large law or accounting firm (his father-in-law, A. C. Ernst, founded the Ernst — Ernst accounting firm). Each partner would draw on central funds and staff services while "doing his own thing."

Mr. Veale—and some analysis of the stock—believe that brings into Alco some companies that other conglomerates can't acquire because their owner-managers want to keep running their own show. Other companies made overtures to prosperous Kilroy Structural Steel Co. of Cleveland. But says its president, Edward A. Kilroy, Jr., whose company now is in the Alco fold: "I've made some money. I don't have to work for anybody. The best thing about Tink Veale is that he does not tamper with good people. He gives them their head."

Alco Standard actually began in 1965, when Mr. Veale merged Alco Chemical Co., of Philadelphia with a half-dozen small companies controlled by himself; a younger brother, George Veale IV; and a college classmate, John Vaughan. Alco's Frank Andrus and Messrs. Vaughan and Veale IV kept running the companies, Myron Gelbach (now president) took over the administration, and Tink Veale went out to spread the gospel to other little companies: four in 1966, five in 1967, 13 in 1968, 23 in 1969 and 27 last year.

WORKING WITH MISSIONARY VEALE

Acquisition, Alco-style, is a missionary process. Mr. Veale does most of the work himself, winnowing 20 or more prime prospects a year from 400 possibilities, "about 90% of them brought to us by friends of friends." If the prospect's financial statements pass muster (steady sales and profit growth, plus stronger patents, processes or market position), he goes to work on the owner, selling his slogan, "It's better to have part of a gusher than all of a trickle."

No matter how good a prospect looks, the man in charge has to pass the personality test—energetic and aggressive, to be sure, but also eager to join Alco and socially compatible as well. Mr. Gelbach says at least one acquisition died when Mr. Veale, assessing the company's president, decided, "we would not be proud to have him at the Pop Club." The Pop (or "Partners-of-Profit") Club is a part-business, part-social group of the top one or two men at each company, plus top staff officials.

Alco won't outbid another suitor for a desirable company. Acquisitions are strictly for stock because Mr. Veale believes an executive doesn't work his best unless he has a stake in the company's ownership (his opinion of "hired managers" isn't printable). He also wants new companies to pay an "initiation fee" by contributing at least 50% more to per-share earnings than the company as a whole in the year of acquisition. Thus, if Alco earned \$1 a share, the acquired company in its first year would have to earn \$1.50 a share on the Alco shares it receives.

That policy averts two common conglomerate problems, analysts say. With no cash purchases, Alco avoids the liquidity crises that have forced companies like Ling-Temco-Vought and KDI Industries to sell units to raise cash as business slumped. The "initiation-fee" idea avoids excessive earnings dilution. Mr. Kilroy says, "If someone offers me four times what my company is worth and he offers me stock, I have to wonder what's he's giving everyone else. If he's doing the same thing with them, why his company is going to explode one of these days and my stock is going to be worthless."

GETTING A PIECE OF THE ACTION

Alco partners and employees now own close to 50% of the company's seven million shares (Mr. Veale owns 592,000). Mr. Veale believes so strongly that "anyone whose decisions affect profits should have a piece of the action" that about 1,000 of Alco's 12,000 employees have stock options. Some partner-presidents have given options to production-line foremen. Executive salaries are considered a bit on the low side, but partners also get yearly bonuses, based partly on Alco's profits and partly on the earnings growth of the partner's company over previous years (if he only matches the past few years, he gets nothing).

For Tempo Products, little has changed since it joined Alco except for the monthly reports Tempo sends to Alco headquarters. Still, Mr. Kaiser concedes that he was wary about the first capital budget he submitted. "I had it loaded," he says, "because I knew the old rule that you only get half what you ask for." The ensuing conversation, he claims, went like this:

Mr. Veale: "That's fine. You can have it all."

Mr. Kaiser: "Aren't you going to cut anything?"

Mr. Veale: "Nope. We only bet winners."

Not all Alco companies are winners, of course. One was sold not long ago when its president decided he would be better off in a different company. Another venture was quietly folded. Others get special attention from Alco's eight "managing partners," who are part consultant and part group vice president, watching over six to 10 other companies as well as their own. One managing partner says there is a big difference between his actions and those of other large corporations: "we'll never reorganize or consolidate a problem company out of existence. All we want to do is set up a guy there who can do the same job the other partners are doing."

WHEN THE SUPERIOR BECOMES INFERIOR

Indeed, when a partner-president disagrees with his superiors, his superiors often lose, because, Mr. Gelbach says, "the partner is the guy who's committed his money to his company." Not long ago Mr. Kaiser told George Veale, his managing partner, that he planned to stake an inventor to funds to develop a product. Mr. Veale thought it a waste of money. "I won," Mr. Kaiser says. "The inventor got his cash. But George won, too, because the invention was worthless."

Not many companies could operate with that sort of decision making. But tolerance for occasional mistakes seems to be part of the college-fraternity feeling that Mr. Veale fosters within his company. "Those guys have all made their million," one analyst comments. "What Tink has done is to get them all competing against each other to see who can make the most money."

Despite Alco's considerable success in recent years, some analysts maintain reservations about the company's future. They worry about Alco's refusal to consolidate smaller operations into large units to obtain the benefits of cooperative effort and economies of scale. More important, they ask what will happen as the handpicked crew of entrepreneurs Mr. Veale has gathered begins to retire.

Mr. Veale has an answer to that one: nepotism. "Exceptional people tend to have exceptional children," he says, pointing to two dozen Alco sons, sons-in-law and nephews currently functioning in staff posts or as No. 2 men to their parents or, in some cases, running the companies their fathers brought into Alco.

WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, women's struggle for equality is now almost 140 years old. More than three quarters of a century passed before the Women's Rights Movement succeeded in attaining the right of women to vote. By August 26, 1920, the necessary number of States had ratified the 19th amendment to enshrine that amendment in our Constitution. Many men hoped that by giving women the vote, the raucous and unfeminine suffragettes would be quelled.

Women have not been deflected, however, from their goal of full equality—equality not only at the polls, but also in the political parties, in public power, in employment, in management, in education, in the home, and in all spheres of public and private life. President Nixon

indicated last week the amusement with which he contemplated women's organization for political strength. This is an indication of why suffrage cannot be correlated with equality, more than 50 years after the institution of the 19th amendment.

Congress and the President must join in supporting the Women's Movement for full equality and responsibility. Such support is dictated as an affirmation of the democratic principles upon which our country stands.

Last year, women chose August 26, the day of the effectuation of the 19th amendment, to demonstrate their continuing struggle for equality. In commemoration of the 19th amendment, and of the women's strike in 1970, I will shortly offer a joint resolution to direct the President to designate August 26 of every year as "Women's Equality Day." After a century and a half of struggle, women are entitled at least to this small token of respect.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my resolution in the RECORD at this point: Joint resolution designating August 26th of each year as "Women's Equality Day"

Whereas, the women of the United States have been treated as second-class citizens, and have not been entitled to the full rights and privileges, public or private, legal or institutional, which are available to male citizens of the United States; and

Whereas, the women of the United States have united to assure that these rights and privileges are available to all citizens equally, regardless of sex; and

Whereas, the women of the United States have designated August 26, the anniversary of the date of the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, as a symbol of the continued fight for equal rights; and

Whereas, the women of the United States are to be commended and supported in their organization and activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That August 26th of each year is designated as "Women's Equality Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation annually in commemoration of that day in 1920, on which the women of America were first given the right to vote, and that day in 1970, on which a nationwide demonstration for women's rights took place.

WOMEN ARE HARASSED DAILY FOR TITLE DESIGNATION

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, while Congress debates the equal rights amendment, the "Women's Equality Act," and other measures designed to give women full equality in all phases of public and private life, women are harassed daily by Government interrogations as to their marital status. Thus, the thousands of Government forms which make up red-tape require women to designate "Miss" or "Mrs.," while men, apparently, are sufficiently described by the term "Mr."

Each time a woman is required to designate Miss or Mrs., she is reminded that her identity is perceived not only by her sex, but also by her marital status; that

is, without knowing whether or not a woman is married, her identification is not complete. This inquiry is only one of the thousands of reminders that the Government perceives a woman's primary role as a wife and, one may assume, as a mother. Governmental curiosity about marital status does not, apparently, extend to the private lives of men. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification for such idle curiosity about women; and in view of the vast number of forms which must be completed by anyone associated with the United States, its elimination will do much to enhance the personal respect for the individual, and serve as an indication of the Federal Government's commitment to principles of equality.

There is, however, a more destructive consequence of the Government's designation of marital status. I speak of the subjection of women to double discrimination; that is, discrimination because they are women, and discrimination because they are, or are not married. Black women, of course, incur an additional level of discrimination. Employment, for instance, is one field in which discrimination against women is notorious, and despite Federal legislation, the existence and extent of such discrimination is still well-entrenched. Men who work for or with the Government and who are inclined to prefer men for nonclerical employment—and I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that such preference is still the rule in all of the Federal agencies—are additionally disposed to discriminate according to marital status. Thus, after clearing the initial hurdle of sex discrimination, a woman will often be denied employment—or promotion, or responsibility, or some other benefit—because she is married. Supervisors rationalize extensively about this discrimination, usually on the basis that a married woman is apt to get pregnant, or she is a "second breadwinner," or some other unsubstantiated myth.

Likewise, a married woman may be denied credit on the basis that she has a husband which may be available to a single woman despite her sex. Health insurance, life insurance, social security, maternity benefits, and other benefits are available to different degrees depending upon marital status.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too much to ask that women be treated and considered as individuals and not as wives of individuals. To avoid any temptation on the part of the Federal Government to be a party to any such discrimination, I will shortly offer this bill to eliminate designation by marital status by means of a title or prefix, in any instrumentality of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of my bill in the RECORD, at this point:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit any instrumentality of the United States from using as a prefix to the name of any person any title which indicates marital status, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) no instrumentality of the United States shall use in connection with—

(1) the carrying on of any correspondence,

(2) the keeping of any record, or
(3) the issuance of any certificate, document, or other written instrument, any title as a prefix to the name of any person which has the effect of indicating the marital status of such person.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "instrumentality of the United States" means—

(A) the Congress of the United States,
(B) any court of the United States established by Congress in accordance with article III, section 1 of the Constitution, and

(C) any agency, department, corporation, independent establishment, or other instrumentality of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any government of any territory or possession of the United States.

(b) This Act shall take effect with respect to all—

(1) correspondence which is carried on,
(2) records which are kept, and
(3) certificates, documents, and other written instruments which are issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LINK from 3:30 p.m., July 22 through July 27, on account of House Agriculture Committee field trip.

Mr. MATHIAS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) from July 22 through July 26, on account of official business as member of House Committee on Agriculture.

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. PATMAN for 15 minutes today 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. KEMP, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORSE, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. FOLEY, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. BIAGGI, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOWARD during consideration of the military construction bill today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. GUBSER), to insert his remarks immediately after those of Mr. HOLIFIELD regarding Camp Pendleton.

Mr. LEGGETT, to include tables and extraneous material in his statement earlier today.

Mr. GROSS to insert his remarks during debate on House Resolution 533.

All Members (at the request of Mr. COUGHLIN) for 5 legislative days on the subject of Mr. MORSE's special order today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. RED of New York.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON of New York.
Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. SCHMITZ.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. WHELEN.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. GUBSER in two instances.
Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. LATA.
Mr. SPENCE.
Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. RUPPE.
Mr. CLEVELAND.

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

Mr. YATRON in two instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. WALDIE in three instances.
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. ROUSH in two instances.
Mr. HANLEY.
Mr. DORN.
Mr. MAZZOLI in four instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. BEGICH.
Mr. PATTEN in two instances.
Mr. ICHORD in four instances.
Mr. BINGHAM.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 699. An act to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 26, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 533. Resolution to provide for additional compensation for the officers and employees of the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 92-373). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10061. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 538. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-375). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 9270. (Rept. No. 92-376). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARING, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 10013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase personal exemptions after 1973 by an amount based on annual variations in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 10014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase personal exemptions after 1973 by an amount based on annual variations in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING (for himself, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CAFERY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 10015. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roam-

ing horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING (for himself, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 10016. 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. BARING (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 10017. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 10018. 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. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10019. A bill to designate certain lands in the Shenandoah National Park, Va., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 10020. A bill to prohibit the furnishing of mailing lists and other lists of names and addresses by Government agencies to the public; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 10021. A bill to assist in the effective and suitable disposal of passenger cars at the time of the discontinuance of their use on the highways by encouraging the disposal of such cars through persons licensed by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10022. A bill to amend section 245 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime to deny any person the benefits of any educational program or activity where such program or activity is receiving Federal financial assistance and to provide for injunctive relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10023. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10024. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for persons who interfere with the conduct of judicial proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10025. A bill to establish an environmental financing authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10026. A bill to permit the release of certain veterans from liability to the United States arising out of loans made, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10027. A bill to provide for the estab-

lishment of a national cemetery in Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10028. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by imposing a tax on the transfer of explosives to persons who may lawfully possess them and to prohibit possession of explosives by certain persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 10030. A bill to amend section 207(c) of the Flood Control Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 10031. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG,

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COTTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 10032. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON,

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 10033. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBISON of

New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 10034. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 10035. A bill to establish an independent agency to be known as the U.S. Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel to represent the consumers of the Nation before Federal and State regulatory agencies with respect to matters pertaining to certain electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities; to provide grants and other Federal assistance to State and local governments for the establishment and operation of utility consumers' counsels; to improve methods for obtaining and disseminating information with respect to the operations of utility companies of interest to the Federal Government and other consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 10036. A bill to authorize the engagement of the District of Columbia to engage in certain activities designed to effect com-

munity development; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 10037. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize the lease or sale of tobacco allotments within a State under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 10038. A bill to amend the Communications Act to establish conditions upon which competing applications may be considered for authorizations specified in pending renewal applications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 10039. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 10040. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10041. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to establish an emergency Federal economic assistance program, to authorize the President to declare areas of the Nation which meet certain economic and employment criteria to be economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 10042. A bill to permit greater involvement of American medical organizations and personnel in the furnishing of health services and assistance to the developing nations of the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. SCHWENGER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REES, Mr. PELLY, Mr. ROE, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 10043. A bill: Vietnam Veterans Act of 1971; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. FAUNTRROY, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. GROVE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 10044. A bill: Vietnam Veterans Act of 1971; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 10045. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 10046. A bill to amend section 16 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1121, 1153, ch. 425; 33 U.S.C. 411 and 412); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 10047. A bill to amend the act of

March 3, 1899, commonly referred to as the Refuse Act, relating to the issuance of certain permits; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 10048. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, relating to grants for the construction of treatment works, in order to increase the Federal share of construction costs and to authorize the obligation of certain amounts for such grants, and to amend section 10 of the act relating to water quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. DON H. H. CLAUSEN, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 10049. A bill to provide for the management, protection and development of the national resource lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10050. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10051. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the penalty for pollution of the water by oil; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10052. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 10053. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 10054. A bill to establish a working capital fund for the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit barbers who work for a percentage of the charges made for their services to establish qualified pension plans for themselves in the same manner as if they were self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 10056. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery at Camp Parks, or Port Chicago, Calif., for northern California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 10061. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 799. 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. BURTON:

H.J. Res. 800. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEVINE (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WARE, Mr. HALL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the place where citizens are to vote in any election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 802. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on October 3, 1971, and ending on October 10, 1971, as "National Student Participation Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 375. Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of State to call for an international moratorium of 10 years on the killing of all species of whales; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution relative to control of the production and traffic in illegal drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution relative to control of the production and traffic in illegal drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Res. 559. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that administration pursuit of current proposals at peace talks in Paris is a matter of utmost urgency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 560. A resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10057. A bill to release the conditions in a deed with respect to certain property heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Columbia Military Academy and its successors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 10058. A bill for the relief of Daniel L. Suter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 10059. A bill for the relief of Jun Nam Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10060. A bill for the relief of Suh Mi Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

112. THE SPEAKER presented a petition of Fridlander Semen Iskovlevich, Krivo Rog, U.S.S.R., relative to treatment of Soviet citizens in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.