

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY UNTIL 9 A.M. ON THURSDAY, JULY 29

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Wednesday, it stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. on Thursday.

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

PROGRAM

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

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. following a recess.

Immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senate will resume its consideration of the pending business, the so-called Lockheed bill, and the pending question will be the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON). Because the Senate will be reconvening following a recess, there will be no morning business. The Senate will resume consideration of the Stevenson amendment immediately following the standard recognition of the two leaders.

At such time as the Stevenson amendment is disposed of, the Senate will then proceed to the consideration of amendment No. 334 to S. 2308, proposed by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH).

At not later than 2 p.m. tomorrow—in other words, possibly before 2 p.m.—the Senate will temporarily lay aside the

pending business, and will proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 296, H.R. 8866—an act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

A time limitation agreement has been entered into with respect to the so-called sugar quota bill, under which agreement there will be 1 hour to be equally divided on the bill; and there will be 30 minutes to be equally divided on amendments, with the exceptions, as to time, of the so-called South African amendment, on which there will be 3 hours, the so-called confiscation amendment, on which there will be 2 hours, and an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), on which there will be 1 hour.

It is anticipated, Mr. President, that there will be a number of rollcall votes tomorrow. There will be a vote, certainly, on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), when debate is completed thereon. There presently is no time limitation agreement with respect to debate on that amendment. Moreover, there will surely be rollcall votes on various amendments to the sugar quota bill.

It is anticipated that action will be completed on the sugar quota bill tomorrow, which would mean that the Senate would likely stay in session until a reasonably late hour. Undoubtedly there will be a rollcall vote on passage of the sugar quota bill.

A motion to invoke cloture on the pending business was entered today, and a rollcall vote on that motion will occur on Wednesday immediately following the mandatory quorum call, which means

that the vote would occur at about 12:15 p.m. on Wednesday.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1971, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26, 1971:

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

William Brevard Hand, of Alabama, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of Alabama, vice Daniel H. Thomas, retiring.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William L. McCulloch	Robert L. Nichols
Robert W. Taylor	Clyde R. Mann
Adolph G. Schwenk	Albert C. Pommerenk
William H. Lanagan, Jr.	Herbert L. Wilkerson
Francis W. Vaught	Manning T. Jannell
	Ernest R. Reid, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 26, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 26, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Fear not, for I am with thee: Be not dismayed, for I am Thy God. I will strengthen thee, yea I will help thee.

—Isaiah 41: 10.

Eternal Father of our spirits, at the altar of prayer we bow praying that we may receive wisdom for the facing of these hours, courage for the living of these days, and strength that in the fight to set men free we may not fail man nor Thee.

We are disturbed by the troubles of these times, worn out by many worries, disheartened by the difficulties which beset us, and tempted at times to give up wondering if the struggle is worthwhile. Now we bring our worries and our difficulties to Thee, not to run away from them, but praying for strength and courage that we may do our work with a new spirit and a new confidence because we know Thou art with us.

Bless our astronauts and grant them a safe journey to and from the moon. May their endeavor add to the sum of our human knowledge and benefit the whole human race.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1892. An act for the relief of Stephen C. Yednock;

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Arnold D. Smith;

H.R. 2110. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfinger;

H.R. 2246. An act for the relief of Charles C. Smith;

H.R. 3344. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 3753. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernie D. Bethea, U.S. Marine Corps, retired;

H.R. 6217. An act to amend the peanut

marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and

H.R. 7271. An act to authorize appropriations for the Commission on Civil Rights.

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

H.R. 4263. An act to add California-grown peaches as a commodity eligible for any form of promotion, including paid advertising, under a marketing order; and

H.R. 5208. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, and to authorize the annual active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard.

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

S. 389. An act for the relief of Stephen Lance Pender, Patricia Jenifer Pender, and Denese Gene Pender;

S. 733. An act to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Clayton Bion Craig, Arthur P. Wuth, Mrs. Lenore D. Hanks, David E. Sleeper, and DeWitt John;

S. 2317. An act to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965;

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating 1971 as the "Year of World Minority Language Groups";

S.J. Res. 132. Joint Resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; and

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 22, 1971.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:40 p.m. on Friday, July 23, 1971, said to contain a message from the President entitled "A Report on Rural Financial Assistance."

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNING, Clerk,
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO RURAL AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-147)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting today the first annual report on financial assistance to rural areas, as called for by Title 9 of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

The revitalization of rural America is one of the important objectives of my administration. For I am convinced that the growth which this Nation will inevitably experience in the coming decades will be healthy growth only if it is balanced growth—and this means growth which is distributed among both urban and rural areas. The recent trend of diminishing population and diminishing prosperity in many rural areas must be actively resisted. This report tells about some of the steps we have taken in this direction—and about some of the conclusions we have reached concerning future steps.

As the report points out, financial assistance is now available from public and private sources for agriculture, industrial development, housing, community development and other economic activities in rural areas. This document describes some of the things this administration is doing to correct deficiencies in these programs. It also provides detailed financial data for selected Federal programs for Fiscal Year 1970, most of them Federal direct and insured loan programs.

Perhaps the most important element of the report, however, is its conclusion that the most critical financial needs for achieving greater rural development are those of State and local governments. My General and Special Revenue Sharing proposals are geared to meet these needs. These proposals recognize both the steadily increasing demand for service being placed on State and local governments and the severe limitations on new and existing sources of revenue at these governmental levels.

These proposed revenue sharing funds could be used for specific services presently provided by State and local governments, or to finance new programs and services tailored to particular needs of States and localities, including rural development. One of my six Special Revenue Sharing programs, in fact, is earmarked specifically for Rural Community Development and it alone would provide a total of \$1.1 billion annually for rural programs and services administered at the State and local levels. In addition, substantial portions of my revenue sharing proposals for transportation, education, urban community development, manpower training, and law enforcement assistance would directly benefit rural residents. And my General Revenue Sharing proposal would provide additional funds which could be used to augment various rural efforts.

I would emphasize that revenue sharing monies could be used not only to pay for direct governmental services but also to give credit assistance for accelerating the expansion of commercial and industrial development through locally sponsored institutions. Such institutions can be particularly useful in those specific areas where there are shortages of private investment capital, and where even the removal of existing barriers to the free movement of private capital may not entirely meet local needs.

I strongly believe that it would be better to establish a series of State and local special credit institutions than to create a nationwide federally sponsored community bank, since the former course places responsibility for decision making and action closer to the people who require assistance—and is more likely to produce decisions which are truly responsive to their needs.

This report also highlights the problems caused by the excessive proliferation and fragmentation of Federal assistance programs. Too often, the result has been an uncoordinated and piecemeal approach to rural development. Merely to increase the level of rural assistance without making basic reforms in the delivery systems will not enable us to solve the problems of rural communities.

This is why it is so important that my proposals for reorganizing the executive branch be enacted by the Congress. For only a thoroughgoing restructuring of the organizational framework can bring about a true consolidation and coordination of numerous Federal programs and with it the more effective and efficient delivery of Federal assistance. The proposed new Departments of Community Development and Economic Affairs

would have particular responsibility in the rural development area.

As the report indicates, many families are presently excluded from eligibility for Federal credit assistance because of their low income. Traditional development programs can do little to give them the direct aid they need. This is another reason why I believe so strongly that my proposed family assistance program could have a major impact on the quality of life in rural America. Not only would it immediately help poor families raise their standard of living, but it would also enable many of them to take advantage of Federal credit assistance which is presently beyond their reach. Coupled with more effective delivery of federally assisted housing services, the family assistance plan would permit great strides in improving the quality of rural housing.

The problems of agricultural credit and farm debt are also taken up in this report. While the credit requirements of commercial farmers appear to have been adequately funded during the last 20 years—primarily by private lenders—the recent trend of increasing farm debt is likely to continue throughout this decade. Fortunately, the federally sponsored farm credit lending institutions—which are now entirely member-owned—have been playing an increasing role in meeting the credit needs of farmers. If private lenders and the Farm Credit System continue to expand their credit assistance at the same rate as during the 1960's, there should be adequate credit available to meet the needs of commercial agriculture during the 1970's.

For those farmers who are unable to qualify for credit from private lenders and the Farm Credit System, recently strengthened Federal credit programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration are available to meet additional needs. In my "Salute to Agriculture" speech this past May, I announced plans to increase the farm operating and farm ownership loan programs by \$215 million over the level originally budgeted for 1972—an increase of nearly 50% in available loan funds. I pledge that my administration will continue to be responsive to the needs of those farmers who are unable to qualify for private credit. I also believe, however, that we should continue to rely primarily on private lenders to meet the general credit needs of commercial agriculture, and I would point to various measures which are recommended in this report for improving the flow of private credit to agricultural borrowers.

In addition to all of these decisions and recommendations, I have also supported enactment of legislation to create a Rural Telephone Bank which will soon be able to provide substantially increased credit assistance to small rural telephone companies and cooperatives. This will mean better telephone service for our rural citizens. I have recently sent to the Congress a budget amendment requesting \$30 million for the initial purchase of capital stock in this Bank. My speech last May also announced increased lending for rural sewer and water projects in both 1971 (an additional \$100 million)

and 1972 (an additional \$111 million)—a nearly 60% increase over the level budgeted for the 1972 fiscal year.

I am confident that the actions already taken by this administration—in conjunction with the new programs which I have recommended to the Congress—can do a great deal to bring about the renewal of rural America. The achievement of this goal is essential if the growth we experience in the years ahead is to be for us not a curse but a blessing. All Americans have a high stake in the success of rural development.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 23, 1971.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the public works and atomic energy appropriation bill for 1972.

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

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9382, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. BOLAND submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-377)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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," 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 1, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 30, 32, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20, 26, 28, 29, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 44 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$170,000,000"; and the Senate 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 amend-

ment insert "\$200,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,000,000"; 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 "\$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "section 718 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1799), and for special planning assistance grants as authorized by section 720 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1800)."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation may be used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the cost of any activity or project, except that grants made pursuant to section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (84 Stat. 1783), may be made in an amount not to exceed 75 per centum."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,250,000"; 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 "\$16,096,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,522,700,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$52,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$13,000,000 for space shuttle main engine test facilities and \$5,500,000 for space shuttle thermal protection facilities"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no transfers shall be made to the appropriation "Research and Program Management."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$24,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$619,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,307,700,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$68,707,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$62,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,123,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GAIMO,
DAVID PRYOR,
J. EDWARD ROUSH,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOSEPH M. McDADE.

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN STENNIS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, 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

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 1: Provides an increase of \$55,000,000 in annual contract authority for the rent supplement program as proposed by the House, instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Provides an increase of \$170,000,000 in annual contract authority for the homeownership assistance program (sec. 235), instead of \$165,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Provides an increase of \$200,000,000 in annual contract authority for the rental housing assistance program (sec. 236), instead of \$165,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$225,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers agree that \$35,000,000 of the amount provided should be used for housing for the elderly.

Amendment Nos. 4, 5 and 6: Amend the language for the low and moderate income sponsor fund to provide for both grants and loans under sections 106 (a) and (b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, as proposed by the Senate, instead of loans as proposed by the House; appropriate \$4,000,000 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete language proposed by the Senate to make the funds available until expended.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriate \$3,250,000 for counseling services, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$16,500,000 for salaries and expenses of housing management programs as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 9, 10 and 11: Delete language proposed by the Senate, and the House language as proposed by the Senate, and in lieu of the Senate language insert perfecting language; and appropriate \$10,000,000 for new community assistance grants as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 12, 14, 15, and 16: Delete provisions proposed by the Senate to include language in the bill to authorize the transfer of funds to new programs in the event of enactment of special revenue sharing or other legislation superseding the Model cities, Urban renewal, Rehabilitation loan fund, and Grants for neighborhood facilities. If special revenue sharing or some other new program should be approved at an early date to supersede or replace these programs, the necessary funding can be considered at that time, including any request for an appropriate transfer of funds.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$1,250,000,000 for urban renewal programs, instead of \$1,200,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Restores House language requiring that funds for open space land programs generally be used to finance not in excess of 50 percent of the cost of any activity or project, and adds language making an exception for grants made pursuant to section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended, where not to exceed 75 percent grants are authorized.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$22,750,000 for salaries and expenses, community development programs as proposed by the

Senate, instead of \$21,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$45,000,000 for research and technology, instead of \$35,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Authorizes \$3,771,000 for administrative expenses for research and technology as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$8,250,000 for fair housing and equal opportunity, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$16,096,000 for administration and staff services, instead of \$15,846,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,346,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes the item proposed by the Senate for a \$250,000 contribution to the National Homeownership Foundation.

TITLE II

Space, science, veterans and certain other independent agencies

Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$2,300,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$2,330,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum provided includes necessary funds for the responsibilities that formerly were performed by the National Marine Science Council.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$2,522,700,000 for research and development, instead of \$2,517,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,541,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Earmarks \$39,000,000 for the NERVA program as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$52,700,000 for construction of facilities, instead of \$33,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Authorizes \$7,900,000 for rehabilitation and modification of facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes the word "and" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Deletes the \$2,100,000 proposed by the Senate for the expansion of the Visitor's Information Center at the Kennedy Space Center.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that \$13,000,000 be authorized for space shuttle main engine test facilities and \$5,500,000 for space shuttle thermal protection facilities, instead of \$20,000,000 for space shuttle facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Provides that construction of facilities funds shall remain available through June 30, 1974, as proposed by the House, instead of until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$722,635,000 for research and program management as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$720,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34: Authorizes transfers not to exceed two percent between the appropriations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but no transfers shall be made to the appropriation Research and Program Management, instead of five percent transfer authority between appropriations as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 35: Authorizes \$24,225,000 for expenses of program development and management, instead of \$23,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$619,000,000 for the National Science Foundation, instead of \$582,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$645,150,000 as proposed by the

Senate. The House bill provided at least \$40,000,000 to assume support of basic research projects dropped by other departments and agencies. The managers are of the opinion that an increased amount over and above the sum recommended by the House should be provided as the result of conference action.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Earmark \$26,800,000 for summer institutes and other programs of training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$23,300,000 for the summer institutes program as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Earmarks not less than \$28,800,000 for institutional support of science as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Earmarks not less than \$99,300,000 for science education support as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to make funds for scientific activities financed with special foreign currencies available until expended.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$2,307,700,000 for medical care, instead of \$2,244,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,333,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Managers agree that both objectives, the minimum of 97,500 operating beds and the average daily patient load of 85,500, must be met and funds are to be apportioned accordingly.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$68,707,000 for medical and prosthetic research, instead of \$64,707,000 as proposed by the House and \$72,707,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$93,418,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$90,418,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III

Corporations

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$62,500,000 for interest adjustment payments, instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$85,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Authorizes \$8,123,500 for Administrative expenses, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,247,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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 amount, to the 1972 budget estimate, and to the House and Senate bills for 1972 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year	Amounts
1971	\$16,996,888,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	17,457,017,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972	18,115,203,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	18,698,518,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1972	18,339,738,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	+1,342,850,000
Budget estimate of new budget (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	+882,721,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972	+224,535,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	-358,780,000

¹Taking into account \$850,000,000 in the budget as a proposed supplemental for special revenue sharing, or 1/2 year funding in certain housing and urban development programs, the bill is \$32,721,000 over the budget estimates.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GLAIMO,
DAVID PRYOR,
J. EDWARD ROUSH,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN STENNIS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9667, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on 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.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-382)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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," 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 12, 20, 32, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, and 19; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,592,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$26,000,000"; 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 "\$14,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,129,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$93,037,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,087,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,662,093,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$69,337,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,750,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,205,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,631,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken by said amendment and delete the matter proposed by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$40,000,000"; 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: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 305. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$80,000,000 in fiscal year 1972 for 'State and Community Highway Safety' and 'Highway Related Safety Grants'." And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$900,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 14, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 49.

JOHN J. MCFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
TOM STEED,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLIFFORD P. CHASE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, 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—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$21,592,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$21,342,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,342,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes 15 positions in addition to those provided by the House. The managers are in agreement, however, that none of these positions shall be allocated to the office of consumer affairs or to the regional representative program.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$26,000,000 for transportation planning, research, and development instead of \$24,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$31,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount recommended includes the full \$4,755,000 requested for upper atmosphere climatic impact assessment research.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$750,000

for grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. 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. 4: Appropriates \$1,760,000 for consolidation of departmental headquarters as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate an amendment which reads as follows:

"CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT TERMINATION

"For payment of the airlines contribution toward the development of the Civil Supersonic Aircraft, \$58,500,000, to remain available until expended."

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$97,682,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of \$96,682,000 as proposed by the House and \$101,682,000 as proposed by the Senate. 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. 7: Appropriates \$9,750,000 for alteration of bridges as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$14,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Aviation Administration

Amendment No. 9: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate making the funds appropriated for facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) available for engineering and service testing including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$301,809,300 for facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$252,009,300 as proposed by the House.

The managers are concerned over the delay in the implementation of this program with the prior year appropriations. Such delays result in unnecessarily large unobligated balances which the managers feel can be avoided by proceeding more rapidly in implementing the program.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes the language "research, development, and service testing" and inserts in lieu thereof "research and development" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$63,360,700 for research and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) as proposed by the House instead of \$73,360,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes the language "research, development, and service testing" and inserts in lieu thereof "research and development" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$580,744,000 for Federal payment to the airport and airway trust fund instead of \$530,944,000 as proposed by the House and \$750,744,000 as proposed

by the Senate. 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 additional \$49,800,000 provided over the House relates to the additional amount provided for facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund). Under the conference agreement there will be an estimated unappropriated balance in the trust fund of \$248,000,000 as of July 1, 1972. The managers agree that the unappropriated balance in the trust fund as of July 1, 1972, shall be available solely to liquidate obligations incurred for airport development grants subsequent to June 30, 1972.

Federal Highway Administration

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$7,129,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,110,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,159,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Provides transfer of \$93,037,000 from the appropriation for "Federal-aid highways (trust fund)" instead of \$92,337,000 as proposed by the House and \$93,326,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Earmarks not to exceed \$15,087,000 of amount provided for salaries and expenses to remain available until expended instead of \$14,855,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,320,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$10,000,000 for rail crossings-demonstration projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that \$3,000,000 of the amount appropriated for rail crossings-demonstration projects is to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for the Darien Gap Highway as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$4,662,093,000 for Federal-aid-highways (trust fund) instead of \$4,661,393,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,662,382,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment that provides that appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund for forest highways are authorized for liquidation of obligations incurred against balances of the sums authorized for prior years and remaining unobligated at July 1, 1971.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment that provides that appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund for public lands highways are authorized for liquidation of obligations incurred against balances of the sums authorized for prior years and remaining unobligated at July 1, 1971.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate \$2,500,000 for Baltimore-Washington Parkway (trust fund).

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$69,337,000 for traffic and highway safety instead of \$62,837,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,837,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers are in agreement that the eleven additional projects proposed are to be evenly divided.

Amendment No. 26: Provides that \$25,750,000 of the amount appropriated for traffic and highway safety is to be derived

from the Highway Trust Fund instead of \$22,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$29,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Railroad Administration

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$2,205,000 for office of the administrator, salaries and expenses, instead of \$1,943,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,468,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$10,350,000 for railroad research instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$5,631,000 for bureau of railroad safety instead of \$5,481,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,781,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$25,000,000 for high-speed ground transportation research and development instead of \$29,077,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

No part of the reduction is to be applied to the Washington-New York and New York-Boston demonstrations or to the \$3,000,000 requested for the high-speed ground test center.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which provides that not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall be available for use in construction and engineering work on an extension of the Alaska Railroad from Fairbanks, Alaska, to the International Airport located near that city. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$6,300,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$7,149,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers are in agreement that none of the additional personnel employed shall be assigned to field stations outside of UMTA headquarters except to supervise and implement on-going projects.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$65,000,000 for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training instead of \$52,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$78,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Earmarks \$62,000,000 of the amount appropriated for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training for research, development, and demonstrations instead of \$49,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the House to earmark \$3,000,000 for research, development, and demonstrations related to subway safety and language proposed by the Senate to earmark \$40,000,000 for research and demonstrations on bus, commuter rail, rail rapid transit and light rail research.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$30,640,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$28,940,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 37: Restores House provision limiting commitments for grants-in-aid for airport development to \$280,000,000.

Amendment No. 38: Restores section number as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Limits obligations for Highway beautification to \$40,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Restores House provision and limits obligations for State and community highway safety and Highway related safety grants to \$80,000,000 instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Restores House provision limiting obligations for forest highways to \$20,000,000.

Amendment No. 42: Restores House provision limiting obligations for public lands highways to \$10,000,000.

Amendment No. 43: Restores section number as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Limits commitments for grants for urban mass transportation to \$900,000,000 instead of \$800,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 45, 46, 47, and 48: Restore section numbers as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to conform the section number. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

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 amount, the 1972 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills follows:

	<i>Amounts</i>
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	\$2,984,620,605
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (as amended)	2,860,327,997
House bill, fiscal year 1972	2,733,369,997
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	2,958,929,997
Conference agreement	2,905,310,997
Conference agreement compared with:	

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	-79,309,608
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	+44,983,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972	+171,941,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	-53,619,000

¹ Includes \$174,321,000 advance FY 1973 appropriation for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

JOHN J. MCFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
TOM STEED,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 9910, TO AMEND THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 9910) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressman CELLER's Judiciary Subcommittee on its hearing last week regarding District representation.

This has had more implications than we generally recognize. The United States is not only responsible for the disenfranchisement of 850,000 District residents but, indirectly, of millions of people in the capital cities of Latin American countries that have modeled their governments in varying degrees after ours in the United States. Unfortunately in these newer nations our unwise disenfranchisement of the residents of our Capital has been imitated. However, there are already strong drives in several of these capital cities such as Brazil which has recently replaced Rio as the capital of Brazil. I am hopeful that they will succeed just as I am hopeful that our long drive will be a success in this Congress.

Nearly all the other capital cities in the free world that are older than Washington, D.C., are represented in their national assemblies. And all the English- and French-speaking countries of Africa have national representatives from the capital. In some cases the capital is part of a province or a state but it does have representation. In the Middle East, Turkey and Afghanistan are excellent examples where the capitals have representation. In Korea, Seoul is the 10th province and gets legislative representation. Other examples for Asia include Japan, Thailand, and Malaysia. The list could go on and on and with regard to Europe let me include Stockholm, Sweden; Vienna, Austria; Paris, France; Rome, Italy; and, of course, London, England whose form of government our Founding Fathers built and developed ours on, with this exception.

PASSING OF W. C. "BILL" JARNAGIN

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, each of us in this body represents a district in which resides one or more outstanding members of the fourth estate. Thus I am not today claiming for northwest Iowa any singular distinction not occasionally shared by other areas of this great country. But I do regret to report that over the past weekend I have learned of the death of one of the finest practitioners of the journalistic art who has graced my State. W. C. "Bill" Jarnagin spent more than half a century in publishing and editing newspapers, most of that time as the head man of the Storm Lake, Iowa, Pilot Tribune. He was a kindly man and generous. But he was also perceptive in his observation of human behavior, and his five decades of the columns depicting the scene, local or national, were always carefully read and appreciated. His peers in Iowa recognized him with frequent tributes. He was chosen Master Publisher. When he sold the Pilot Tribune last year he was honored with one of the grandest parties his community ever staged. He continued to write his column until his recent illness foreclosed even that labor of love.

I did not want the passing of this noble gentleman to go without notice in this House, whose activities Bill used to watch so closely.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION AND STUDY BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 538

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 20 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) However, the committee is authorized to send not more than—

(1) ten majority members and eight minority members of such committee and three

majority staff assistants and two minority staff assistants to the Republic of the Philippines, Japan, and Southeast Asia for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of the committee in the Republic of the Philippines and in the case of American veterans and servicemen in Japan and Southeast Asia; and

(2) six majority members and five minority members of such committee and three majority staff assistants and two minority staff assistants to Western Europe of the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of the committee in the case of American veterans and servicemen in Western Europe.

(c) In addition, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within and without the United States, for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of the establishment, operation, and maintenance of cemeteries and of veterans' benefit programs properly coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1973, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1973.

Sec. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

With the following committee amendment:

CXVII—1711—Part 21

On page 1, line 1, strike all after the word "Resolved," through the word "currencies:" on page 4, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 20, Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction regarding:

"(1) Medical facilities, hospitals, counseling programs and veterans' benefits for American veterans and servicemen in the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam;

"(2) Present counseling programs, the quality of medical care, and the operation of education, pension and other programs for American veterans and servicemen in the United Kingdom, West Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Spain, Italy and Greece.

"For the purposes of carrying out each of the two investigations studies and inquiries enumerated above, the committee is authorized to send not more than eleven members (six majority and five minority) and three staff assistants to those countries within which such investigation, study or inquiry is authorized to be conducted.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 20, Ninety-second Congress, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purpose of carrying out the authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:"

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority side, to the very able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travel resolution from the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I think it should be said in fairness that this is the second resolution from that committee for travel. I also would like to say in all fairness that of all the resolutions for travel which have come before our committee during this session, this one appeals to me personally more than any of the other resolutions.

I am sure those Members who read the papers, look at TV, and listen to radio, are very familiar with the question of the drug traffic just now and the effect it is having on our boys in Vietnam and on the boys who are coming back home, so many of them, having become addicts as the result of taking heroin and other drugs.

The able and distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) the chairman of the committee—and I would like to observe he is a very able and fair chairman and one of good judgment—has become very much concerned about this problem and he has talked to me personally about this resolution on several oc-

casions. I think it comes as no secret that as one of the humble members of the Rules Committee, I do not look with a great deal of favor upon so many of these travel resolutions, but I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think this is one which is justified.

The original resolution, as introduced, provided for 18 members to travel on each of two study missions. The Committee on Rules cut that down to 11 members and at the same time cut the staff from five down to three. The resolution provides for travel to both Europe and Asia. Of course, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over many cemeteries abroad and various other programs affecting our veterans.

So, Mr. Speaker, without making any extended remarks, I should just like to repeat that the drug problem particularly is one of major importance. We just cannot overemphasize, as I see it, the necessity of preventing the further spread of this cancer, as well as encouraging the rehabilitation of these unfortunate young men who have become the victims of the drug traffic.

As I say, while we approached this with some caution in the Rules Committee, as we do all these travel resolutions, I believe this one is justified.

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

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to yield to my able and distinguished friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Mississippi for yielding to me.

After all is said and done, it will give some 22 members of this particular committee a trip around the world in two bites, if one can describe it that way. They will at least make it around the world—in 80 days?

What intrigues me more than anything else about this resolution is the stopover in Luxembourg. I was not aware that we had any troops stationed in Luxembourg. It is undoubtedly a nice place to visit.

France is also listed. Our troops were thrown out of France some time ago. Perhaps the committee members are going over to France to see if they can find the use to which that Army or Air Force hospital has been put—the hospital which was built and never used by our forces.

While we are all cognizant of the drug problem as it affects servicemen around the world, I am sure every committee in the Congress, if they can hang their hats on the drug problem, will be sending members overseas to investigate it.

I say again that I am intrigued by the fact that the committee is going to Luxembourg and France, where I do not believe we have a military presence.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee yield to me?

Mr. COLMER. If my friend from Iowa has finished, I shall be happy to yield to the very able and very interesting gentleman from the great State of South Carolina who is very much interested in

the cause of the veterans of this country.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I welcome this opportunity of replying to my distinguished and able colleague from Iowa.

Of course we have something to do in Luxembourg. I might say in the beginning, this resolution does not provide for 20 members. As the distinguished chairman of the committee pointed out, it was cut to 11, six on this side of the aisle and five on the other side of the aisle, with three staff members.

The gentleman will recall that this resolution originally started out to call for looking into the cemetery situation which, as the gentleman so well knows, has been placed under the Veterans' Administration. We have 21 cemeteries in western Europe; including 11 in France and one in Luxembourg.

We also have drug problems in Europe among the armed services. We have a counseling service in the Veterans' Administration. This resolution provides not only for looking into the cemetery situation but the drug problem in the Far East and in Europe and the GI education benefits. Men serving in the military are now eligible for these benefits. So we not only have a dual job but a more than triple job in going into western Europe to look into this situation. We do not have enough men participating in the GI bill in Germany, for instance. We would like to know why. We are sending out these checks at the rate of \$10 million a month. This is the taxpayers' money, and it is going to 81,000 men and women in the Philippines alone. I have a breakdown of the various countries in Europe. Twenty-one thousand men, principally in Italy, Greece, England, France, et cetera, are receiving these checks. We think a trip of this nature is certainly worthwhile and this Congress is entitled to know how this \$10 million a month is being spent. I do not know of a resolution that is more timely or more worthwhile than the one that the House is considering today.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, could not two members find out just as much about the situation in the Philippines, Laos, Vietnam, and elsewhere as 10 or 11 members?

Mr. DORN. I must very frankly and candidly say to my colleague I do not think so. We have to go into Vietnam and quite often you have to split up in South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and South Vietnam. I do not see how two men could possibly do this job. Suppose both of them became ill or something of that nature. You would not have much of an investigating committee if you did not have a sufficient number of members.

Mr. GROSS. Evidently the Committee on Rules thought that a fewer number could do the job, because they cut it from some 20 to 11. That helps to some extent.

I do not intend to oppose this resolution to the extent that I would force a vote on it.

Mr. DORN. I say that I am standing here to agree with what the distinguished

members of the Committee on Rules did.

Mr. GROSS. Then, someone made a mistake when they presented the resolution: Is there not a Commission on Cemeteries?

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is there not a Commission on Cemeteries?

Mr. DORN. Perhaps. But this is rather a new jurisdiction on the part of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. I thought for years we have had a commission that was presidentially appointed.

Mr. DORN. Whether we have a commission or not, the legislative oversight jurisdiction has been placed by the Congress specifically in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Congress creates a commission and then it has to send Members around to check up on what the commission is doing. Is that right?

Mr. DORN. I know what my distinguished colleague is interested in.

Mr. GROSS. No, I am not interested in taking a trip.

Mr. DORN. It is to save the taxpayers money. I agree with him, and I think this type of investigation can save money and certainly see that this Congress is made aware of the situation in South Vietnam and Korea and Japan, such as the bill that we passed a few days ago about drug abuse.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not asked for my personal opinion on this, but I will give it to him, anyway. That will be the day when a bunch of junketeers saves any money for the Federal Government.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DORN. I will say to my great colleague I know this, and I hope the gentleman will correct his remarks in the Record—this is not a junket. This is a working schedule that has been arranged for the time when the gentleman from Iowa will be perhaps on recess back among the tall corn. This committee will be looking into a problem which is very, very dangerous.

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

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to concur in the statements which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), for absent the ability of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to travel and investigate the conditions which exist in our veterans' hospitals, they would not have been able to come up into my area nor would they have been able to go to so many others which involves veterans and veterans' care. The conditions which exist would not have to come to light, at least in my district, as to the very deplorable conditions which existed at the Kingsbridge Veterans Hospital. It was in response to the visit of the chairman and his committee that there was some response, and at present the committee is considering a bill to construct a new hospital there.

Mr. Speaker, the very least we owe the veterans is the very maximum of care and attention. It is important not simply in my district but throughout the Nation. The committee can learn, as a result of the experiences that other countries have had in the treatment of their veterans and, perhaps, put this knowledge to good use in the care and treatment of our own veterans.

Mr. Speaker, this could hardly be characterized as a junket in that type of situation. In my judgment it is a sacrifice on the part of the members of the committee to travel abroad to study this situation in order to make the Members of the Congress and their constituents aware of the problem which exists.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. DORN. I want to say that this House is well aware of the fact that our distinguished chairman "Tiger" TEAGUE would not advocate any junket in any form. This will be a hard-working, difficult schedule in order to cover a situation that needs to be cared for.

I might say that it was my privilege many years ago to go around the world with the Committee on Government Operations, a subcommittee headed by our late colleague, Herbert Bonner, looking into the surplus problem and as a result of that trip we were able to save the taxpayers of this country over \$300 million.

I believe on this occasion we will gather information that is pertinent and necessary to the deliberations of this body and the other body.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to my distinguished friend and able colleague, the Delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, of course, am in no position to judge the validity or the merits of this trip, but even if I were, I would not have a vote on the floor of the House and I think, perhaps, the gentleman ought to help me do something about that. However, as a late arrival in this body, I wonder if the gentleman would explain to me and to those who are interested what is the cemetery problem?

Mr. DORN. There are quite a few areas around the world where a lot of our men have served with great honor and distinction and many of whom made the supreme sacrifice and are buried overseas. Of course, there is a maintenance problem involved with reference to the cemeteries. I know that the Members of this House and the people of the country want those cemeteries maintained in the very best condition. This is why the committee wanted to check on that situation.

As the gentleman knows, we now have a problem at Arlington National Cemetery as well as a problem throughout the United States in finding room for the final resting place for our servicemen, some of whom have paid the supreme sacrifice and all of whom served at great sacrifice. I cannot think of a situation which is more worthy of consideration

than to see that there is a final resting place for those who wore the uniform of our country and to see that that final resting place is maintained as it should be.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further. I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina in light of the gentleman's explanation that if I had a vote I would probably vote for this legislation and I hope the gentleman will help me get that vote the next time around and the gentleman will have my support.

Mr. DORN. I am sure that my colleague from the District of Columbia is aware of the problem which exists at the present time in the Arlington National Cemetery which is located right across the river, close to his home, the area which the gentleman represents.

I want to commend my distinguished colleague and say again that I regret the fact that the able chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), could not be with us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct impression that Members generally are not fully aware of the extensive overseas responsibilities and scope of operations conducted by the Veterans' Administration under the direct oversight of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Accordingly, I think it would be helpful to insert at this point the following brief résumé of operations in Southeast Asia, the Philippines, and Western Europe:

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF OPERATIONS

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Drug Abuse: The Congress has recently passed a Veterans Administration Drug Abuse Bill. Problems relating to this exist in South Vietnam, Japan and South Korea.

Counseling: The Veterans Administration operates a predischarge counseling program in Southeast Asia, principally South Vietnam.

Medical: Military casualties are processed in Vietnam, Japan and the Philippines.

PHILIPPINES

A large Veterans' benefits program operates in the Philippines. The VA maintains an office and supports a hospital. There is also a national cemetery.

WESTERN EUROPE

Cemeteries: The Committee has jurisdiction of the overseas cemeteries located in England, Luxembourg, Netherlands, France and Italy.

Non-Service-Connected Pensions: This program operates in the major Western Europe countries with heavy concentration of veterans in Ireland, Italy and Greece.

Education: Veterans may attend institutions of higher learning and are attending most of the major universities of Europe.

Military Prep: This program functions primarily in Germany where there is a large concentration of troops.

As the Members are aware, a few years ago the House transferred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee jurisdiction over cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior. As a result, our committee has

oversight as well as legislative jurisdiction over a total of 21 cemeteries located in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, England, Italy, and Tunisia.

Furthermore, in the administration of the compensation, pension, and educational programs we find that there are almost 22,000 VA beneficiaries living in Western Europe, all the way from Scandinavia to Italy and Greece. In the Far East, we have in the Philippines alone almost 82,000 veterans and the dependents of veterans entitled to benefits under U.S. law. A very significant figure is that every month 114,582 VA checks are mailed to foreign beneficiaries representing a total monthly expenditure of over \$10 million.

In view of the foregoing, I believe it is demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is a continual and growing need for on-the-spot analysis and review of the adequacy and efficiency of these very substantial foreign operations in the field of veterans' affairs. I applaud the generous bipartisan action of the Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, in favorably reporting House Resolution 538 and I strongly urge its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), and I agree with them.

May I simply add that when this resolution was originally introduced, it was for the purpose of amending the Veterans' Committee's original investigative authority resolution which we passed at the beginning of the session. Such a cause of action would then have made this authority permanent. The Rules Committee felt that it was not the thing to do at the present time. So, this resolution is for two trips rather than permanently authorizing this travel on an annual basis.

I do not particularly relish, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility or authority to authorize for other committees their travel authority, including how many Members they can take, or the size of their committee staff. I had the privilege of serving on the committee headed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) for some time, and I believe that he is able and very fair, and I never saw any junkets take place on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during those years that I served on that committee.

We do not even define what the staff shall be, but just leave it in the resolution as staff, whether they be a Republican staff or Democratic staff.

So far as I am concerned I do not particularly care about this responsibility, but we have been given this responsibility, and we think it is a fair thing to do with respect to this resolution. I heartily support this resolution, and urge its adoption.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) on this request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 8432, the so-called Lockheed bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas as to when this bill was reported out of the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, this was reported before noon last Wednesday, just before noon, you might say 12 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. And has the gentleman from Texas checked to see whether this meets the parliamentary requirement for 3 legislative days?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the answer is "Yes." I have checked with the Parliamentarian. It is 3 days. You would count either the first or the last on determining the 3 days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN TOURISM

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress and again during the current 92d Congress, I introduced legislation, known as the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1971, which would grant the Secretary of State and the Attorney General broad authority to waive visa requirements for business and pleasure visitors of up to 90 days.

I felt, among many reasons, that my bill would be in the national interest because while unprecedented numbers of Americans are traveling abroad, by contrast, the number of foreign visitors coming to the United States is not increasing by a comparable rate, and consequently, the United States runs a deficit in the tourism account of over \$2 billion annually. This is the difference between what foreigners are spending to come here and what American are spending overseas, and this trend has continued over the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the July 24 edition of the Washington Post, indicating that the Commerce Department has launched a new drive to increase foreign tourism because the travel deficit reached an all time high of \$2.5 billion in 1970, and new Commerce figures show the 1971 deficit will be at least 10 percent higher.

There is general agreement that the most effective way to close this increasing gap is to stimulate and encourage foreign travel to the United States, thereby improving our balance of payments, and my bill (H.R. 571), would accomplish this by facilitating the entry of foreign tourists through relaxation of some of the unnecessary, cumbersome, and antiquated requirements which now must be met before visitors' visas can be issued to foreign visitors traveling to the United States.

I urge once again that the Congress go to the root of the problem and encourage foreign tourism by permitting easier issuance of visitors' visas to those persons wishing to come to the United States for less than 90 days. My bill would accomplish that purpose.

The article from the Washington Post regarding foreign tourism follows:

FOREIGN TOURISM DRIVE IS LAUNCHED

Citing an accelerating travel deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, the Commerce Department yesterday launched a new drive to increase foreign tourism throughout the 50 states.

Assistant secretary for tourism C. Langhorne Washburn called a nationwide series of 14 meetings in September to be attended by state travel directors and overseas and domestic staff members of the U.S. Travel Service, an arm of the Commerce Department. One of the meetings will be held in Washington; the purpose, Washburn said, is to mobilize greater local involvement in tourist promotion.

The travel deficit—the difference between what U.S. travelers spend abroad and what foreigners spend here—reached an all-time high of \$2.5 billion in 1970 and new Commerce figures show the 1971 deficit is 10 percent higher.

AN INTERESTING CHANGE IN EDITORIAL POLICY

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post Tuesday, July 20, 1971, concerning title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, also referred to as the Emergency Detention Act, will be of considerable interest to the Members of this House. The nameless and faceless writer or writers of this editorial indicated that the Emergency Detention Act would have easily been repealed had not "the Internal Security Committee, with its usual propensity for mischief, come forward with a substitute bill slightly amending the existing law but retaining

many of its worst features." This committee, described as having a "propensity for mischief" happens to be the committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I find this editorial to be an interesting contrast to an editorial published by this same Washington Post on this same subject some 20 years ago. Now I am aware that these unknown, nameless, faceless, and sometimes mysterious editorial writers are real people who, like politicians, can die, get fired or promoted, and even sometimes change their opinions. It would be very interesting if they would tell us what happened to the editorial writer in this particular case.

It is certainly true that the provisions of title II, which were originally intended to set up reasonable guidelines to prevent a future recurrence of the type of mass detention imposed upon the Japanese-Americans by Executive order at the beginning of World War II, has not changed. Maybe only the mood of the times is different. Certainly the attitude of the Washington Post is different.

In 1950, Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat, of West Virginia, introduced bill S. 4130, cosponsored by Senators Douglas, HUMPHREY, Lehman, Kefauver, Benton and Graham and himself, which became title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. In then endorsing this measure the Washington Post described it as a "fresh approach to the Communist problem." The Post editorialized:

We think the proposed bill aims at intelligently selective internment in the real interest of security and not at indiscriminate punishment of persons for the mere holding of disloyal or odious opinions.

For the sake of emphasis, it is important to remember that the above words from the Post editorial were written about a much harsher bill since the final wording of title II strengthened the protection offered individuals.

Now let us look at what the Post says in 1971:

DETENTION CENTERS FOR SUBVERSIVES

Concentration camps are about as un-American as borscht. Yet there is a provision authorizing the creation of such camps, euphemistically called detention centers, in an act of Congress—the Internal Security Act of 1950—still very much on the statute books to this day. That provision is certainly the most un-American inheritance from the now slightly face-lifted House Un-American Activities Committee, currently operating under the alias, House Internal Security Committee. It authorizes, during a period of war, insurrection or invasion, the rounding up and detention of persons concerning whom there is "reasonable ground" to believe that they would "probably" engage in sabotage or espionage.

Un-American as such camps or centers may seem to most Americans, they are not unimaginable. At the outset of this country's involvement in the Second World War, American citizens of Japanese ancestry were rounded up all over the west coast and impounded, behind barbed wire, in what were then called "relocation" centers—merely because it was supposed they would "probably" engage in espionage or sabotage. So there is very little reason to be surprised that minority groups of various sorts—mill-

tant blacks, long-haired youths, New Left radicals, old left Communists, ardent adversaries of the government or of the war in Vietnam—are full of apprehension that they may become victims of this totalitarian mechanism. Indeed, William Greider of this newspaper reported recently that the FBI has compiled, and keeps enlarging, a list of the names, addresses, jobs and phone numbers of thousands of Americans considered potentially dangerous as spies or saboteurs in case of war or some other "national emergency." The FBI documents stolen at Media, Pa., afforded confirmation of this index.

Rep. Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii, a wounded war veteran who has reason to feel rather strongly about internment camps because some of his relatives were interned in one 30 years ago, has introduced a bill—along with more than 100 co-sponsors—to repeal Title II, the internment camp provision, of the Internal Security Act. There would have been little doubt about its adoption, had not the Internal Security Committee, with its usual propensity for mischief, come forward with a substitute bill slightly amending the existing law but retaining many of its worst features.

The Matsunaga bill would eradicate an ugly splotch from the American escutcheon. It has the full backing of the Justice Department. It would lift a pall of fear from the country. We hope that Congress will adopt it speedily, restoring the American way of dealing with dissent and rejecting the Un-American Activities way.

Mr. Speaker, how does one explain such a glaring inconsistency? I shall make a note to send a copy of this statement to the Post since I will be very interested to understand this radical change of position unless they choose to remain silent. Yesterday it was "intelligently selective internment," today it is "mischief."

Mr. Speaker, the present law is a wartime statute which can be invoked by the President upon the occasion of a declaration of war by Congress, invasion, or insurrection in aid of a foreign enemy. The House Committee on Internal Security bill, H.R. 820, would amend the act to provide that it cannot be implemented by the President in the case of an insurrection except upon a concurrent resolution of the Congress declaring the existence of an insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. Second, the present bill makes explicit that no citizen shall be apprehended or detained on account of race, color, or ancestry. The HCIS bill further provides for an amendment to assure representation by counsel for any person detained pursuant to the act, and for the services of experts and other persons to assist in a defense.

Certainly, a newspaper has the right to change its editorial mind. It only seems to me that this is an interesting contrast. I believe that a careful study will still reveal that adopting the amendments contained in H.R. 820 is the true libertarian approach to a very difficult problem. Surely, we do not want to return to the dark situation where what happened to the Japanese can happen again and most certainly we do not want to tie the hands of the President in an emergency wartime situation.

GROUP TACTICS ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in the Evans-Novak column in yesterday's Washington Post that there is a group of liberal House Democrats plotting to undermine President Nixon's Vietnam policies and force acceptance of the Vietcong peace proposal—all for narrow partisan purposes. The so-called group, an informal organization of 13 prominent left-liberal Democratic House Members, is this week sponsoring a conference for the ostensible purpose of educating the public about the Pentagon papers. But the group's internal memorandums quoted by Evans and Novak indicate quite a different purpose—that of trying to shift the blame for the war to the Nixon administration and thwart the President's efforts to secure a peace settlement.

The column quotes the group's July 7 agenda as follows:

The political focus must be shifted away from the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Nixon will argue in 1972 that he ended the war that the Democrats got the country into. It is critical that he not succeed. Only by undermining his present policies and by obtaining a Democratically-sponsored congressional action forcing the acceptance of the present Vietcong proposal can we recover lost ground.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially alarming at this most delicate stage in the Paris negotiations that there is a group in this body which is more intent on playing politics with the war than on applying statesmanship to the peace; that there are persons in this body who are not only praying for the failure of the President's peace efforts, but who are actively working to undermine those efforts. It is apparent that these pseudodoves are more interested in making partisan points than they are in forging a lasting peace.

I have indicated on previous occasions that I think the Congress can and should provide some policy guidance on Vietnam and I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 347 for that purpose. My resolution would state that it is our national policy to completely withdraw from Vietnam at the earliest practicable date, and to accelerate and complete that withdrawal by a date certain provided there is a concurrent agreement to release all American prisoners being held in Indochina 60 days prior to that date certain. I have avoided specifying a date certain because I think this is and should be a negotiable matter. If we are genuinely interested in achieving a negotiated settlement, we must allow our negotiators in Paris a maximum amount of flexibility. That is what negotiations are all about. To force upon them a specific date, let alone forcing them to fully accept the seven-point Vietcong proposal, is to make a mockery of the word "negotiate."

This week I will be recirculating my resolution for bipartisan cosponsorship. It seems to me that a bipartisan resolution which provides congressional guidance while recognizing the need for a flexible negotiating position is the most responsible and prudent course for the Congress to follow. This would also seem the logical approach for the House-Senate conferees to take in their current deadlock over the Mansfield amendment to the draft bill. Forcing our negotiators into a corner and tying their hands, as the group would have us do, is not only reckless and irresponsible, but contrary to the goal of achieving a just and lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the Evans and Novak column to which I have previously alluded as well as a column by Henry Owen from Saturday's Washington Post. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, July 25, 1971]

PUTTING THE BLAME ON NIXON

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Internal memoranda show that this week's conference on the Pentagon papers arranged by militant antiwar Democratic congressmen has a partial hidden motive of trying to deflect in Richard Nixon's direction some of the political shrapnel coming from the documents.

The Group, an informal organization of 13 prominent left-liberal Democratic House members, which is sponsoring the conference, includes congressmen unhappy that the political fallout from the Pentagon papers has hit the last two Democratic Presidents, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and not President Nixon. That's not a case of loving Mr. Johnson more but of loving Mr. Nixon considerably less.

Late in June, shortly after the Pentagon papers were leaked, the question was raised at a meeting of two New York members of The Group, Reps. John Dow and William Fitts Ryan, with staffers. A July 6 memorandum on that meeting reveals they proposed a conference on the Pentagon papers with the purpose of "arousing public pressure on the Congress" for a Vietnam pullout resolution.

"An inquiry aimed specifically at the policies and decision-making processes of the Nixon administration," says the memorandum on the Dow-Ryan meeting, "could effectively transfer the public outrage from the past tense of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations into the present tense of the current administration."

The agenda for the weekly meeting of The Group on July 7 makes this strategy explicit:

"The political focus must be shifted away from the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Nixon will argue in 1972 that he ended the war that the Democrats got the country into. It is critical that he not succeed. Only by undermining his present policies and by obtaining a Democratically-sponsored congressional action forcing the acceptance of the present Vietcong proposal can we recover lost ground."

The same theme is followed through in The Group's list of potential participants for the conference on the Pentagon papers—as in the case of Melvin Gurtov, one of the authors of the Pentagon papers who has just resigned as an analyst for the Rand Corp. think tank. In suggesting Gurtov, a staff memorandum notes that he has been "highly critical of the Nixon administration and says it is following the same policy as previous administrations. . . ."

A footnote: Some members of The Group told us that the sole purpose of their forthcoming conference is to improve public understanding of the Pentagon papers and that the memoranda indicating a political motive reflect only the over-active imaginations of young staffers. Other members of The Group, however, confided to us that they regard as accurate the intent of the conference as outlined in the memoranda.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1971]
"HOW?" IN WASHINGTON—"WHEN?" IN PARIS:
THE TWO SETS OF TALKS ON ENDING THE
VIETNAM WAR

(By Henry Owen)

China's invitation to President Nixon suggests that its leaders agree with him when he says that the American military involvement in Vietnam is ending and that the real question is how it will end. To the Chinese and others, this probably means when it will end. For Americans, however, an equally important question is whether it will end in a way which permits both branches of government and both political parties to share responsibility for the outcome, and thus unites rather than tears the United States apart. This depends partly on the negotiation between the two sides at Paris but, even more, on trilateral negotiations between the President, the Senate, and the House in Washington.

These negotiations now center on what should be said about Vietnam in congressional resolutions and/or in the pending draft bill. The Senate, after rejecting a harsher McGovern-Hatfield resolution, passed the Mansfield amendment which proposes a date or total withdrawal in early 1972. The administration objects—arguing that this would reduce its bargaining power at Paris. In the House, John Anderson of Illinois, chairman of the Republican Conference, has introduced a resolution which tries to take account of this concern. It calls for withdrawal of U.S. forces by a date certain in return for release of the American POWs, and endorses continuing aid to South Vietnam after U.S. withdrawal; but it does not specify the date by which U.S. forces are to be withdrawn. Congressman Anderson says merely that while this date "would have to be within a reasonable time frame to have any appeal at the bargaining table . . . from a practical negotiating standpoint this is something best left to be worked out in the secret sessions at Paris."

The President made clear in his April 16 TV panel discussion before newspaper editors that he has in mind a total withdrawal of U.S. forces if two conditions can be met: if U.S. POWs are returned, and if the South Vietnamese develop a capability which gives them "at least a chance" to defend themselves. (He has not said when they would achieve this "chance," but present withdrawal rates, if continued, should get all U.S. forces out of Vietnam around the end of 1972.) Specifying "the goal of total withdrawal with no residual force," and accepting that we can only give the South Vietnamese a "chance" to defend themselves and thus cannot ensure a favorable outcome to the war which will continue after our withdrawal—all this helps public opinion to accept the hard realities that must be faced in negotiating our withdrawal and afterward. Whether it also provides a basis for shared responsibility between the President and the Congress will depend on whether the President is prepared eventually to accept the concept of a fixed date for withdrawal.

The recent Vietcong proposal at Paris brings the issue to a head. The President's trip to China takes the spotlight off the North Vietnamese, but they are still the peo-

ple with whom we will have to do business on ending the war. At first reading, their recent proposal seems more of the same: the usual demands for a coalition government, for U.S. reparations, and—at least by implication—for cessation of U.S. aid to Saigon. But the senior North Vietnamese negotiator's remarks and the language of the proposal leave it unclear whether these political demands need to be accepted in order to settle the other two points; U.S. withdrawal (which Hanoi demands by the end of 1971), and return of POWs. Even if the withdrawal and political issues can thus be separated, important questions will remain: Would Hanoi agree to our minimum conditions of a 1972 (rather than 1971) date for U.S. withdrawal, continuing U.S. aid to Saigon after that withdrawal, and release of U.S. POWs captured in all Indochina. This is uncertain, to say the least; the most that can be said is that Hanoi's proposal creates an opportunity to try to find out—in hard and, it would be hoped, secret bargaining.

The two sets of negotiations—in Washington and Paris—will interact; Hanoi will be looking over the administration's shoulder to see whether both political parties and the Congress are behind the President's position in Paris talks. Evident disagreement among them might encourage Hanoi to hold out for its maximum demands. On the other hand, a congressional resolution which endorsed the concept of withdrawal by a date certain, left the administration free to fix that date in bargaining, and supported continuing post-withdrawal U.S. aid might strengthen the administration's position—if the President were prepared eventually to strike a bargain at Paris which would involve withdrawing by a fixed date.

Both the Paris and Washington negotiations are likely to proceed slowly. The administration wants to avoid rocking the boat until after the October South Vietnam election (which the Communists probably hoped to disrupt by their proposal). The announcement of the President's trip to Peking will probably reduce pressure for early action on the Hill. So it's unlikely matters will come to a head until later in the year.

Even then, there is no assurance, or even probability, that the two negotiations will succeed—that the administration and the Congress will be able to come together on a policy which looks to withdrawal in 1972, or that Hanoi will be sufficiently flexible to permit an agreement on this basis. All that can be said is that the prospects seem slightly better than, say, six months ago. Even if the two negotiations do prosper, the war will likely go on after our withdrawal—toward an outcome which no one can predict. But at least our withdrawal will have been taken in a way which reduces the likelihood of bitter domestic U.S. divisions and recrimination in its wake.

IMPORTANT TO END WAR

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the item appearing yesterday has already come up relative to the self-appointed organization to place the blame on Nixon. That is about the only way you can really categorize this.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, in saying what a pity this is. To my knowledge, this war has never been a political one. I do not believe any war should be. But the attack by this organization placing the

blame on President Nixon, I think, is a blatant attempt to bring partisan politics into it. Just as they will not blame any particular political party for starting this war, I do not think anyone should blame any particular group. The important thing is to end this war.

I have noticed the leadership on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans alike, have not made any attempt to bring partisanship into ending this war. I notice the democrat leadership gives President Nixon credit for reducing the total casualties and reducing the troops in Southeast Asia.

The attempt by this political group to undermine President Nixon's efforts in Southeast Asia cannot help the cause of world peace and in fact probably will result in additional encouragement to the enemy which in turn could prolong the war. I think it is high time that the leadership on both sides condemn this type of activity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING III—SPENDING LIMIT AND REGISTRY OF ELECTION FINANCE

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I spoke about my bill, the Campaign Expenditure Disclosure Act of 1971, H.R. 7299, designed specifically for campaign spending disclosure and limitation in the House of Representatives.

Last week, I spoke about an important provision of the bill which would require full and complete disclosure of any campaign contributions—public or private—in the amount of over \$10.

Today, I would like to speak about two corollary provisions of the bill: to establish a registry of election finance, and to limit campaign spending in a general election to \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to insist upon full and complete disclosure, and if we are going to require each candidate to maintain records, we must provide an office to receive and hold these records.

Therefore, I propose a registry of election finance, to be attached to the General Accounting Office, for the purpose of making reports and statements filed with him available for public inspection and copying, and preserving reports and statements for a period of 11 years from the date of receipt.

This registry's primary purpose would be to provide the public—on demand—financial information on their representatives. It would—in the fullest sense—be a servant of public information.

Mr. Speaker, full disclosure to a registry constitutes an important step toward bringing the spiral of campaign spending under control. However, disclosure would be most effective in the context of a campaign spending limit. Otherwise there is no compelling reason, other than public pressure, to hold down the spending. Therefore, I have included

in my bill a provision placing a limit of \$100,000 on the amount any candidate may spend in a general election.

I originally had in mind a much lower limit on both general and primary election expenditures but I discovered in talking with candidates from other congressional districts that it must be a lot less expensive to get around Vermont and talk to the voters than it is in other areas of the country.

I spent less than \$5,000 on my last general election campaign, so I think \$100,000 is a realistic figure for any district in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have proposed a total limit on expenditures; I have proposed full and complete disclosure with a single campaign depository; and I have proposed a registry to keep the records for the people. I honestly think this is a realistic way to hold down the spiraling cost of running a campaign for Congress in the United States.

H.R. 7299, the Campaign Expenditure Disclosure Act of 1971, should be acted upon by the Ethics Committee and the Whole House at the earliest possible moment.

FARMER FRUSTRATIONS

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and enlightening report appeared in the July 12 Babson's Reports in regard to the farm situation.

Because this article is so easy to understand and the topic so vital to the economic future of our countryside, with your permission, I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where my colleagues and all the others who read the RECORD may benefit from it:

FARMER FRUSTRATIONS

Despite somewhat better prospects for output, sales, and income, there's little joy down on the farm.

Truth is, farmers are doing poorly—returns from their labor, management, and investment falling far behind earnings by similar resources in other occupations.

Comparison: In 1969 all manufacturing corporations earned \$59 billion on an investment of \$296 billion.

That same year all U.S. farms earned \$2.79 billion on an investment of \$243 billion.

And within the food business itself odds are stacked overwhelmingly against the farmer—for the President's 1970 Economic Report credits food chains with a 23.6% return on net invested capital, food processors 22.4%, farmers only 1.1%.

In each case the net earnings indicated are before taxes but after deduction of labor and management costs.

Even the largest lag. It's commonly believed that farm statistics make a poor showing because they include the numerous small marginal farmers.

But this is not borne out by the Secretary of Agriculture's 1969 report.

The 1.1% return on investment for all farms contracts with 0.8% for the nation's smallest, (sales of \$10,000 or less) that make up about two-thirds of the total. Return of large farms, (with sales above \$10,000) is given at 1.6%—while that for the largest,

(with sales of \$20,000 or more) is tabbed at 0.9%.

Smoldering Resentment: Farmers are also riled because each year they have to work harder, invest more to keep going.

They're upset too, because their share of GNP is so small and net farm income, before labor, management costs, buys less and less.

The Cause: Most farmers feel hemmed in, even squeezed, by government price policies—are specially critical of the programs of the past 20 years during which their parity income has slipped from 107.5% to less than 74%.

Majority dislike production controls—but many are deterred from open opposition because their farms are heavily capitalized and they fear the severe price fluctuations that return to free markets would initially bring.

But within the farm community there are varied points of view on production controls and price-support programs—making it difficult for Administration and Congress to set a course.

ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. court of appeals in a decision issued July 8 in the Calvert Cliff case has ruled that the Atomic Energy Commission has failed in its duty to implement environmental safeguards in the nuclear powerplants it supervises.

The court speaking of the AEC says the Commission's "crabbed interpretation of the National Environmental Policy Act makes a mockery of the act."

Addressing itself to the duty of the court, the court says:

Our duty in short is to see that important legislative purposes heralded in the halls of Congress are not lost or misdirected in the vast hall ways of federal bureaucracy.

The court accuses the AEC of "total abdication of responsibilities" to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the court has used much stronger language than the Governor of Kansas or of myself in expressing its views regarding the actions of the AEC.

Several days ago, I opposed the proviso in the AEC authorization bill which would give the AEC the authority to buy lands in Kansas to store radioactive waste in Kansas.

The courts' decision confirms my fears that you cannot trust the AEC.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article by Bart Barnes which appeared in the Washington Post of July 24, 1971, and I also include at this point a recent release from the UPI:

REACTORS

CAMBRIDGE, Mass.—Emergency shutdown mechanisms now used on nuclear power reactors would not work well enough to prevent a major catastrophe involving the possible deaths of thousands of persons in the event of a cooling system rupture, a scientists' group said today.

Four members of the Union of Concerned Scientists called for a total halt to issuance of licenses for nuclear power plants under construction and a thorough review of emergency shutdown system in operating plants.

At a news conference releasing their report on "Nuclear Reactor Safety: An Evaluation of New Evidence," the four discussed tests conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1957 and in late 1970-early 1971.

If, the report said, "one of the major cooling lines to a reactor core were ruptured, the water circulating through the primary cooling system would be discharged from the system and the reactor core would be without coolant."

There would be no nuclear explosion, but the core would rapidly melt through the containing structures and into the earth, releasing a cloud of radioactivity. "The cloud can be lethal . . . in some circumstances, at close to 100 miles," the report said.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1971]

A-PLANT SAFEGUARDS HELD FAULTY BY COURT

(By Bart Barnes)

In a decision that could force changes in plans for 55 nuclear power plants across the nation, the U.S. Court of Appeals here ruled yesterday that the Atomic Energy Commission has failed in its duty to implement environmental safeguards in projects it oversees.

The court directed the AEC to overhaul its procedures for insuring protection of the environment against potential damage from the operation of nuclear installations.

Specifically, the court ordered the commission to conduct a "full and fruitful" environmental review of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Company's nuclear power plant under construction at Calvert Cliffs, on the shore of the Chesapeake Bay in Calvert County.

And it suggested the Commission "should consider very seriously the requirement of a temporary halt in construction pending its review."

Deciding two cases that combined objections to the Calvert Cliffs project with a broad attack on AEC environmental protection procedures, the court said the Commission's "crabbed interpretation of the National Environmental Policy Act makes a mockery of the act."

It accused the AEC of "total abdication of responsibility" to act positively to protect the environment and it assailed the commission for allowing a "shocking" time lag between the effective date of the act and the date it instituted procedures to require compliance.

"The very purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act was to tell federal agencies that environmental protection is as much a part of their responsibility as is protection and promotion of the industries they regulate," the court held.

Yesterday's decision has broad implications not only for the Calvert Cliffs plant but also for the 55 other nuclear generating plants under construction around the nation.

They may have to be held to stricter measures for protection of their environments than are now contemplated before they can receive AEC authorization to install or operate nuclear reactors. The 22 nuclear power plants already in operation are presumably not affected.

Both Baltimore Gas & Electric and the AEC declined to comment on the court's ruling yesterday, saying they needed time to study it.

Suits challenging AEC environmental procedures were brought by the Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee—a collection of civic groups in Maryland—the Sierra Club and the National Wildlife Federation.

The decision is one of several on environmental issues by courts at the District and Appeals level here during the 18 months

since the Environmental Policy Act went into effect. Other rulings have blocked a proposed oil pipeline in Alaska and a canal in Florida and paved the way for possible elimination of the of the pesticide DDT.

In the introduction to yesterday's ruling, Judge J. Skelly Wright said the cases are "only the beginning of what promises to become a flood of new litigation—litigation seeking judicial assistance in protecting judicial assistance in protecting our natural environment.

"Our duty, in short is to see that important legislative purposes heralded in the halls of Congress are not lost or misdirected in the vast hallways of the federal bureaucracy," he continued.

Wright was joined in the opinion by Judges Edward A. Tamm and Spottswood W. Robinson III.

In the Calvert Cliffs generating plant and in other nuclear power plants under construction, the court said that once construction permits had been issued, the AEC refused to consider requiring changes in construction plans to account for environmental concerns.

Staff members produce, as a matter of course, reports on the environmental impact of projects under construction "but nothing will be done with them," the court said.

The commission does provide for an environmental review once construction is completed and an operating license is applied for but by that time any alterations to minimize the environmental impact may be prohibitively expensive, the court said.

"Either the licensee will have to undergo a major expense in making the alteration or the environmental harm will have to be tolerated. It is all too probable that the latter result would come to pass," the decision held.

In the Calvert Cliffs plant, construction of the \$300 million facility is about 45 per cent complete and operations are set to begin in 1973.

Since its inception it has been under fire from environmental groups who fear not the possibility of a nuclear accident but a potential threat to the Chesapeake Bay.

The plant, about 45 miles southeast of Washington on the western shore of the bay, will use more than a billion gallons of bay water a day to cool its equipment.

The water will be returned to the bay as much as 10 degrees warmer than when it was taken out. Critics of the plant have argued that that this heat will damage marine life.

Baltimore Gas & Electric officials have said the 1,600-megawatt facility is essential if they are to continue to provide uninterrupted service to their more than 700,000 customers in central Maryland.

In yesterday's ruling, the appellate court remarked that the AEC had not demonstrated "overenthusiasm" in drawing up its environmental policy rules.

It was especially critical of a rule prohibiting any consideration of environmental issues by AEC hearing boards if the notice for the hearing had appeared in the Federal Register before March 4, 1971.

This was more than 14 months after the Environmental Policy Act went into effect, the court noted.

The decision also criticized the AEC for accepting certifications of other federal and state agencies that certain environmental standards were being met, without making its own evaluations.

And it attacked the commission for failing to require that hearing boards consider environmental issues although staff members are required to consider such matters in making evaluations.

CHINA'S AGGRESSIVENESS IS UNCHANGED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, during the period between the President's announcement of his trip to Communist China and his departure upon that trip, it is necessary and proper that the American people carefully examine all of the issues which are involved in a determination of our future relationship with Communist China, and with the Nationalist Chinese Government on Taiwan to which we have been committed for more than 20 years.

To this end, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been receiving testimony upon this subject. One of the most important statements was made by Dr. Franz Michael, of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies of the George Washington University.

Dr. Michael points out that the cultural revolution was a power struggle between Mao and his supporters, on the one hand, and the Liu-Shao-Chi leadership of the Communist Party, on the other.

He notes:

The result was that Mao did not succeed in establishing a Maoist revolutionary organization of his own style . . . Instead, the military took over . . . In fact, the militarization of Chinese society, encompassing family life, kindergartens, schools, and all social and economic organizations, must be regarded as an ominous trend.

The emergence of the military combined with the leadership cult of Mao has produced what Dr. Michael believes to be "all the overtones of aggression known to us from other leader cults in the recent past." Thus, now that the power struggles within China seem to have abated, Peking can turn once again to the outside world.

Dr. Michael warns that any new American policy must "have no illusions about Peking's main purpose—which is continued support to the Communist strategy of 'wars of national liberation'—any successful negotiations with Communist China must be based on the purpose of inducing Peking to abandon this policy. Any retreat on this point will only encourage further aggression."

To those who advocate the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalist Government from the United Nations and its replacement with Communist China, Dr. Michael states that—

It is hardly necessary to restate the facts of the Chinese Nationalist Government's loyal fulfillment of all United Nations obligations and acceptance of international responsibilities in contrast to the behavior of the Communist Government in Peking. What should be stressed again is the fact that on Taiwan there exists an open Chinese society with a living standard many times that of the mainland population (the highest in Asia next to Japan), and even more important, in my view, an open Chinese educational system. The argument that the 800 million people should have a voice in world affairs is, in any case, untenable, since in a Communist coun-

try no consent save submission has been sought by the regime in power.

All who urge an abandonment of Taiwan, recognition of Communist China, and its admission to the United Nations, should carefully consider the words of Franz Michael.

I wish to share this testimony with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

TESTIMONY OF FRANZ MICHAEL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, may I thank you for this opportunity to testify before your committee on the important issue of United States policy towards China.

Recent dramatic events, Dr. Kissinger's journey to Peking and President Nixon's and Prime Minister Chou En-lai's announcement about the forthcoming visit to Peking by the President himself have suddenly brought the astounding news that we are entering a new phase of our relations with Peking, a phase of negotiations. This beginning of discussions with Peking is in accord with the proclaimed main foreign policy goal of our administration to initiate an age of negotiations, to find, wherever possible, a *modus vivendi* with the world of Communist countries, in order to overcome the stalemate of the present confrontation.

We have, of course, for some time negotiated with Peking, first in Geneva and later in the Warsaw talks, but the Chinese discontinued these talks from time to time and abandoned them altogether during the Cultural Revolution. Since assuming office, President Nixon has indicated both through statements and actions—such as easing travel restrictions and import regulations—our readiness to open a new phase in our relations. Until recently these gestures were ignored or countered with diatribes. Then came Peking's well-advertised Ping-Pong policy, and now we find that negotiations appear to have actually begun.

At a time when purloined state secrets have been shamefully misused by an irresponsible press, untrained in the proper evaluation of documentary material, to misinform the American people and harm the national interest, one cannot but feel a certain satisfaction that our government can keep a most important secret so well. But the issue now is what do we negotiate about and what opportunities, what dangers, what risks can be foreseen by those of us who cannot be privy to the secret talks themselves.

All we know so far is that the talks will deal with the normalization of relations between the two countries and an exchange of views. And we have the President's word that we will not seek new relations "at the expense of our old friends"—referring to Taiwan, nor initiate action "directed against any other nation"—presumably the Soviet Union. What action can then be expected within this framework? There is an obvious limitation to our own flexibility and the vital question remains—does the invitation by Chou En-lai indicate a change of policy on which a new type of relationship could be based, or is it a maneuver through which a new dimension is added to the pursuit of a Chinese Communist policy goal that has not changed.

To appraise the prospects and dangers of our venture let us have a look at the situation on Mainland China, at recent trends in Peking's foreign policy, and at the personality of Chou En-lai and his present position.

I. MAINLAND CHINA IN THE WAKE OF THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

There has obviously been a major shift within China, brought about the Cultural

Revolution. In essence, the Cultural Revolution was a power struggle between Mao and his supporters, and the Liu Shao-chi/Teng Hsiao-ping leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. This struggle Mao won, destroying the existing party structure. But Mao did not succeed in establishing a Maoist revolutionary organization of his own style, allegedly modeled after the Paris Commune of 1871. Instead, the military took over and the new Chinese administration and reorganized party are dominated by the military to a degree rarely known in modern times. In fact, the militarization of Chinese society, encompassing family life, kindergartens, schools, and all social and economic organizations, must be regarded as an ominous trend. Combined with the leader-cult of Mao, first developed within the military forces and through them spread to the population at large, this militarization carries all the overtones of aggression known to us from other leader cults of the recent past. Within China a worship of power has led to such statements as those by new military leaders and close followers of Lin Piao, "When we have power we will have everything; when we lose power we will lose everything . . . having no power is misery, having power brings happiness; seizing power is very difficult and the loss of this power is very dangerous." Lin Piao, Mao's affirmed successor, and the epitome of this military power, is quoted as having said in February 1967, "To use my customary language, I would define political power as the power of suppression."

While the factional struggles within China are by no means over, a drab order has been restored, and the military authority of the Mao/Lin group has been reasserted. Thus, Peking's policy can again turn towards the outside world in this post-Cultural Revolution phase.

China's self-imposed isolation during the period of the Cultural Revolution may have been far more rational in design than is often recognized in the West.

If Peking wanted to prevent any foreign intervention and exploitation of the internal conflicts and weaknesses resulting from the power struggle, self isolation provided this protection. With the reassertion of authority under the new leadership, a new initiative in the realm of foreign policy can be undertaken.

II. TRENDS IN SINO-SOVIET RELATIONS

The revived activity in foreign policy, however, may not be entirely voluntary. In part, at least, it may result from the alarm caused by the sharpening of the Sino-Soviet conflict, which led to a growing number of serious frontier incidents. These incidents must have appeared rather ominous to Peking as the shock caused by Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia conjured up the spectacle of possible Soviet military action against "Maoism" in China. The "Brezhnev Doctrine" claim to a Communist right of intervention in Socialist countries whenever socialism is threatened from within or outside the country could well apply to China. The massive build-up of close to forty fully equipped Soviet divisions along the Chinese frontier in Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, and Turkestan, lent credibility to the political threat. By the end of 1969 this threat of military intervention appeared very close indeed. This was the moment for a change in China's foreign policy toward the Communist bloc as well as toward the non-Communist world.

The motivation and direction of the new Chinese foreign policy must be understood within this setting. The danger of conflict with the Soviet Union was avoided through negotiations, initiated by Kosygin's meeting with Chou En-lai at the Peking airport in September 1969. These negotiations led to

the reestablishment of regular diplomatic relations, and, at the very least, to the end of frontier incidents and the normalization of frontier relations. Of more importance, perhaps, was the quiet discontinuance of Mao's earlier claim to leadership of world communism in open challenge to Moscow. Peking seemingly accepted the Soviet thesis that no one center for Communism exists, but that all parties are equal—though one may be more equal than others—and that Mao was the leader of China only. Ideologically, at least, the way has been opened for Sino-Soviet parallel policies, or even cooperation towards common Communist goals. This trend, if it is actually a trend, has recently been reinforced by an implied Soviet acceptance of the new military-dominated Chinese Communist Party as a proper and acceptable party within the socialist international framework. Though both sides still maintain their military stance, and frequently indulge in name-calling, the conflict has clearly been de-fused.

III. THE NEW ASIAN UNITED FRONT

Concurrently with the Soviet negotiations, Peking moved to establish closer relations with North Korea and North Vietnam. Through an exchange of political and military leaders, Peking arranged the "New Asian United Front." We can only surmise what plans have been discussed in the lengthy sessions between the major military leaders of the new allies. From the published statements, however, there emerges a new aggressiveness directed against the United States as the "imperialist enemy" of the peoples of the world and her "lackeys" of Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Indochina, and Israel.

The basis of this New Asian United Front is the increased emphasis on the support of "wars of national liberation" and revolutionary movements. Aside from the stress on support to this type of warfare, China is proclaimed the "reliable rear area" for these wars—referring to the growing validity of the Chinese nuclear deterrent. The statements and agreements of Peking, Pyongyang, and Hanoi contain no reference to the Sino-Soviet contest within the Communist world, and the Chinese policy toward support of Communist revolutions can, therefore, be interpreted as a move toward reconciliation by proxy with overall Communist policy as agreed to by the Soviet Union. Therefore, the main trend and purpose of the new Chinese policy is to play down the conflict within the Communist world and to renew the effort of supporting revolutionary movements, focusing on United States policy as a major target.

This abatement of the Sino-Soviet conflict raises the spectrum of a future alignment of the forces facing each other today along the Sino-Soviet frontier—a most formidable military concentration, indeed, if these armies should no longer be a check on each other but combining to face outward towards South Korea, Japan, and the Pacific area. Should such force be used to back the announced expansionist aims of the New Asia United Front, the threat of world peace would become grave. Our own posture will have to be determined by whatever reading we can gain of Peking's intentions—obviously a major topic of any coming or even present talks. Lest we indulge in euphoria it should be clear that there has been no public indication whatsoever of a lessening of Peking's present aggressive posture. On the contrary, the new intensity of this aggressiveness has been indicated in Peking's slogans for May 1971.

These slogans present the theme that "Revolution is the main trend in the world today." One by one, the slogans support the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Korea, the Asian, African, and Latin American coun-

tries, the Arabs, and Cuba and Albania in their "wars of national liberation" and their struggle against United States "imperialism," Japanese "militarism," and Zionism. The tenor of the slogans, most more than in previous years, expresses a detailed aggressive militancy with no signs of modification of policy. The same tone prevails in the joint editorials published on July 1, the 50th anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party, in the *Peoples' Daily*, *Red Flag*, and the *Liberation Army Daily*. The theme begins with an exhortation to "persistently follow the road of seizing political power by armed force, continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to be good at learning the thought of Mao Tse-tung." Equally ominous is the inclusion of the promise to liberate Taiwan under the section that deals with the Peoples' Liberation Army, followed by the claim that "we need not only a powerful army but also a powerful air-force and a powerful navy."

IV. PEKING'S PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS

This Communist expansionist policy is conducted on two fronts. One is the military, which is carried on wherever Peking assumes that there will be only minimal resistance from local governments and no outside support for existing local resistance. The other front is that of propaganda warfare, aimed at undermining the trust in United States assistance and undermining in the United States our belief in the moral standards of the causes we are supporting. Sowing distrust between us and our allies, image breaking, and the creation of dissension among peoples and their governments is one of the major purposes of this kind of psychological warfare—warfare we have little understood, let alone countered.

This kind of propaganda carefully selects its targets and plays up to their emotions and beliefs. This is nothing new in Communist international relations. At the time of the Bolshevik Revolution Moscow introduced a new dimension in international relations through the support of Communist movements and other groups in foreign countries; movements whose attitudes or policies were of some advantage to the Communist purpose. This was the original purpose of the Comintern, which was formally abandoned during World War II as a gesture to the Western allies in the war against Hitler. International contacts, though less centralized, have never been abandoned, however, and the people-to-people policy is an obvious attempt by Peking to regenerate a worldwide revolutionary movement. In statements from Peking, a clear distinction is made between relations with the American people and relations with the American government. Indeed, the Chinese Communist purpose is to use people-to-people diplomacy to undermine non-Communist governments and their policies.

An invitation to the U.S. president to visit Peking could, however, for the moment at least, negate the propaganda dichotomy of friendship to the American people and implacable hostility to their "imperialist" government. It remains to be seen what advantages or disadvantages may have been weighed in Peking's decision to extend the invitation, and whether propaganda war will cease on the basis of negotiations.

V. PEKING'S NEGOTIATOR: CHOU EN-LAI

One danger of a public euphoria about a new course in Peking is the build-up given by the media to the Chinese Prime Minister, Chou En-lai, as a "pragmatist," a man of reason and moderation not limited by "ideological blinders" allegedly reserved to old guard Communists. This picture is reminiscent of that once painted in World War II of Stalin—when the alliance of the Soviet

Union led a great many Americans to think of the Soviet leader as Uncle Joe, the shrewd old peasant with the pipe who was only defending Mother Russia against the Nazis.

There is no question that Chou En-lai is a suave and sophisticated Communist leader, who has become the kingpin of Sino-Soviet negotiations, the architect of the New Asian United Front, the leading spokesman of Chinese Communist propaganda policy and, perhaps, the most important decision-maker in Peking—at least in foreign policy matters.

Chou En-lai rose to his position of increased power during the Cultural Revolution, not by attempting to restrain the course of the revolution, as is often believed, but rather by giving it direction leading to the present military-political structure. Chou is closely linked with the new military leadership. In fact, he is in charge of the military-industrial structure responsible for the rapid development of Chinese nuclear technology. Chou is far from the moderate many believe him to be. In his past record he emerges as a ruthless and cruel leader, quite capable of the brutal slaughter of the families of Communist agents who revealed information when captured by the Nationalists. Chou En-lai has now played a key part in establishing the military-political structure in China, in resuming contacts with the Soviet Union, and in devising both military and propaganda policies against the West. He must be regarded as one of the most able and dangerous Communist leaders. India's Nehru, who had trusted Chou and did not survive the bitter results of his deception, stated before his death: "I must confess that we have seldom come across such a travesty of truth and decency in international behavior."

VI. UNITED STATES POLICY

In anticipation of a new phase of relations with Peking, we must, therefore, have no illusions about Peking's main purpose—which is continued support to the Communist strategy of "wars of national liberation." This kind of warfare is the Asian counterpart to the military threat of Soviet armor, which hung over Europe during the years of the Cold War and was answered by the NATO alliance. In Asia today there exists no peaceful co-existence" or detente. Any successful negotiations with Communist China must be based on the purpose of inducing Peking to abandon this policy. Any retreat on this point will only encourage further aggression.

In his breakthrough towards negotiation President Nixon, and his chief advisor, Dr. Kissinger, will unquestionably be aware of these issues. Indeed, they may be already on the agenda. One wonders about Chou En-lai's motives. Yet he may also hope for a disarray in our relations with our allies. He may feel that the position, within the Communist world as well as without, which will derive from these negotiations may be worth the minimum concession needed for that normalization of relations" of which the announcement speaks. It is difficult to see how the visit could have been announced without some broad understanding about the possibility of acceptable agreements. There should be no illusion about the extreme risk, indeed the danger of this mission, which in itself will have its psychological impact on our, as well as the other, side. Our position has been one of commitments and alliance, redefined under the Nixon doctrine. Anyone traveling in Asia recently has heard the often-expressed concern over the uncertainty of American policy and the fear of U.S. isolationism caused by the internal debate.

In a recent speech, Japanese Ambassador

Ushiba warned about this psychological danger. In his words:

"It is a good thing to urge Asian nations to defend themselves, but it will psychologically and politically have an adverse effect if it gives Asians the impression that the United States is thinning out its security commitment. In Asia as a whole psychological measures are sometimes more important than actual military protection. Some Asian countries may need actually less military protection in terms of modern defense ability than those in Western Europe, but they may need more psychological military presence or moral commitment for their political stability."

In order to retain the fall-back position of our alliances, we must, therefore, be most careful in our approaches to Peking not to give the false impression of abandoning our stand and commitments for the sake of very doubtful gains in the hazy world of Communist motivations. Most of all, it is vital that there be no doubt about our determination to fully honor our commitment to our Nationalist ally on Taiwan—for against this all Asia will measure our credibility.

VII. THE CHINESE UNITED NATIONS SEAT

It is with this caveat that we must approach the most serious problem facing us at the moment in Asia, Peking's attempt to gain the Chinese seat in the United Nations and to have the National Government expelled—the substance of the Albanian Resolution. This is not simply a matter of an American policy decision, since the outcome depends on the vote of the majority of governments in the assembly. A Chinese Communist victory is possible this September if the majority of the assembly members give up the principle that the issue is an "important question" requiring a two-thirds majority and if a simple majority then supports the Albanian resolution.

This is not the place to dwell upon the consequences of such a decision, which, in my view, would lead to a serious decline in the role of the United Nations itself. Once before, the Soviets, with their Troika proposal, endangered the future functioning of the United Nations in its present, limited, role. Peking violations of the Charter stipulations are a matter of record. Admission without a change in Peking's policy would make a travesty of the Charter. Peking has violated its principles not only in the past; the new, increased emphasis on "wars of national liberation" supports a form of aggression which clearly falls under the illegal use of force referred to in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations General Assembly, in its last session, was very specific in prohibiting the use of force in violation of existing demarcation lines between countries and within divided countries and in the obligation to refrain from organizing guerrilla forces and other groups to cross boundaries and penetrate into other countries. The proclaimed policy of Peking today, therefore, is clearly hostile to the basic concept of the United Nations. The admission of Peking on the basis of its present policy would at the very least paralyze the organization, but might very well lead to its demise. The problem for American policy is how to counter this danger and to protect that usefulness which the United Nations still possesses.

The most practical proposal so far made appears to be that of the Lodge Report. The principle of accepting *de facto* control by existing governments is to be applied on a universal level. If, as some maintain, eight hundred million Chinese should not remain unrepresented, it would be equally unfair to leave out of the system of representation the fourteen million on Taiwan, a larger

group of population than that of two-thirds of the member nations of the United Nations. It is hardly necessary to restate the facts of the Chinese National Government's loyal fulfillment of all United Nations obligations and acceptance of international responsibilities in contrast to the behavior of the Communist government in Peking. What should be stressed again is the fact that on Taiwan there exists an open Chinese society with a living standard many times that of the mainland population (the highest in Asia next to Japan), and even more important, in my view, an open Chinese educational system. The argument that the eight hundred million people should have a voice in world affairs is, in any case, untenable, since in a Communist country no consent save submission has been sought by the regime in power. The assumption that governments represent the peoples under their respective control, if valid, will have to be generally applied with fairness to all. This is the basis of the Lodge Report. A practical division of nations into areas controlled by opposed governments exists in East and West Germany, North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, as well as in Peking and Taipei. The principle of the Lodge Report—the admission of two governments of divided nations, each for the area and population it controls—will properly apply the idea of universal participation in the United Nations. In my view, therefore, it should be the goal of American policy to obtain a broad support for this concept through a proposal submitted to the United Nations to take the place of the Albanian Resolution. I believe that support will be forthcoming for such a proposal from East as well as West Germany, South Korea, South Vietnam, and the National Government, as well as from some of the leading countries represented in the United Nations, including the Soviet Union. Should the Chinese Communist government accept this proposal, its participation in the United Nations would be based on the recognition of the present status of the mainland and Taiwan and any inviolability by military means. In other words, this would be a test of Peking's policy. If Peking refuses, there will be more time to wait and see what course internal and external developments will take in Mainland China, without having to face the immediate threat of a major Chinese Communist psychological victory, which would be a grave threat to our position in Asia and to peace.

A solution of the UN issue appears to be a major part of the "normalization of relations." In the meantime the Albanian Resolution has been tabled, and in view of the urgency of the matter, immediate preparations are required if the case before the UN is not to be lost by default. The President's statement about not acting at the "expense of our old friends" will find here its immediate application. It is regrettable that the need for secrecy has apparently prevented us from acting in consultation with our allies. It is vital to correct that omission for the moves to come.

Whatever the outcome of this extraordinary venture in diplomacy, we cannot abandon the responsibility for our part in the security of the free world on which, in the last resort, the peace in which we believe depends.

SELECTIVE STRIKE LEGISLATION NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, American people have

come to think of a rail strike, or rail strike threat, as a near-permanent fixture upon our national scene. Meanwhile, the Congress has been seen as the court of last resort through which, at the 11th, if not the 25th hour, a settlement of sorts is imposed.

This chronic threat and disruption of rail service helps no one, certainly not the general public which remains the threatened or damaged third party. Nor is it proper that, repeatedly, the Congress is compelled to pick up the pieces of broken negotiations and produce a patchwork settlement to get the trains moving again.

To this pattern of performance, the Supreme Court had added a slight modification. It has refused to overturn a lower court ruling which permitted railroad unions to strike selectively.

The Court's theory was, presumably, that, with the major portion of the Nation's rail system functioning, no national emergency would exist and Congress would not therefore have to resolve the problem. In practice, however, this judicial theory may not hold water. A rail strike affecting one line, or one region of the country, can destroy a critical link in the national chain and effect other, even all, parts of the Nation. Further, it is quite obvious that a selective strike can escalate into a national strike. But, even short of this eventuality, public concern and outrage could compel congressional action.

It is clear, then, that we need legislation to cope with such a possibility. Such legislation should permit Presidential intervention if a selective strike causes immediate imperilment of the national health and safety. It should permit the President to ask both parties to spend additional time at the bargaining table in search of settlement. Finally, it should embody the administration's suggestion of final offer selection.

Final offer selection is designed to eliminate the divisiveness of compulsory arbitration while at the same time providing strong impetus to collective bargaining and assurance of peaceful resolution. Specifically, final offer selection provides that, after the disputants have bargained to the best of their ability, each would set forth two final offers which would constitute complete and binding agreement. A board composed of public members would then select one of these offers.

The emergency strike legislation—H.R. 9088—of which I am a cosponsor would achieve these goals. It would not outlaw selective strikes, but it would assure that they remained within that category. This legislation would, among other things, amend section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. It would limit a selective strike to two carriers operating in a system in any one region and carrying no more than 20 percent of that region's revenue ton-miles.

With some of our Nation's railroads now struck on the newly permitted selective strike basis, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on this

legislation, scheduled to start tomorrow, are most timely.

H.R. 9088 offers a good solution to this problem. I shall, however, follow these hearings with an open mind with regard to similar bills that will be considered.

The most important fact at this moment is that Congress recognizes this problem and is moving to enact legislation to resolve it.

MFN FOR EASTERN EUROPE, SOVIET UNION, AND CHINA

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on August 4, 1969, I introduced a bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing the President with the authority to extend "most favored nation" trade status to Rumania. President Nixon had just returned from a successful world tour which included a warm reception in Bucharest by President Ceausescu and the Rumanian people. Since then relations between our two countries have blossomed.

Today, I am reintroducing the same bill, amid reports that President Nixon has decided that the time has come to give MFN to Rumania. The Department of State has endorsed a similar bill in the Senate, stating:

The administration would not . . . object to this particular bill since it provides discretionary authority to the President to negotiate agreements to extend MFN treatment only to Rumania.

Evidence of improved relations abounds. In the last year, trade between our two countries has doubled. In 1970, Rumania bought \$66 million worth of goods and services from the United States. In the face of a possible U.S. trade deficit this year and a precarious balance-of-payments position, the fact that Rumania buys more from us than it sells us is indeed good news.

Also, speculation is rampant that Rumania was instrumental in arranging for Dr. Kissinger's recent visit to Peking and President Nixon's expected visit within the next few months.

In March 1970, the Apollo XII astronauts were warmly received when they stopped in Rumania, and recently scientific and technical cooperation has been striking.

Finally, when disastrous floods struck Rumania in the spring and summer last year, the U.S. Government and private U.S. citizens responded immediately and generously to the humanitarian plight of the people.

Relations between our two countries have steadily improved, and in part this has been because of Rumania's fierce independence as a separate nation within the Warsaw Pact. President Ceausescu has always placed the interests of his small country of 20 million people above those of their "big brother" in Moscow.

In 1962, when Russia proposed to fully integrate the economies of the Eastern

European countries with her own and introduce areawide economic planning, Rumania steadfastly refused to participate. The Russian masterplan called for Rumania to produce raw materials, mineral and agricultural products, rather than an industrial complex including an immense iron and steel mill which Rumania favored. This act of opposition, more than any other, helped preserve the economic and territorial integrity of all the East European nations.

When Russia led the other Warsaw Pact nations in an invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, Rumania bitterly condemned it as "a great mistake and a grave danger to peace in Europe." Further, Ceausescu warned the Soviets that "they would encounter armed resistance if they tried to invade Rumania."

Although Rumania, unfortunately, has not permitted the development of personal and economic freedom among its people, nevertheless it is this same principle of freedom which it holds to be inviolate as between nations. Ceausescu has stated:

We base our foreign policy on the principle of equality of rights, noninterference in the internal affairs of others, respect for sovereignty and national independence, and the right of the peoples to decide their own fate without outside interference.

This principle has led Rumania to establish and maintain relations with West Germany and Israel, oppose the Soviet version of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, walk out of the Budapest Conference of Communist bloc countries in August of 1968, vote often in opposition to the position of the Soviet Union in the United Nations General Assembly, and maintain extremely cordial relations with the Peoples Republic of China.

Rumania's independence in the determination of its own foreign policy should be encouraged by the United States. For it is this independence and the consequent lack of solidarity in the Communist bloc, which permit the United States to lead from a position of strength when dealing with the Soviet Union.

Congress can encourage that independence in the Rumanians by authorizing the President to grant them most-favored-nation tariff treatment. Increased trade which would result from such action would also aid our own commercial interests.

MFN would make Rumania less economically dependent upon the U.S.S.R. than it is today. In 1969, although Rumania had the lowest percentage of trade with Russia of any East European country, it nevertheless amounted to a whopping 30 percent of her total exports. The economic leverage which this gives to the Soviet Union cannot help but spill over into the political realm. In fact, there can never be political independence for a country until there is economic independence. By helping to provide that economic independence, the United States can at the same time help to provide the foundation for political independence which is so much in our own national interest.

MFN for Rumania would also be in our

own commercial interest. If trade restrictions were the common policy of all of the Western nations in their dealings with Communist countries, they might have a potent economic and political impact. However, of all of our European allies, we are the only ones who do not presently grant MFN to Rumania. We therefore impose no serious problem to Rumania by this attitude but hurt only our own interests.

To be sure, the Rumanians are indeed desirous of gaining MFN tariff treatment and the increased trade which they hope it will make possible. However, one of the chief reasons they desire this is so that they will be able to earn more American dollars with which to buy more and better American goods and technology. The advantages this holds for U.S. businessmen are obvious.

Upon his return from Rumania in 1969, President Nixon told the throng of people gathered at Andrews Air Force Base that—

Deep differences in political philosophy cannot permanently divide the peoples of the world.

What is most important for the United States is that those differences in political philosophy should not be used like a vice to crush the independent, nationalistic course which the Rumanians have chosen for themselves. This will not occur so long as America recognizes that independence and actively encourages it.

President Nixon has recognized that independence and now has urged the Congress to act to foster it. As with the ping-pong tournament in China, the ball is now in our court. If we in Congress are to fulfill our responsibility in the determination of national policy, then hearings should be held on our Eastern European trade policy at an early date.

The two bills I am introducing today could provide the focus for those hearings.

The general bill I today introduced would permit the President to extend MFN to any country with which the United States has diplomatic relations and which is a member of GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—if the President determines such to be in the national interest.

PCB'S—ENVIRONMENTAL POISON

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 23, the U.S. Department of Agriculture revealed that a significant proportion of chickens raised in 12 States have been contaminated with an extremely dangerous chemical—polychlorinated biphenyl—PCB.

This occurrence tragically illustrates the failure of the Federal Government to take preventive action against the uncontrolled use of this deadly chemical. During the past 2 years I have attempted to get the appropriate Federal agencies to take the necessary protective actions that would have forestalled such an oc-

currence and would have guaranteed the health and safety of the public. But in an almost unprecedented display of disregard for the public health and welfare, that administrative action has not been forthcoming.

Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to totally ban the distribution of PCB's in interstate commerce, thus insuring that our health and environment are safeguarded from the hazards of this chemical.

Manufactured in the United States solely by the Monsanto Co., polychlorinated biphenyls are a serious threat to our health and to our environment. Like DDT—their chemical cousin—PCB's and their residue are extremely toxic to animal life, cause birds to lay eggs with shells too thin to protect the embryos they enclose, and have a deleterious effect on the reproductive capacity of animals.

But by far the most frightening hazard is the effect of PCB's on human beings. Polychlorinated biphenyls may be taken into the body by direct action upon the skin or as a vapor through the respiratory tract. The effect on the skin is chloracne: the early symptoms of which are pimples and dark pigmentation; later, more serious eruptions. Persons who have been continuously exposed to PCB's may suffer nausea, vomiting, loss of weight, edema and abdominal pain, increased respiration, lowered blood cell count, and inhibition of the carbohydrate metabolism. More serious effects are those on the kidneys. The principle effect, however, is on the liver—possibly leading to atrophy, followed by death.

PCB's are very persistent in the environment thus making them a long-term threat. They are not soluble in water and resist biological breakdown.

In the past, PCB's have been sold by the Monsanto Co. for use in plasticizer applications; in closed system applications, such as coolants in transformers; as hydraulic fluids; and as an extender in pesticides.

When I first brought the potential dangers of PCB's to the attention of the appropriate Federal agencies in April 1970, I requested that certain specific actions be taken to protect our health and environment from the hazards of PCB's.

I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to ban the use of polychlorinated biphenyls in pesticides. The Department of Agriculture agreed to discontinue the use of PCB's in pesticides and to cancel registrations for pesticides containing PCB's.

I urged the Food and Drug Administration to set food tolerance levels for PCB's, to require the labeling of all products containing PCB's, and to determine whether this chemical should be banned completely. In replying to me, the FDA advised me that it was undertaking a survey to determine the extent of food contamination from PCB's—the results of which I still have not received. FDA refused to set food tolerance levels and to require labeling.

I urged the Secretary of the Interior to act to protect fish and wildlife from this hazard. He replied that investigations

were being carried out by various agencies of the Federal Government and the results of these studies would be funneled to the staff of the Council on Environmental Quality.

I urged the Commission Product Safety to determine the nature and extent of the threat to our environment. The Commission replied that it was not possible for them to conduct an indepth investigation of the hazards of PCB's at that time.

And I urged the Council on Environmental Quality to coordinate the efforts of all appropriate Government agencies, so that the public might know the sources and the seriousness of the PCB danger, and that it take steps to eliminate this hazard as soon as possible. The Council advised me that it was working with other Federal agencies to determine what course of action was available to the Federal Government.

Earlier this year I renewed by call for administrative action by requesting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to place an immediate ban of the importation, manufacture, and sale of all products containing PCB's with the possible exception of certain closed system applications. I urged that he require that any product containing PCB's not included in such a ban be labeled with a warning as to their detrimental environmental effects. I requested that he obtain from Monsanto those production and sales figures necessary to determine the extent of possible PCB contamination—data which Monsanto has refused to provide me. And I urged that the Environmental Protection Agency coordinate all appropriate governmental agencies in dealing with this hazard.

In replying to me, EPA ignored all four of my requests and in no way responded to them.

In short, except for the action of the Department of Agriculture in banning PCB's in pesticides, the Federal Government has not taken any of the necessary steps which I have requested over the past 2 years to combat this very serious environmental and health hazard.

The results of this Government inaction are now tragically apparent. Large amounts of poultry and hogs in a 12 State area may now be contaminated with this toxic chemical.

For nearly 3 months PCB's have been leaking into fish meal processed at the East Coast Terminal, Inc., plant in Wilmington, N.C. The meal has been sold to 64 poultry producers in Virginia, Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

According to the Department of Agriculture, 16,000 tons of fish meal had been produced at the Wilmington plant between April 30 and July 16—when the plant was closed down.

This contamination would yet be unnoticed if it were not for the fact that a commercial poultry processor became alarmed at the low rate of hatching of eggs in his broiler breeding chickens.

I can see no way that all the poultry and hogs subjected to this chemical can now be traced. The potential results could be disastrous.

And this is not the sole instance of widespread PCB contamination in the food chain.

In December 1970, the Campbell Soup Co. discovered that fat samples taken from slaughtered chickens contained a high quantity of PCB residue. Upon being notified of this finding and recognizing the potential danger of this occurrence, the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets immediately stopped the movement of all poultry from the area in Sullivan County, N.Y., where the chickens had been raised.

The New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets then began a full-scale investigation into the extent of possible PCB contamination in poultry. Their laboratory confirmed the findings made by Campbell Soup Co. of high levels of PCB's, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture established a continuing restraint on the movement of all poultry for slaughter in Sullivan, Ulster, and Orange Counties, N.Y., until it was found to be safe through a special screening test operation.

As a result of their investigations and in conjunction with USDA, the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets ordered that 146,000 PCB-contaminated chickens be buried under close supervision to make absolutely sure that they would not reach the marketplace.

The Campbell Soup Co., USDA, and the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets all took prompt action to deal with this serious problem, and that is reassuring. However, the potential damage which could have resulted if this incident had not been discovered in time cannot be ignored. And I must stress that this is not an isolated example.

In January 1970, samples of milk collected by the State of Ohio Department of Agriculture revealed residue of a product closely resembling DDT and DDD. On February 19, a dairyman, George Schwarzwald, was issued a notice by the division of food, dairies, and drugs to discontinue the sale of milk until such time as the residue found in his milk was below the actionable level. On February 27, another dairyman, Franklin Humphrey, received a similar notice.

Subsequent samples from individual cows and the bulk tank on these farms submitted to agriculture laboratories and the pesticide laboratory at Ohio State University revealed that the residue was not DDT but PCB's. The Ohio State Department of Agriculture found the contaminating substance to be AROCLOR 1254, manufactured by the Monsanto Co. Apparently, the dairymen's silos were lined with a product called Cumar which included AROCLOR in its content. The PCB's were then absorbed by the silage which in turn was fed to the milk cows, resulting in PCB-contaminated milk.

Although I have been assured by the Ohio State Department of Agriculture

that this problem is now under control, the harm that might have resulted is obvious.

In view of the lack of administrative action even after these incidents were brought to the attention of Federal agencies and in light of the obvious threat posed by PCB-contamination in milk and poultry, on May 19, I introduced legislation (H.R. 8576) to ban the distribution of polychlorinated biphenyl in interstate commerce. However, this legislation gave the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the authority to exempt from this ban PCB's for use in certain closed-system applications; namely, as the dielectric fluid in capacitors, the coolant in transformers, or as a fire resistant in heat transfer media, provided that he found such uses would not adversely affect the public health and welfare.

It is now apparent, however, that PCB's are a serious threat even in these closed system applications, as evidenced by the current incident of poultry feed contamination. Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to totally ban the interstate distribution of PCB's. And I am calling for congressional hearings into this matter.

Further, I am reiterating my call for the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency to commence immediately a full and exhaustive investigation in to the extent of PCB contamination. And I am calling for an immediate administrative ban on the manufacture, shipment, and sale of all PCB's.

The problem of PCB's is indicative of a much larger problem—that of the almost unrestricted influx of harmful chemicals into the marketplace. A system must be established to insure the safety of a chemical before it can be sold and then only for specific uses.

But in the meantime, everything possible must be done to protect the public from known chemical dangers. We know the hazards of PCB's. We know what can and must be done to combat those hazards. And we must undertake those actions now.

At this point I include in the RECORD two articles by Hank Burchard which appeared in the Washington Post on July 24 and July 25 respectively, and a July 24 New York Times story by William Blair.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1971]
CHEMICAL FOUND IN CHICKENS—CONTAMINATED FOWL FOUND IN 12-STATE AREA

(By Hank Burchard)

A "significant proportion" of the chickens raised in 12 states have been contaminated with a DDT-like compound, the Department of Agriculture announced yesterday.

USDA said it has "no evidence" that any of the birds have reached consumers and has taken steps to make sure none do.

The contaminant is poly-chlorinated biphenyls, known as PCB. For nearly three months it had been leaking into fish meal processed at the East Coast Terminal, Inc., plant in Wilmington, N.C. The meal has been sold to 64 poultry producers in Vir-

ginia, Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas and Mississippi.

PCB, like DDT, is a persistent compound that accumulates in fatty tissues and is said to cause low fertility and birth defects in animals. Its effects on humans are uncertain, but USDA has set the maximum acceptable level of PCB in marketed flesh at 5 parts per million, the same as for DDT.

Tests of poultry in markets in the South and East during the past week have found none that have as much as 5 p.p.m. of PCB, according to Dr. Fred J. Fullerton of USDA's consumer and marketing service.

"In my opinion, there would be no broilers in stores above the tolerance," Fullerton said. The agency does not regularly test for PCB.

In poultry not yet slaughtered, USDA found PCB concentrations as high as 22 p.p.m., and one poultry producer reported levels as high as 40 p.p.m.

The contamination of fish meal in the Wilmington plant was caused by leakage of PCB being used as the heat exchange mechanism in a sterilizing machine.

The accidental leakage, which may have begun around April 30, was brought to the attention of the Food and Drug Administration last week by the Monsanto Corp., sole U.S. producer of PCB compounds. FDA in turn alerted USDA on July 16.

PCB, which stands for a dozen related compounds, has been long and widely used in the U.S. as a solvent in the production of paint, pesticides plastics and resins and such items as "carbonless" carbon paper, as well as in heating and cooling machinery. Monsanto now recommends its use be limited to heat exchange systems, an FDA spokesman said.

PCB contamination of the tissues of poultry produced in New York State last year resulted in the seizure and destruction of more than 100,000 birds. The source of contamination in that case has not been pinpointed.

Although PCB has been in use worldwide since before World War II, it was not until 1969 that its presence in soil, water and animal tissues became known.

"Environment" Magazine, which first brought the PCB problem to national attention, reported that concentrations of PCB were overlooked in chemical analyses because it is so similar to DDT.

Kevin Shea, the magazine's scientific director, yesterday disputed the government's assurances that toxic birds are not on the market. "I suspect PCB contamination may be quite widespread," he said in a telephone interview from St. Louis, Mo.

"We were told to check birds from the South more than two months ago, but haven't yet been able to track it down," he said.

Dr. Joseph Stein of USDA said the agency had "been checking chickens in the South during this period and have found nothing to lead us to suspect contamination of marketed birds."

Scientific opinion on the dangers presented by PCB is divided. USDA researchers, a spokesman said, regard the outcry over PCB (and DDT) as exaggerated.

An FDA spokesman said the agency forbids use of PCB in food or in the production of food containers. "Its effects are not known in detail," he said, "but to us it's an adulterant and impermissible."

Dr. Robert Relseborough, of the University of California at Berkeley, discovered while doing research on the brown pelican that PCB was endangering the species. Since then he has reported finding PCB residues widespread.

[From the Washington Post, July 25, 1971]
LAW SOUGHT TO BAN DDT-LIKE CHEMICAL
(By Hank Burchard)

A New York congressman said yesterday he will introduce a bill to ban all use of a DDT-like compound that has contaminated human and wildlife food chains in the U.S. and around the world.

The announcement by Rep. William Fitts Ryan (D. N.Y.) came after it was revealed Friday that high levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) has been found in fish meal fed to poultry in 12 states, including Virginia and Delaware, over the past three months.

A Department of Agriculture spokesman said yesterday that fish meal from the same Wilmington, N.C., plant had also been fed to an unknown number of hogs. The department said it does not believe any of the poultry or pork involved has reached consumer markets and is moving to prevent them from being sold.

Fish meal produced by East Coast Terminal, Inc., of Wilmington, was contaminated from about April until the plant was ordered closed Friday. The PCB, being used as the heat transfer medium in sterilizing vats, leaked unnoticed into the meal.

The contamination was not discovered by any government agency. It came to light when a customer of the Monsanto Corp., sole U.S. producer of PCB, complained that his chickens were being sickened and their eggs were of low fertility.

Monsanto traced the problem to the chicken feed and the feed to the Wilmington plant, then notified the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, which notified USDA, which a week later made the first public announcement.

GROSS NEGLECT

Ryan, whose office has been investigating the PCB problem for two years, said the case "graphically illustrates the gross neglect of the federal government to take preventive action against the uncontrolled use of deadly chemicals by American industry."

He said his bill would be introduced Monday. It will replace his HR 8576, introduced May 19, which would permit the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to exempt certain uses of PCBs from the ban.

"The latest case convinces us there is no safe way for the stuff to be used," said Ryan aide Chic Edwards.

USE LIMITED

A spokesman for the Monsanto Corp. said yesterday the use of PCBs is "absolutely essential" for heavy electrical equipment and that the company has taken "very stringent measures" to control use of the compound.

Since last August, he said Monsanto has withdrawn PCBs from sale for any purpose other than as the insulating fluid in electrical capacitors, as a coolant in transformers or as a fire-resistant ingredient in industrial heating and cooling systems. The embargo also applies to the United Kingdom, in which Monsanto also has a monopoly in PCBs.

For more than 40 years before the Monsanto action, PCBs, which are a group of a dozen chlorinated hydrocarbons, had been widely used as plasticizers (softeners) in paints, sealants, adhesives and other surface coatings, with miscellaneous applications in thermostats, food, pharmaceuticals and hydraulic fluids, according to the April, 1971, "New Scientist and Science Journal."

A spokesman for the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, Inc., said yesterday that PCBs "never have been 'widely used' in paints. They had certain limited industrial applications and are no longer used. Any paint buyer may be assured the products contain no PCBs."

EFFECTS LIKE DDT

The effects of PCBs in animals are similar to those of DDT, and before 1966 the presence of the compound in the biological chain was not suspected because it was mistaken for DDT in laboratory analyses.

There is no consensus among scientists about how dangerous the compound is. Their concern centers on the fact that PCBs, like DDT, is a highly stable compound that breaks down slowly. A worldwide ban on PCBs and DDT will be proposed at the United Nations environmental conference in Stockholm next year.

It is insoluble in water but soluble in fats, a factor which causes it to become concentrated in the tissues of progressively larger animals in the food chain. Residues of up to 1000 parts per million (p.p.m.) have been found in the tissues of American seabirds. The USDA Rules do not permit sale for human consumption of flesh containing more than 5 p.p.m. Some chickens fed on the contaminated fish meal have been found to contain up to 40 p.p.m.

Last December a Campbell's Soup plant in New Jersey discovered impermissible levels of PCBs in chickens purchased from New York growers. Again the discovery was made in private tests, since the federal government does not regularly test for PCBs in marketed flesh.

CHEMICAL TRACED

New York State officials traced the contamination to chicken feed produced in a plant that uses stale bakery goods (which may have been wrapped in plastic made with a PCB). Some 146,000 chickens were destroyed and buried.

Earlier, milk from two Ohio dairy herds was found to contain PCBs derived from silage stored in silos painted with PCB-treated epoxys.

Government regulation of PCBs has been limited. The USDA recently banned their use in pesticides, and the FDA does not permit them to be added to food products. A half dozen other agencies say they are considering regulations.

Monsanto's recognition of PCBs as an ecological hazard and its voluntary ban on their use except in "closed-system" equipment is very nearly unique in industry, according to the scientific journal.

The company also collects used PCBs from its customers and destroys them in a special incinerator in Illinois.

MONSANTO TESTS

Recently completed Monsanto tests, conducted over two years, showed that rats fed food containing up to 100 p.p.m. showed enlargement of the liver but suffered no other effects, the company spokesman said. Dogs showed no ill effects, he said.

Rep. Ryan said he was skeptical of tests ordered by the company for its own products.

Edwards, his aide, said "It's ridiculous to have to introduce a bill every time another family of dangerous compounds turns up in our bodies and throughout the environment, but, given the repeated failure of government agencies to act, there's nothing else we can do."

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1971]
UNITED STATES FEARS POISON IN SOME CHICKENS—SEARCH ON IN 12 STATES AFTER FEED IS FOUND TAINTED

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON.—The Department of Agriculture announced today a search in 12 states for broiler chickens and chicken feed that may be contaminated by an industrial chemical.

The toxic substance is of the chemical family of polychlorinated biphenyls. Spokesmen for the Agriculture Department and the Food and Drug Administration said that the PCB,

as the chemical is known, had leaked from heating machinery used to pasteurize fish meal at the East Coast Terminal, Inc., Wilmington, N.C. The meal was sold for use as an ingredient in poultry feed and may have found its way into some hog feeds, officials said.

They said that the meal had been sold to at least 64 feed processing plants. These included plants that raise and process poultry for retail markets. The officials said that the Wilmington plant had recalled all fish meal shipped since April 30, the indicated date of the beginning of the problem. The plant closed voluntarily a week ago, they said.

The toxic substance causes digestive distress, nausea, fever and other upsets in humans, officials said. The Food and Drug Administration said it had a guideline of 5 parts per million for the PCB substance. Agriculture scientists said that 15 to 20 parts per million had been found in fish meal still at the North Carolina plant.

ALARM OVER EGG-HATCHING

The contamination was disclosed by an unnamed commercial poultry processor who became alarmed at the low rate of hatching of eggs in his broiler breeding chickens. Using private laboratory tests, he found up to 40 parts per million in the fat of some of his chickens, Agriculture officials said. He traced the meal to the Wilmington plant, they said.

The meal was sold to users in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, North Carolina, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia.

The F.D.A. set a guideline of five parts per million for the substance after it had been found in feed from an Agway, Inc., plant in Sullivan County, N.Y., early this year. Higher concentrations were found in chickens fed the feed and shipped to a processing plant in New Jersey.

Federal officials said that 146,000 chickens had been destroyed in Sullivan, Orange and Ulster Counties, N.Y., as a result of the finding.

16,000 TONS OF MEAL

An Agriculture Department spokesman said that about 16,000 tons of fish meal had been produced at the Wilmington plant between April 30 and July 16. Normally, fish meal makes up only a small portion of mixed poultry feeds.

A spokesman for Representative William F. Ryan, Democrat of Manhattan, said that Mr. Ryan had been trying for a year to get the shipment of PCB prohibited in interstate commerce. He introduced legislation to that effect but it has languished in the House Interstate Commerce Committee, the spokesman said.

He said Mr. Ryan had warned of "widespread" contamination of foodstuffs, particularly poultry, before the New York case. He had looked into the toxic effects of PCB after reading a study by California scientists on the chemical and finding that it was not soluble in water and could be taken into the human system by physical contact, the spokesman said.

PCB has a wide range of industrial use, including paints and resins and in the manufacture of plastics and other materials. In the North Carolina case, the substance was used in a heat exchanger to cool liquid. In the New York chicken case, the PCB was believed to have been in paint that flaked off a storage bin or to have been absorbed by the feed from the paint.

THE PEOPLE OF UTICA, MISS., ACT TO HELP POW-MIA'S

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. GRIFFIN is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in early June, the people of Utica, Miss., my hometown, undertook the task of sending two representatives to Paris, France and Rome, Italy to express their support and concern for all the American POW-MIAS presently being held in North Vietnamese prisons. Air Force Maj. Thomas E. Collins III, has been a prisoner since October 18, 1965. He is a native of Utica.

The representatives were Mayor John F. Tillman and Postmaster F. L. Scott, both noted and well-respected members of the community. The mission proved successful beyond the hopes of all of us who supported and encouraged the effort.

It is a source of enormous pride to me that citizens in and around a small town like Utica, 1,033 population, should undertake such a project with logistical and financial problems to be overcome. Overcome they were, Mr. Speaker, for, within a remarkably short time after the effort began, the money was raised and arrangements made for Mayor Tillman and Postmaster Scott to embark on their mission.

It was a community project, and one in which people of all walks of life participated. Its motives were of the noblest order and its intentions purely humanitarian. They went to express the heartbreak and concern and love of millions of Americans for the servicemen being held prisoner. They went, not to embarrass or humiliate the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris, but to make yet another effort to reach the hearts and minds of the representatives of the Government of North Vietnam—to try once again to impress upon them that nothing is to be gained from withholding vital information from the prisoners' families except heartbreak and pain. They went to intercede for them, to seek simple human mercy and compassion for brave men who were carrying out the official policies of the Government of the United States at the time of their capture.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot express the pride and exhilaration I feel at this noble and worthy effort on the part of my hometown people. It is my fervent hope that this effort will cause the North Vietnamese to reconsider their destructive and despicable policy of refusing even basic information to this Government and the families of the prisoners.

As a portion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the report Mr. Tillman and Mr. Scott submitted to the people of Utica upon their return. Also included is a newspaper article from the Clarion Ledger of Jackson, Miss., announcing the trip.

The articles follow:

REPORT TO: MISSISSIPPI LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION, IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

INTRODUCTION

To show their concern for the better treatment of our POW's and a concerted effort to negotiating a settlement of the War's in S. E. Asia. The small community of Utica, Mississippi (pop. 1,000) initiated a drive to send a delegate to the Paris Peace Talks, his mission, to deliver petitions and letters (over 10,500) to both the Viet Cong and Republic of North Vietnam Delegations. This effort was so overwhelmingly successful, that in less

than one week, more than enough money was contributed for the expenses of two delegates.

STATEMENT OF JOHN F. TILLMAN AND
F. L. SCOTT

On our arrival in Paris on the morning of June 6, 1971, we immediately began to seek out the addresses of Minister Xuan Thuy, chief delegate for Rep. of North Vietnam at the Paris Peace talks and address of Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, the Viet Cong's Chief Delegate. When we obtained these addresses and telephone numbers, we began to call for an appointment and stated the purpose of our mission. We were informed that they would call back and set up appointments for Monday. On Monday, no response from them.

We went by taxi to Xuan Thuy's Headquarters—were greeted courteously by an English speaking Oriental—said he would set up appointment for that afternoon. We proceeded to Madame Thi Binh Headquarters—not so courteous to us. After we did get to the gate and were identified, she sent us a number by an aid to call for appointment that afternoon. We called this number and were given the address of the Peace Talk Headquarters and advised us to be there at 2 P.M. On our arrival at 2 P.M., and getting past the Police outside, we were told that no one could speak English. This same response was given us on each additional attempt to reach Madame Binh.

On Monday night an aid to Xuan Thuy called and said they would admit us at 10 A.M. on Tuesday and accept our petitions—no news men to be there. We complied with his request and was there at 9:45. This time a different man greeted us and advised, "Minister too busy", would see us later. We asked if we could leave our letters and petitions at the door. Their reply was, "that is left up to you". We placed the box containing our messages at their door and started for our taxi. At this time Police came and very firmly told us to take the box and get out. We complied without protest—our observations—they are masters at deception.

We proceeded, as previously planned to Airport and went to Rome, Italy. Our purpose to seek aid from the Vatican and possibly an audience with his Holiness Pope Paul VI, in having our messages delivered to the Hanoi Government or the Peace delegations in Paris. On arrival, we were much discouraged. Everyone told us it would be impossible to have an audience with the Pope on such short notice. We did not give up. We went by taxi to an address given us by a friend, before we left Utica, Mississippi. It was here our hopes were renewed. We made contact with the Rev. Msgr. Bernard Law V. G. Catholic Diocese of Natchez and Jackson, a most wonderful man and very much concerned about our mission.

Not only did he arrange for our appointments at the Vatican and audience with the Pope, he advised us that they would receive our messages for delivery to the peace delegations. He also arranged an appointment with Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Italy, at 2 P.M. the following day. He met us (much to our surprise) to act as our interpreter.

We approached the Minister on possibility of accepting part of our petitions for delivery to Hanoi or to the Paris Peace delegation. After a short consultation with other officials, (not identified), he accepted our challenge and advised his government did not have diplomatic relations with North Viet government, but his government would make an attempt to deliver our messages. Our prayers were finally being answered.

On our return to Washington and appointments with 1st, The Honorable Richard Smyser, an adviser of President Nixon on foreign affairs and then The Honorable Frank

Selvert, under Secretary of State foreign affairs. We are pleased to report them, much impressed by our report. Each of these gentlemen requested a copy of this report and advised us to ask Congressman Charlie Griffin to have it entered into the Congressional Record.

We believe our mission was a great success. We made our impact on the Peace delegations in Paris and we enlisted, not only the Vatican, but the concern of another great world power, in better treatment for our POW's and a final settlement of this long war.

It is our sincere hope that other towns and cities, especially those that have prisoners, begin, at once, to make plans to send a small delegation (2 or 3 people) to Paris and other Capitals. The Hanoi government is deeply concerned about their public image. Such missions as ours will help focus public opinion on them. We believe this will finally be the answer.

UTICA WILL SEND ENVOY TO PARIS
(By Charles Smith)

Utica is working to become the first Mississippi town to have one of its citizens attempt a face to face meeting with North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegates in Paris.

The town's officials said they will send a representative to the peace talks to request release of Americans being held as prisoners of war in southeast Asia.

The representative, not yet selected, will carry letters and petitions signed by concerned Utica and Hinds County citizens, asking for the release of the POWs and specifically asking for freedom for Air Force Maj. Thomas Edward Collins III, a Utica native who has been a POW since Oct. 18, 1965.

Collins, 33, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. T. E. Collins Jr. of Utica. He is married to the former Donnie Katherine Martin of Utica who now lives in Jackson with their two sons, Martin, 7, and Edward, 5½.

Mayor John Tillman said the town is asking for help with its plans from all citizens with emphasis on the following:

Signatures on letters and petitions to be presented to North Vietnam and Viet Cong delegates at Paris.

Donations of any amount to help pay the plane fare and expenses of the selected representative.

Help in spreading news to clubs and churches regarding the campaign.

Congressman Charlie Griffin of Utica is giving full support to the plan and is sending his personal check to aid with expenses. He is announcing Utica's plans from his office in Washington.

The town is spearheading the expense fund drive with a \$100 donation.

H. Ross Perot, Dallas multimillionaire originated the plan for cities throughout the nation to confront North Vietnam and Viet Cong delegates with representatives of each town that has a man missing in action or being held as a prisoner of war.

Perot, who tired unsuccessfully to carry Christmas packages to the POWs in 1969, urged Mississippians to take part in this new plan when he spoke in Jackson at "Free the Prisoners Day" in February.

Last year Perot took American newsmen on a trip of S. Vietnam, Laos and Paris to seek relief of the American prisoners of war.

Some 25 Mississippians are prisoners of war or are missing in action.

TOWNS RESPOND

A number of cities and towns have already responded to the call, including Houston, Tex., Memphis, Tenn., Fort Walton Beach, Fla., and Alexandria, La.

"Utica is a small town of 1000 people but its size has never been a deterrent when it has a goal in mind—this time the release of

some 1,500 cruelly mistreated, brave Americans unlucky enough to be POWs in a very long conflict," Mayor John Tillman said.

Letters and petitions are available for signing at several other businesses in the town. Petitions will also be circulated at club meetings.

Tillman and the board of alderman will receive funds collected toward expenses. They hope to send the delegate within the next four weeks.

Mississippians, in addition to Maj. Collins, identified as prisoners of war include Maj. George Robert Hall, Hattiesburg; Lt. James William Bailey, Carthage; Cmdr. Charles R. Gillespie Jr., Meridian; Lt. Col. Carlyle S. Harris, Tupelo; Lt. Cmdr. Claude Douglas Clower Jr., Tupelo; and Cmdr. Robert Byron Fuller, whose mother lives in Baton Rouge and his sister lives in Jackson.

Listed as missing in action are: Spec-4 Jerry W. Elliott, Clinton; M-Sgt. Thomas E. Moore, Biloxi; Maj. James Wimberly Lewis, Meridian; Maj. Gregory I. Barras, Jackson; CWO Michael Varnado, Natchez; Lt. Col. Puris Luna, Jackson; Lt. Virgil King Cammeron, Jackson; Capt. Robert D.-Kent, Meridian.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XX

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the twisted and tangled deals that made up the paper empire of Frank Sharp are only now beginning to be understood. Apparently, now that some light is being cast into those dark shadows, the Federal agencies charged with administration of justice have begun to see the magnitude of their errors in the handling of the Sharp case.

Very early in the proceedings the Department of Justice requested and received a sweeping order granting complete immunity to Frank Sharp, in return for a guilty plea on two minor counts. At that time, the local U.S. attorney had no earthly idea of the number of illegal acts that Sharp had committed. Yet he was willing to ask for, and his bosses at the Justice Department approved, an order of immunity for Sharp.

The other day the judge who granted that order seemed to start having second thoughts.

The State of Texas would like to bring Sharp before grand juries to determine if there may be cause to think he violated Texas laws. Under the original immunity order, this could not be done. So, the Texas attorney general went to court and asked that the Sharp immunity order at least be modified, so that they could bring Sharp before State grand juries. Judge Singleton did modify his order. Apparently he recognizes, even though the Justice Department does not, the the injustice and abuse that the original order perpetrated.

That original immunity order meant that justice could not be done; it forbade any law enforcement officer from touching Sharp. Yet at the time it was granted there had not even been a complete investigation. The Department of Justice actually asked to have its hands

bound, and asked to tie the hands of anybody and everybody who wanted to see that complete justice was done. That was unconscionable, and it still is.

I do not believe that the immunity order should have been asked for in the first place. I think that it should be withdrawn completely.

If we are going to ask the people to have full faith in the administration of justice we have the right and the duty to ask and demand that the laws be completely and impartially enforced. There cannot be one standard of justice for one man and another for someone else. Frank Sharp ought to stand trial for his crimes, just as any other man should. Let us have done with this immunity business, and get on with the business of seeing that justice is fully and completely done, and let the chips fall where they may.

A NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to introduce House Joint Resolution 798 asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day." This special recognition would be in honor of more than 50 million hunters and fishermen for their contributions to conservation and outdoor recreation.

It is past time that Congress recognize the services of the sportsman to the wise use of our natural resources and for their participation in healthful recreation and its encouragement.

Since the turn of the century hunters and fishermen have consistently been in the forefront of every conservation crusade. Our Nation's early conservation leaders, such as Theodore Roosevelt and Gilbert Pinchot, were hunters and fishermen. Outdoorsmen were the first to decry the destruction of America's forests, streams, soils and wetlands. They were the first because their love of the outdoors had made them aware of the beauty of nature and the necessity of protecting wildlife habitat and scenic grandeur. Hunters and fishermen were the first to plead for conservation because they were the ones who were hiking the mountains and fishing the streams. For more than 50 years outdoorsmen carried a lonely crusade to manage our natural resources wisely.

They were the ones behind every major conservation action in Washington and State capitals. They created their own publications to warn all Americans of what would happen to the environment.

It is only in recent months that Americans were awakened to the threats of the destruction of their environment. The news media suddenly popularized ecology and environment. The total American citizenry became aware of the serious need for conservation. This is not news to hunters and fishermen who gladly welcome the public to help with a crusade that outdoorsmen have con-

ducted since 1900. All Americans are needed to join the campaign to use our Nation's resources wisely.

Hunters and fishermen are a significant boost to the economy of the Nation. Their expenditures for equipment, meals, lodging, travel, and guides reach into nearly every county of the United States. In 1965, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife reported that hunters and fishermen spent over \$4 billion in pursuit of their favorite recreation. I am confident that the 1970 survey, which is scheduled for printing in September, will show that hunters and fishermen now pour much more into America's economic arteries.

According to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, in 1965 sport fishermen drove 23 billion miles to enjoy 522 million recreation days; hunters drove over 8 billion miles and enjoyed 185 million recreation days. The 76-page report is filled with statistics on the contributions of hunters and fishermen to the Nation's economy, but there is no measurement yet devised for measuring spiritual values. We cannot measure the rejuvenation of a sportsman who has spent an hour on a peaceful trout stream or slow trailing a jumpy covey of bob white quail. We do know that 50 million hunters and fishermen appreciate a chance to spend a few hours enjoying nature and resting from the tensions of our complex life. We do know that those who hunt and fish are better citizens for it.

Many of the ills of our society originate in our vast urban concrete complexes where there is little opportunity for the people to reach a wilderness area and recreate their spirits by communing with nature. In fact, I would go so far as to say that if by some miracle our citizens in the asphalt jungles could travel each weekend to the mountains and lakes and seashore this Nation would have less strife and turmoil. When man in his lonely trip through his allotted time on our planet removes himself too far from the woods and waters and soil from which he springs, there are inevitably complex tensions, frustrations and trouble. The hunters and fishermen of the Nation have long recognized the need to return to the natural world. This need is greater than ever before.

I would like to cite two general statistics to illustrate why hunting and fishing are wholesome recreation for our citizens: A study in the Seattle juvenile court over a 20-year period showed that of 45,000 youths who came before the court not one of them had an outdoor hobby, and a study by the jailer of Knox County, Tenn., over many years showed that out of 10,000 inmates less than 2 percent had ever owned hunting or fishing licenses.

Hunters and fishermen were responsible for establishing all 50 State fish and game departments. From the very beginning, these departments were supported by the sales of hunting and fishing licenses. Financial support has always come from hunters and fishermen and not from the general public. I think it important to emphasize here that all State fish and game agencies are charged

by law with the welfare and protection of all fish and wildlife. Hunters and fishermen are proud that their moneys provide protection for more nongame species of fish and wildlife than those species which the outdoorsmen pursue.

Hunters and fishermen demanded, following the deplorable market-hunting era of the 1800's, that seasons and bag limits be imposed. This was an equitable way to manage the welfare of each game species and also insure that outdoorsmen had an equal chance to enjoy the annual harvest of surplus fish and game.

Whenever a fish or wildlife game species has become in short supply, it has inevitably been the hunter and fisherman who demanded protection and that his money be spent on wildlife research, management, and law enforcement. In fact, it has been sportsmen's money that has largely insured the welfare of hundreds of nongame species. I am proud to say that there is no species of game fish or wildlife in America that is in danger from sports hunting or fishing.

The endangered species which we read so much about are nongame species. The careless destruction of habitat and the wanton pollution of our environment have caused these nongame species to become endangered. The hunter and fisherman money is doing more for these species than help from any other source. For instance, in California \$1 million in sportsmen's license fees are expended annually for the enhancement of nongame fish and wildlife. Sportsmen, more than anyone else, are dedicated to all living species. They are proud to help while the public has not or will not.

I would like to cite another instance where hunters and fishermen are doing more for nongame species than any other segment of our population. Ducks Unlimited, a private organization of ardent waterfowl hunters, has spent millions of dollars in Canada to increase and improve nesting areas. It is true that the Ducks Unlimited members hope to increase the annual surplus of waterfowl for hunting in the fall, but their wildlife areas support over 250 species of nongame wildlife.

Sportsmen, in their campaign to perpetuate fish and wildlife, were the first to pay for extensive fish and wildlife research. Their funds have generously gone for scholarships, the establishment of fish and wildlife management departments and conferences to exchange scientific data.

In 1937, hunters asked that the 11-percent excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition be put into a special fund for wildlife management and land acquisition. In 1965, when President Lyndon Johnson submitted a bill to end certain excise taxes, sportsmen demanded that their tax not be removed. American outdoorsmen are unique in all the world in that they asked to be taxed in order to enhance their favorite recreation. More than \$435 million have been collected through this excise tax known as the Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act. The tax goes to the U.S. Department of the Interior and is prorated to all 50 States fish and

game departments on a 75 percent Federal and 25 percent State matching basis. The land that has been bought under this program is enjoyed by all Americans but only hunters and fishermen have paid. The fish and wildlife on these lands are for the benefit of all American citizens but only the outdoorsman has paid.

Sports fishermen also asked that their tackle be taxed 10 percent. The proceeds from this money is prorated to the State conservation commissions for clean water, access, fish propagation, and management. The tax to fishermen provides water improvement which insures the survival of hundreds of species of life other than game fish.

In order to campaign more effectively for their sport and our Nation's environmental needs, hunters and fishermen have formed many National and State organizations. Over the years they have led every major conservation crusade. The names of these organizations, mainly supported by hunters and fishermen, are familiar to all of you—the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, Ducks Unlimited, and many others.

When Senator THOMAS JAMES MCINTYRE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 117 in the Senate, a companion resolution, he emphasized the need for all Americans to have an opportunity to "get away from it all." He stated that it has become of crucial importance in the congestion and frustration of today's complicated life to participate in outdoor recreation such as hunting and fishing. I concur wholeheartedly with the Senator from New Hampshire. All of us here in Congress have a great deal to learn from hunters and fishermen.

It is important to the spiritual and physical survival of our people that Congress encourage hunters and fishermen to continue their conservation crusade and their enjoyment of outdoor recreation. I ask that Congress honor the hunters and fishermen of America by passing my resolution which asks that President Richard Nixon declare the fourth Saturday of each September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

WHITE PAPER ON CUBA

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have previously quoted from the work of Dr. Manuel J. Reyes who is Latin news editor of Station WTVJ in Miami. He is a distinguished Cuban who fled Cuba in August of 1960 with his wife and three children. He received diplomatic and civil law degrees in Cuba in 1948-49.

Dr. Reyes has maintained close contact with the anti-Castro underground in Cuba, the same contacts which aided him in his disclosure in August 1962, of the presence of Russian nuclear missiles in Cuba—8 weeks before President Kennedy revealed the facts in October 1962.

Dr. Reyes has now written a "White Paper on Cuba: The Floating Arsenal."

His statements require careful consideration. I am very much concerned that there is a strong disposition on the part of the leaders of our country to ignore what is happening in Cuba. This could be a dangerous thing. Castro's presence there continues to represent a threat to the democratic way of life throughout the Western Hemisphere. This is a problem which will not resolve itself. I am convinced there is much more that could and should be done to weaken Castro in Cuba and to bring about his ultimate downfall with the restoration of a sound government there which will work in harmony with other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I submit Dr. Reyes' paper for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It contains startling information on the military buildup in Cuba. It follows:

WHITE PAPER ON CUBA: THE FLOATING ARSENAL

(By Dr. Manuel J. Reyes)

On August 7, 1962, I announced for the first time over television in the United States that there were 5,000 uniformed Russian soldiers in the neighborhood of the Canimar River, in the province of Matanzas, Cuba. The information was denied in different spheres of the free world. Twelve weeks later, the 1962 October crisis took place, which not only made the world shake, but also put the world on the edge of a thermo-nuclear war.

On April 28, 1969, I denounced for the first time in six years a new Russian military build-up in Cuba, taking into consideration the information furnished by the Patriotic Resistance on the island. The report was received with a lot of skepticism; nevertheless, it was evident that the Russians were going to increase their military position in Cuba, after Fidel Castro publicly announced toward the end of 1968, his support of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. On July 26, 1969, a Russian naval fleet visited the island. It was said that the fleet made a courtesy visit.

On November 9, 1969, Marshal Grechko, Minister of Defense of the Soviet Union, arrived in Cuba. It was said that he was visiting the island to study the reasons for the deterioration of the Russian arms and military equipment given to the Communist troops of Castro. The Resistance informed us that Grechko visited many Cuban caves.

On April 10, 1970, I reported that Castro had tripled the number of missile boats equipped with teledirected surface-to-surface missiles, with a 40-50 mile range.

In June, 1970, United States Coast Guard Intelligence testified before the U.S. Senate's Subcommittee on Internal Security confirming the assertions I had made.

On May 14, 1970, a second Russian naval fleet went to Cuba. The third Russian fleet went to Cuba on September 9th, causing official speculation that the Soviet Union was building a nuclear submarine base in Cienfuegos. We had already advised the American Congress of this fact, before the Congressional Subcommittee for Inter-American Affairs, on July 27, 1970.

The fourth Russian fleet arrived in Cuba on December 7, 1970. Two Russian naval squadrons thus met in Cuba for the first time—since there were still Russian warships which arrived there on September 9, 1970.

The aforementioned are the facts which have prompted the publication of this "white paper."

The following is the way in which the Russian military invasion of Cuba has been developing.

I want to make it very clear that I am not a military expert, and I do not have the means to verify all technical matters; I feel it is my duty to publish the facts, figures and evaluation which have come into my possession. For many years, I have gathered data from the Cuban underground. So today, it is not only my voice addressing you, but the voice of the millions of Cubans who are suffering on the island; the voice of many Cubans who are actually risking their lives working in the underground and furnishing us information that otherwise we would not know, and the voices of many Cubans who have told the truth upon arriving in this land of freedom.

Cuba today is a natural aircraft carrier of the Soviet Union entrenched in the heart of this hemisphere and 90 miles from the United States of America.

We are going to try to show that this enemy aircraft carrier has turned into the Trojan Horse which externally does not show its large military installations and tactical arms under Cuban soil.

Let us start by saying that Cuba is naturally rich in minerals. Cuba has always been considered as the second country in America in iron reserves, the first one being Venezuela. Cuba is the third county in the world in nickel, cobalt, chrome, and manganese. At time of wars, Cuba has been considered as the top producer of some of the aforementioned minerals.

In 1960, a military study was initiated in Cuba by Cuban geologists and Soviet military personnel who covered all the natural features of the island, including the keys, for the purpose of using these facilities for military ends, such as the storage of missiles, munitions, reserve weapons, fuel, communications and medicines. Taken into consideration in this study were the many natural caves in Cuba.

Many of these caves have been reinforced with 6" wide concrete. Work of this military character has been done in Sierra de los Organos in the province of Pinar del Rio, in the Sierra de Lupe, in Oriente Province, and in Altura Central on the Isle of Pines.

I think we can show the extent of this construction by the following figures: Until 1958, Cuba produced four million barrels of cement a year; each barrel was equivalent to four sacks of cement and each sack weighed 130 lbs. There were four cement factories in Cuba with the aforementioned annual production, working eight hours daily. All of this cement was used for civilian construction and export, never for military purposes. When Fidel Castro stole power in Cuba, he greatly increased the cement production of the island.

What has been the destiny of this cement? It has definitely not been used in urban or rural construction for the people. There is only one answer to this question: Enormous quantities of cement have been used for military, underground construction by the Soviet Union and the Castro regime in Cuba.

In 1963, huge shipments of hydraulic cement were sent from Belgium to Cuba and were unloaded at Cienfuegos Bay (#1)*. The hydraulic cement is not precisely for surface construction. This cement hardens at high speed in a humid area. It is understood that the hydraulic cement was used for underground construction for the storage of missiles and weapons with high humidity coefficient. In 1963, more than 300 cement trucks were unloaded in Cienfuegos and taken to a secret locale. However, the Cuban underground has pointed out that the cement was taken to the missile base, "La Campana," in Manicaragua (#2). This base is located on the farm formerly owned by a German-American by the last name of Koop.

On the Isle of Pines (#3), there are natural marble caves. The resistance of the marble structure is tremendous against external bombing. The Isle of Pines also possesses silicon and clay riches.

Without fear of error, we can affirm that in Cuba there are actually more than 3,000 natural caves, adapted by the Soviet Union and the Castro regime with strategic military goals in mind. Cuba today is the Trojan Horse of America.

At this time, it is estimated there is an average of 20,000 to 30,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba, scattered among military bases throughout the island.

We must bear in mind that on July 26, 1962, Russian military troops landed in Cuba at the Dubroc docks in the province of Matanzas, using the new pier inlet at Mar y Melena and at Mariel Bay (#5), in Pinar del Rio province.

We all know that it was said that the Soviets had dismantled the missile bases after the October 1962 crisis; but, did the Soviet soldiers leave Cuba? Or are they still there? Have the dismantled bases been reactivated again? Did the Soviets really remove the missiles from Cuba? The Cuban people understand they did not, and I reaffirm it on behalf of the Cuban people.

The Castro regime has been building underground hospitals, among which are the Sierra de Cristal in Oriente province, near Nipe (#4) and Levisa bays.

Ninety percent of the fuel reserves in Cuba, and many ammunition dumps, are underground, and in an unmerciful way, the others are under schools. A year ago, there was a terrible explosion at the former Jesuit "Belen" School, where Fidel Castro attended as a youngster. Eight girls were killed and more than 20 were injured. The Cuban resistance revealed that the explosives placed in the school's basement caused the explosion.

The following is a description of military Soviet bases in the six provinces of Cuba.

Pinar del Rio province has received much Soviet attention. In Santa Lucia, there is a metals plant to produce acids used in the functioning of missiles. Two of the principal ports with military Soviet objectives are Mariel (#5) and Cabanas (#6) ports. Both naval installations are being exclusively worked by the Soviets and they do not let Cubans come near. At the Cabanas port, they have established bases for the Komar missile guided boats. In 1970, the number of the boats was tripled to approximately 70. These boats are provided with two missiles each, guided by radar and with a range of 40 to 50 miles. They are considered offensive weapons and the missiles are surface-to-surface type.

In La Gobernadora hills, near the Sierra de los Organos (#6), there is a military base which has internal train rails, once used in mines. At La Gobernadora, also known as Cangre or San Cristobal, near the town of Candelaria (#7), we find the General Russian headquarters for western Cuba. The altitude of the hills is approximately 1,870 feet. The Soviets have constructed a road from El Cangre which goes as far as Cabanas and Mariel. They also have electric lines of 33,000 volts, necessary for missiles. The same electric voltage system is used as the Campana base in Manticaragus (#2), Las Villas province. Following the Pinar del Rio analysis, we can say that south of "Quebra Hacha," the Russians have constructed a residential district where no Cuban is allowed to live; that is, it is strictly for Russian officers. The aforementioned residential district is surrounded by wire fences. They have also built tunnel systems from El Cangre, which leads to the exterior of Kilometer No. 4 of the road that

joins Cayajabo with the town of Artemisa (#8). During the first week of November 1970, a military Soviet convoy was detected at the central road of Pinar del Rio, parting from Las Mangas village toward the Southwest.

In the Province of Havana, there is a big Soviet military base in San Antonio de Los Banos (No. 9). The resistance reports that this base has a 140-mile radar system which can track the planes from Homestead Air Force Base and Boca Chica in Key West. This base is one of the top three air bases in Cuba and it is the headquarters for the Soviet Mig 21. There are no Mig 21s at other air bases in Cuba. The bases are defended by ground-to-air missiles, the SAM-2 class.

There is also a radar system in Havana at the former Commodore Hotel, in the middle of a Russian neighborhood. The SAM missile system initiates in the hills of Averhoff on the Havana-Batabano (No. 10) highway and takes in Managua-Dayaniguas (No. 11). In Campo, Florida, Havana province, there is a SAM missile base camouflaged as a farm known as "Camilo Cienfuegos" and it is here the Cuban resistance believes the Russians have hidden the medium missiles which never left Cuba.

At "Las Cabreras," there is a Russian military complex to which Cubans have no access. In this military complex, there is a guerrilla training camp for foreigners and the Russians are in charge. One of the principal Soviet bases in Havana is at the Managua camp (No. 12). The Cuban resistance indicates that in this place, there is probably one nuclear reactor, even though Castro's regime maintains it is for peaceful ends. Apparently, the nuclear reactor arrived in Cuba in 1968, and there is no indication that it is intended for peaceful purposes.

The Cuban Commission of Nuclear Energy is based in Managua, directed by Luis Larragoitia. Electrical power lines have been built from Mariel, Havana and Matanzas (No. 13) to feed the nuclear reactor in Managua. It is estimated that over a thousand Russian soldiers are in Managua and Santiago de las Vegas (No. 14).

In the Province Matanzas, the most important point is the so-called "La Laguna del Tesoro." For many years the Castro regime has been investing millions of dollars in construction equipment and in building which Castro said would improve the tourist trade. But since the beginning, "Laguna del Tesoro" has been totally closed to the public and only military personnel are permitted within this zone. Therefore, we presume there is a base of military nature.

In Las Villas Province, there is another big Soviet base between Santa Clara (No. 15), and Calabazar (No. 16), at a place known as Malezas. In this base only, Soviet Mig 17s and 19s are found. The base has an anti-aircraft system and artillery made up of multiple machine guns as well as a duplex cannon known as "KAR-30." This base, as well as San-Antonio de los Banos, has underground hangars with special elevators to bring up the Soviet Mig fighters.

Also in Las Villas can be found the so-called missile base of Remedios (No. 17), better known as "La Puntilla" or "Bartolome" base, where they had ICBMs during the October 1962 missile crisis. In the Escambray, the Soviets recently built a road from Guirade Miranda to the Loma de los Vientos. Nobody knows what they have in these hills, but it is known that only Soviet personnel work there.

In Nuevitas (#18) Camaguey province they are building a big cement factory and an electrical power plant. At Camaguey airport, the Soviets have prepared additional access strips, using not the airport itself, but the highway which goes from Camaguey (#19)

to Nuevitas. They have removed the islands from the middle of the road and have smoothed and strengthened the pavement. They have made it possible that this highway can be converted into a landing strip.

On the island of Turiguano, the Russians have stored rockets in one of several hills in the area. Eyewitnesses have indicated that the rockets are moved on train rails. Two doors close the entrance of the tunnel. The exterior of the cave is camouflaged with grass and trees.

All the keys of the Bahamas canal are fortified by the Soviets. Its naval strategic value is enormous, since they can control the traffic from Panama and South America, through Maisi (#19a).

Surrounding the U.S. Naval Base of Guantanamo (#20), the Soviets and the Castro regime have a military outfit known as "Battalion Fronterizo" (Frontier Battalion). This battalion possesses a missile system for its protection. It also has armored units. Around "Gran Piedra" hill, the Soviets have built several underground installations, and it is unknown what the Soviets have stored there.

Other points of great military strategy in the Province of Oriente are as follows:

(1) The air force base of Holguin (#21), considered as the largest in Cuba, has only Mig. 15s and 17s. On the outskirts of Holguin, they have built a residential section known as "Lenin," where only Russian military personnel live. The hangars of this air force base, as well as those of San Antonio de los Banos and Las Villas, are underground.

(2) The military base, Punta de Mula or Punta Lucrecia in the city of Banes (#22), is considered a first-class base and is 20 miles wide. In its area, the Russians have built a naval base for the *Kronstadt* and *Komar* boats. Some years ago, Russian submarines were sighted in this vicinity on military maneuvers. The base is near the mines that are producing copper and cobalt which are being exported to the Soviet Union.

Support for Soviet underground defense in Oriente Province is in the underground system of San Vicente hill near the Boniato mountain; other support is in La Sierra de Cristal near Nipe Bay. There is a secret zone in Nipe Bay to which few have access.

The underground has also reported that in the event of a possible overthrow of Fidel Castro, the Communists have designated Oriente province as the main area of resistance.

Lately, the Castro regime, assisted by the Soviets, has been conducting war games, using antipersonnel gases. All military personnel in Cuba have gas masks, it should be noted.

The Bay of Cienfuegos (#1) is in the southern part of Cuba, in Las Villas Province. It is approximately six miles wide.

On July 27, 1970, I said before the Congress of the United States, and now I reaffirm it, that somewhere in the Caribbean, there is a permanent Soviet naval squadron, headed by a nuclear submarine. The chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Hon. Dante Fascell, asked me where I thought it was based, and according to the information I had from underground sources, I said, either Cienfuegos or Havana.

In April 1963, the regime began to show interest in Cienfuegos, and announced that they were building a shipyard in Cienfuegos near the port industrial area.

In that year, it was reported that the Castro regime was building ships. The Castro regime said that the yard was only for shipping sugar.

In 1967, the yard was completed at a cost of \$8 million and not a single sack of sugar came out of that yard. In 1970, we began to hear about activity in Cienfuegos, in

Cienfuegos Bay, and especially near Cayo Alcatraz.

On a normal day, Cayo Alcatraz cannot be seen from the city of Cienfuegos. Right now, at night, the city of Cienfuegos is under a tremendous shortage of electricity—so, during the blackouts, floodlights can be seen on the horizon. Cayo Alcatraz cannot be seen, but the lights there indicate that people are working there.

Near Cayo Alcatraz, there is a place called La Milpa. All the Cuban fishermen of La Milpa and the surrounding areas have been ordered out. The place now is a military zone.

An underwater net was put in Cayo Alcatraz and also at the entrance of Cienfuegos Bay.

The entrance is under surveillance of Russian guards. Several months ago, a huge Russian ship entered Cienfuegos Bay and stayed there for several weeks.

In December, the Russian ship returned and anchored in a spot between Cayo Alcatraz and Cayo Ocampo.

In the second half of 1970 in Cienfuegos, Soviet sailors were seen walking the streets wearing full uniform. The Russian sailors were transported on land by six British Leyland buses. They were taken back and forth from Cienfuegos to nearby Cayo Alcatraz.

Three-fourths of Cienfuegos Bay has been banned to Cubans. There is a big pipeline from Cayo Alcatraz to Cienfuegos. The Russians have established large warehouses in Cayo Alcatraz, for military storage. A powerful radio station has been built and they have put a naval headquarters there.

Around the middle of December, two huge TU 95 "Bear" planes from the Soviet Union landed in Havana. Both planes were kept at Havana International Airport at Rancho Boyeros.

Two Soviet Admirals came on those planes into Cuba. The Cuban underground reported that one of the planes, capable of transporting missiles or nuclear weapons, had a number 38 on it. Later on, the Russian Admirals were seen in Cienfuegos at Punta Gorda. They took a boat and with three Russian civilian engineers went to Cayo Alcatraz, on several occasions.

Near the inlet of Las Calabrazas the Russians have built an eight lane road toward the Escambray Mountains. No civilians are allowed on that road. In the Escambray Mountains, there is a place called the Hill of the Winds (Loma de los Vientos), where the Russians have been working for almost eight months. No Cubans are allowed in that vicinity. The underground reported that lead ingots have been put into the Hill of the Winds.

Possibly one of the largest barges in the world was sighted in Cienfuegos Bay in December. The Russians own it and it is manned by 303 Russian sailors. In Cienfuegos Bay, there have been two other large Russian barges. In September, the barges left Cienfuegos Bay and went into El Mariel port, in Pinar del Rio province, on the northern part of Cuba. Mariel is the number one port of the Soviet Union since 1961-1962, and before the Cuban missile crisis, most of the offensive weapons were introduced in Cuba through El Mariel port.

As we know, a Russian nuclear submarine was seen during the period of September 12-20, (of 1970); first, near Punta de Ladrillos in the western part of Cienfuegos Bay, and side by side with two other regular Russian submarines at Cayo Loco, the former Cuban Navy headquarters.

The previous report of the nuclear submarine in Cienfuegos Bay was sent by the Cuban underground and, later on, was confirmed by an eyewitness arriving in the United States.

In evaluating Cayo Alcatraz, it can be said that the place is for maintenance and supply of regular and nuclear submarines of the Soviet Union. The nuclear submarines need medicines, food, replacement of crews and rechecking of their missiles. To recheck the missiles, the nuclear sub needs calm waters like those in Cienfuegos Bay.

So, Cayo Alcatraz is of great logistic and military value to the Russians. Cayo Alcatraz is the motor nerve, the center of a large military naval complex of the Soviet Union in the southern part of Cuba. Part of that complex is Cayo Largo (#23), southwest of Cienfuegos. Since 1961-62, Cayo Largo has been taken over by the Russians and no Cuban fishermen are allowed to go near it. At the western part of Cayo Largo, the Russians built a pier and an air strip. The Russians also constructed buildings, one of them five floors high. On the southern part of Cayo Largo, there is a wide beach. Close to the beach, water is as much as 2,000 to 3,000 feet deep.

Part of the naval complex is the Isle of Pines (No. 3). The capital is Nueva Gerona. The island is almost divided by a swamp. In the Bay of Siguanea (No. 24) the Soviet Union established a base for *Kronstadt* boats with *Komar* missiles. These missiles have a range of 40-50 miles; the range of the boat is about 100 miles.

Little by little, all the civilians on the northern part of Isle of Pines have been sent to other provinces of Cuba. On the southern part of the island, there were a lot of lumbermen and fishermen; they also have been taken out. In 1967, more than 5,000 Cuban political prisoners were taken off the Isle of Pines, because they saw too much. They were spread among other political prisoners in Cuba.

I affirm that the puzzle has been put together. Many times in the past, since April 28, 1969, I reported that different Russian convoys have been seen either in Pinar del Rio, Havana or Matanzas Provinces heading south. These convoys have been seen without Castro soldiers, just Russian soldiers!

The solution of the puzzle is this:

The convoys have gone to Surgidero de Batabano (No. 25). From there, Russian soldiers and all kind of military equipment have been shipped to Isle of Pines or Cayo Largo. All of this leads us to believe that there is a large Soviet naval military complex in the southern part of Cuba with an operational base on Cayo Largo, a position for surveillance on the Isle of Pines and a headquarters at Cayo Alcatraz. All of this is a challenge to Guantanamo Naval Base.

The Caribbean, often called the Mediterranean of the Western Hemisphere, has always been protected by surrounding nations and, particularly, by three U.S. bases at Puerto Rico, Guantanamo and Panama. But now, the Soviet Union, through Cienfuegos, Cayo Largo and the Isle of Pines, is challenging that defense.

The above concludes my presentation. I reaffirm what I said at the beginning; that is, Cuba on the surface presents a picture which is totally different from what is really happening in caves and underground. Actually, there is another Cuba below that surface that poses an actual threat not only to the United States of America, but to all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

TO ESTABLISH FEDERAL QUALITY STANDARDS FOR BOTTLED DRINKING WATER

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 I introduced H.R. 4147, legislation authorizing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish uniform Federal quality standards for bottled drinking water.

Since that time, several incidents have occurred to evidence the urgent need for this proposal, as the industry itself continues to grow virtually unregulated by health or purity standards. I am therefore reintroducing my bill today with 28 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. They are as follows: The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG), the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLINS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DULSKI), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. THONE), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG), the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE).

The basic problems confronting the Congress is that no specific and uniform standards exist at the Federal level to regulate the bottled water industry. As a result, consumers have no final assurance that the bottled water they drink is safe, and companies have no consistent guidelines to which to refer in producing their goods.

The absence of Federal law in this field has left the responsibility to the States. Unfortunately, I have found by taking a survey of State laws that State regulations create more confusion than public protection. In most cases, the provisions of these laws are extremely vague as to bottled water, and ambiguous in jurisdiction. Often no accompanying machinery is established to administer the authority which has been granted.

The end product is a great variety of State rules, and uncertainty by both producer and consumer. A producer may meet the standard of one State only to find that his product cannot be sold in another State. Consumers in many areas cannot be certain that their water has been adequately tested. In some locations, bottled water can actually reach the su-

permarket shelves without being regulated by any kind of government agency.

A recent case in the Washington, D.C. area illustrates the confusion in this field, and the need for regulations. As a result of bacteria studies sponsored by the Washington Evening Star, two of Washington's largest supermarket chains removed their bottled water products from the shelves.

Because of the lack of Federal standards, the supermarkets could not be certain they were selling safe goods. Compounding the problem was the fact that no specified Federal agency had jurisdiction over the matter. Hence no one was prepared to offer the necessary scientific advice.

Only last February, Washington area bottled water sales boomed as a result of the unpleasant odor and taste of the Montgomery County municipal water system. I noted at that time that Maryland had no specific regulations pertaining to bottled drinking water, and expressed my concern that the ever-growing number of bottled water consumers were unprotected.

The Maryland case is not unique in spurring bottled water sales. Citizens across the country, wary of their municipal water supplies, are increasingly turning to supermarket substitutes. Once considered a luxury or a health cure, bottled water is now a necessity to many. It is found in almost all food stores, in vending machines, and in many communities, is delivered door to door with milk and orange juice. During the last 2 years, the bottled water industry has experienced some of the fastest growth in the Nation.

Because of this sudden, yet enormous increase in sales and consumption I feel that now is the proper time to establish adequate protective legislation. My bill will allow the Environmental Protection Agency to provide uniform standards for the entire industry, and will make illegal the interstate transportation of bottled water products which fail to meet these standards.

I have received considerable support for this legislation both from consumers who have written to me from across the Nation and from the bottled water industry itself. I am hopeful that this support can now be translated into action. The Congress should not leave consumers unprotected and the industry without guidelines. I urge all Members to join me in cosponsoring and working for passage of uniform Federal bottled water standards.

MILITARY DRUG ABUSE REVIEW BOARD

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress and the executive appear to be moving toward enacting legislation to treat drug addiction in the military, it is imperative that we include in any final law provisions which will salvage the lives of veterans who are the walking

casualties of Armed Forces discharge policies for those using drugs.

Today I am introducing a bill to establish a special Military Drug Abuse Review Board to reconsider all less-than-honorable discharges and dismissals given to members of the Armed Forces for reasons primarily related to drug use. I discussed my proposal with the Department of Defense in June and I was pleased to note that Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard told a Senate subcommittee recently that the Department was prepared to grant amnesty on a case-by-case basis to ex-servicemen who were discharged with less-than-honorable discharges due to drug abuse to enable the ex-servicemen to clear their records on the same basis as present military drug users who are utilizing the servicewide amnesty treatment programs now in effect. The Department of Defense proposal as outlined by Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard parallels my proposal even to the extent of excluding drug pushers and sellers from participating in the amnesty program. My bill provides that any person who served on active duty during the Vietnam era or within 6 years of the close of the Vietnam era may petition the special review board for relief. This bill specifically excludes drug pushers from obtaining any relief under its terms.

I feel that the existing appeals mechanism, the Discharge Review Boards and the Board for Correction of Military Records, are not geared to undertake a general review of drug-related discharges.

Under the terms of my bill, the Review Board is empowered to change the type of discharge or dismissal of a person, or issue him a new discharge to indicate that he was discharged under honorable conditions upon a finding of the Board that the person seeking the discharge:

First, has actively participated in a treatment and rehabilitation program for his drug dependency since discharge;

Second, has made substantial progress in stabilizing or minimizing his dependency condition; and

Third, has not engaged in a pattern of continual criminal activity in violation of Federal, State, or local law.

The Review Board will be composed of 10 members to be appointed by the President and consisting of: two representatives of federally chartered veterans organizations; three nonmedical members of the armed services; one Veterans' Administration physician; one physician who is a member of the armed services; an employee of the Civil Service Commission; a representative of organized labor and a representative of private industry. The composition of the Review Board is intended to allow for a determination of each case by individuals familiar with the possibilities and problems each discharged serviceman faces in regaining his status as a productive member of society, with prime emphasis on his employability.

While elimination of the drug supply, treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and effective prevention pro-

grams are crucial elements of any program to halt drug abuse in the military, we would be treating the problem only partially if we failed to take steps to enable the rehabilitated addicts and users to secure gainful employment after discharge and help them to assume responsible roles in society.

The beneficiaries of the bill I am introducing today are the men who, despite having served in the Armed Forces were discharged from the military service with less than honorable or undesirable administrative discharges primarily because of their use or possession of a narcotic drug or to their dependence on narcotics.

Drug use in the military is so so widespread that it is imperative for us to intensify our efforts to rehabilitate the addicts so that they may resume normal and productive lives. All obstacles to recovery, whether in deficient treatment or imposed legal disabilities, which slow down or make improbable a return to normal civilian life, must be removed. Amnesty policies now in effect in some of the armed services recognize that drug addiction is primarily a medical problem and that the main element of any program should and must be treatment. Unfortunately, the amnesty policies are unevenly applied and the future of a drug user depends upon whether the serviceman is a member of the Army, Marines, Air Force, or Navy. If he is a member of the Army he may receive treatment and undergo rehabilitation without receiving the permanent disability of a dishonorable or undesirable administrative discharge; if he is a member of the Marines, which has the highest percentage of drug users and drug addicts, he will, under current Marine policies, receive a dishonorable discharge; if he is a member of the Navy he might very well receive an undesirable administrative discharge.

Clearly, corrective legislation is needed to rectify the hardships and injustices caused by this uneven and unpredictable system of justice, and I believe that the establishment of a special Military Drug Abuse Review Board would accomplish just that.

During the last 2 months, the shocking extent of drug abuse in the military has been bared and I am optimistic that effective drug abuse rehabilitation and prevention programs will be enacted in this Congress in the very near future.

I am especially gratified that the major provisions of my comprehensive proposal to treat drug abuse in the military, the Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971, have won the wide support among my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, and in the other body as well as the executive branch. Upon introducing my bill on May 10, I knew that its key provision, mandating the retention in the armed services of any serviceman determined to be addicted to narcotic drugs until such time that he is determined to be free from habitual dependence, was breaking new ground and would stir controversy among my colleagues, the military, and the press, and

I welcomed the ensuing debate on how we could best treat and rehabilitate returning GI addicts. My proposal survived the discussions and debates and has emerged as a basic element in all realistic proposals to treat military drug abuse. Since May 10 over 50 Members have joined me in cosponsoring the bill: the Senate has adopted a variation of my proposal as an amendment to the Selective Service Act amendments, and the President has incorporated my mandatory retention-treatment proposal as an integral part of his comprehensive drug eradication program.

I continue to believe that my complete proposal, including the establishment of Drug Abuse Control Corps in each of the services, a uniform amnesty-treatment program and the mandatory retention-rehabilitation program should be enacted and I intend to continue to work for passage of the bill in this Congress.

SHORTER PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SUPPORTED

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues editorial support for my bill—H.R. 9507—which would limit the length of presidential campaigns to 60 days.

An editorial in the Redding, Conn., Pilot points out well what I and the co-sponsors of my bill have stated and will continue to state: for clarity's sake, 60 days is sufficient for a presidential campaign. A campaign of longer duration is, "counterproductive, expensive, and lends to confusion rather than clarity to both issues and candidates."

The editorial follows:

FOR CLARITY'S SAKE

This country will celebrate its 200th birthday in 1976.

The advances in technology and particularly in communications have been tremendous. In just the past 20 years nearly every American citizen has acquired access to instantaneous information about his world via television.

Yet, in presidential elections, candidates still campaign for months, exhausting both themselves and their financial backers. Once, it might have been necessary to indulge in an extended campaign: without radio or television, candidates had to whistlestop to make themselves known. But no more—a man can make himself and his views known to a huge television audience. If he has sufficient money, he can flood the screen with paid commercials.

The Democratic National Committee has set July 9, 1972 as the date for its national convention to select a candidate for president. Obviously, the Republicans will not be far behind. In the nearly four months that the chosen two will have for campaigning, money and rhetoric will flow in great profusion. But will we voters be any more informed and prepared to make an intelligent decision come Nov. 7, 1972?

We agree with Fifth District Congressman John S. Monagan who has long worked to limit the duration of presidential campaigns. He recently criticized the Democratic Na-

tional Committee for their choice of date, stating that he felt it was unfortunate that his party "has not taken the lead in establishing a shorter, more sensible campaign period."

He and seven co-sponsors have introduced legislation to limit the campaign period to 60 days, explaining "We . . . strongly feel that a campaign period of longer duration is counter-productive, expensive, and lends to confusion rather than clarity to both issues and candidates."

In the confusing times we live in, we certainly do not need four month "electronic blitz" campaigns: we need reasoned discussion of issues and proposals. Certainly that could be accomplished in less than four months.

FIRST OFFICIAL DRUG FIGURES CONFUSE THE ISSUE MORE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to report that I have received what I believe to be the first official Armed Forces drug abuse figures based on actual Vietnam military hospital reports. I received them on July 20 from Mr. Everett G. Hopson, special assistant of drug abuse control in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. I had requested them on May 10, and if the 2-month delay in obtaining these figures is any indication of the difficulty the Department of Defense has in obtaining information, then it is no wonder that the drug problem has reached its present epidemic proportions.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Congress and the American public have been alarmed by the statistics on drug abuse within the Armed Forces in Vietnam. Reports have been made that as many as 37,000 American servicemen are heroin addicts. Countless thousands have returned home with their addiction. And yet other reports show that the number of heroin users and addicts is much lower. Dr. Jaffee, the President's consultant, recently reported that the addiction rate is 4.5 percent. That, by the way, is still 10,500 servicemen. The confusion and contradiction of the various reports has become almost as alarming as the drug problem itself. They cloud and confuse the critical issue of the epidemic. And they therefore make it difficult—if not impossible—to formulate the necessary plan of action to solve the problem.

On May 10 of this year, when I introduced my bill H.R. 8216, "The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971," my colleagues and I were aware that accurate, official statistics were necessary to determine the extent of the problem. For this reason, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and requested copies of the January through May military hospital utilization reports—MACV RCS:6260-1. These reports are prepared by commanders of U.S. military hospitals in Vietnam. They are official records on the number of patients discharged from the hospitals for drug related reasons. They include a breakdown on the number of patients discharged by each service—that is, Army, Air Force, Navy and

Marine Corps—the number with less than 2 years of service, race, rank, age, the number of outpatient visits by hospital personnel, transfers of patients out of the country with drug related diagnosis, types of drug abuses, and admissions under the amnesty program.

Mr. Hopson delivered copies of these reports for the period I requested—January 1 through May 31—on July 20. I have reviewed these reports and I hereby point out what they show:

During the 5-month period, 58 deaths of American servicemen were attributable to drug related causes.

There were 1,075 servicemen treated and discharged from the hospital for drug related reasons.

Of those discharged, 60 percent, or 696 were diagnosed as cases of narcotic addiction.

There were 9,070 servicemen treated outside the hospital for drug related reasons.

Nearly 80 percent of those treated and discharged for drug abuse were between the ages of 18 and 21.

Only one person has been treated for the use of LSD.

Only one commissioned officer—and no warrant officers—was reported as having been treated during the period.

There were 612 servicemen treated during the 5-month period under the amnesty program.

Mr. Speaker, according to these statistics, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total number of servicemen in Vietnam have been treated and discharged from military hospitals for narcotics, addiction during the first 5 months of this year. And yet no official estimate has placed the number of addicted servicemen at under 4.5 percent.

I can not stress strongly enough that it is my hope that the problem will be less serious than first appeared. Nothing would please me more than to feel that the drug abuse problem in the Armed Forces is less than some of the other estimates and reports have indicated.

But even if these official reports are accurate, they do not erase the fact that a drug abuse problem exists. It is clear that Congress must continue to act to attack this epidemic. This Nation must not evade its responsibility to those servicemen already caught in the web of drug addiction. My bill, the Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971, if passed, would greatly help attack this frightening problem. And I seek the support of my colleagues to see to it that action is taken. Despite the confusion and the contradiction of estimates, reports, statistics, and even guesses, it is obvious the problem is there. We must solve it and we must solve it now.

I include the report, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 20, 1971.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: This is in further response to your recent letter requesting copies of MACV Hospitalization Utilization Reports (MACV RSC: 6260-1). The MACV Hospital Utilization Report is a local report used to

gather data concerning the numbers of patients who are treated in local medical facilities for drug abuse related diagnosis.

Enclosed are copies of the Reports requested for the period 1 January-31 May 1971. Section A reflects the number of patients who were discharged from a military hospital during the reporting period for a drug abuse related diagnosis. The discharge figure is used because the diagnosis is confirmed. Section B reflects the number of clinically suspected deaths resulting from drug abuse. The figures are subject to confirmation by autopsy. Autopsy reports are processed in approximately four to six months. Section C reflects the number of visits of

patients who were treated for drug abuse on an outpatient basis. In January, 890 visits of Army personnel were treated in medical facilities other than the facilities of the unit to which the patient was assigned. This is in effect a measure of workload rather than individuals. Section D reflects those patients who were transferred out of Vietnam for treatment of a drug related diagnosis. These persons were transferred to other Pacific Command facilities or to the continental United States. Section E reflects the types of drugs abused by those personnel who are reported in Section A. Medical opinion indicates that some of these persons who are treated for narcotics abuse are not consid-

ered to be addicted. Only one person has been treated for the use of LSD. This person was reported by the Navy in April. Section F reflects those personnel who were admitted to the hospital under the amnesty program for rehabilitation. During March the Air Force treated 71 Army personnel in Air Force facilities.

I regret the delay required in responding to your request, and trust the information provided will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT G. HOPSON,
Special Assistant,
Drug Abuse Control.

HOSPITAL UTILIZATION REPORT

[For use of this form, see MACV Directive 190-4]

From: MACMD-PS.
To: MACPM.
Reports control symbol MACV PGS 6260-1, period covered: May 1-31, 1971.

Hospital	Number of patients discharged						Race			Rank				Age				
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	Under 2 yrs. svc.	DOD CIV	CAU	NEG	Other	E1/E5	E6/E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. A—Personnel data:																		
3d Field	2		1		3		3			3				2	1			
3d Surg	4				3		3		1	4				4				
8th Field	2				2			2		2				1				1
18th Surg	7				6		7			7				7				
24th Evac	13				6		10	3		11	1		1	5	5	1		2
27th Surg	4				4		4			4				4				
67th Evac	24				10		18	6		24				15	8	1		
85th Evac	15				7		12	3		15				12	3			
91st Evac	8				6		5	3		8				4	4			
95th Evac	11			1	9		9	3		12				11		1		
6th Conv Ctr	8				4		8			8				7	1			
Subtotal	98		1	1	60		79	21		98	1		1	72	22	3		3
483 USAF Hosp	4				8		7	2		9				9				
377 USAF Hosp		17			14		9	8		17				13	4			
366 USAF Disp	4	12			10		15	1		16				11	5			
35 USAF Disp	1	10			10		8	2	1	11				8	3			
6251 USAF Disp	1	2			3		3			3				3				
1st Med Bn		4			4		2	2		4				4				
3rd MA Bde				3	3		2	1		3				3				
Total	108	50	1	4	112		125	37	1	161	1		1	123	34	3		3

Hospital	Number of deaths					Race			Rank				Age					
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV	Total	CAU	NEG	Other	E1-E5	E6-E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. B—Deaths resulting from drug abuse:																		
TSN Mort	5					5	4	1		4	1			1	2	1		1
Da Nang Mort	2					2	2			2				1	1			
Total	7					7	6	1		6	1			2	3	1		1

SECTION C—DRUG ABUSE RELATED OUTPATIENT VISITS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Out-patient visits	2,039	65	18	66	0

SECTION E—TYPE OF DRUG ABUSE

	Narcotics		Dangerous drugs User	Marihuana User	Other User
	Addict	Nonaddict			
USA	54	18	11	1	24
USAF	41	5	4	0	0
USN	7	0	0	1	1
USMC	1	0	2	1	0
DOD CIV	0	0	0	0	0

SECTION D—TRANSFERS—TRANSFERS OF PATIENTS OUT OF COUNTRY WITH DRUG RELATED DIAGNOSES

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Transfers to PACOM	2	0	0	1	0
Transfers to CONUS	2	0	0	0	0

SECTION F—REHABILITATION EFFORTS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC
Admissions Under Amnesty Program	35	49	2	0

Name, grade, and title of person to contact for additional information: Kenneth G. Hermann, Capt., USAF, MSC Statistician; Telephone Number 923-2043.

Typed name, grade and title of approving officer: David L. Fowler, Maj, MSC, USA, Chief, Administrative Division.

HOSPITAL UTILIZATION REPORT, MARCH 1971—Continued

Hospital	Number of patients discharged						Race				Rank				Age			
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	Under 2 yrs. svc.	DOD CIV	CAU	NEG	Other	E1/E5	E6/E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
	Sec. A—Personnel data;—continued																	
6251 USAF Disp.....	0	16	0	0	14	0	14	2		16				14	2			
Subtotal.....	76	54	0	0	91	0	96	32	2	130				108	18	3	1	
No Navy facility discharged.....																		
1st Med Bn.....	0	0	0	5	5	0	2	3	0	5				5				
Total.....	228	54	0	5	207	0	219	65	3	285	2			240	39	6	2	

Mortuary	Number of deaths					Race			Rank				Age					
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV	TOTAL	CAU	NEG	OTHER	E1-E5	E6-E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. B—Deaths resulting from drug abuse:																		
Tan Son Nhut.....	2					2	1	1		2				2				
Da Nang.....	4		1			5	4	1		5				4			1	
35 USAF Disp.....		1				1		1		1				1				
Total suspected deaths.....	6	1	1			8	5	3		8				7			1	

SECTION C—DRUG ABUSE RELATED OUT-PATIENT VISITS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Out-patient visits.....	1,300	230	16	30	0

SECTION E—TYPE OF DRUG ABUSE

	Narcotics		Dangerous drugs User	Marihuana User	Other User
	Addict	Nonaddict			
USA.....	124	47	14	1	42
USAF.....	36	16	2	0	0
USN.....	10	0	0	0	0
USMC.....	0	3	0	5	0
DOD CIV.....	0	0	0	0	0

SECTION D—TRANSFERS—TRANSFERS OF PATIENTS OUT OF COUNTRY WITH DRUG RELATED DIAGNOSES

	USA	USAG	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Transfers to PACOM.....	4	1	0	3	0
Transfers to CONUS.....	6	0	0	0	0

SECTION F—REHABILITATION EFFORTS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC
Admission under amnesty program.....		110*	17	0

SECTION G—GENERAL COMMENTS

*71 or 65% of the 110 Army personnel admitted under the amnesty program were at USAF medical facilities.
 Name grade and title of person to contact for additional information: Kenneth G. Hermann, Capt, USAF, MSC Statistician MACMD-PS.

Typed name, grade and title of approving officer: David L. Fowler, Maj., MSC, USA, Chief Administrative Division.

From: MACMD-PS.
 To: MACPM.

HOSPITAL UTILIZATION REPORT, FEBRUARY 1971

Hospital	Number of patients discharged						Race				Rank				Age			
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	Under 2 yrs. svc.	DOD CIV	CAU	NEG	Other	E1/E5	E6/E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
	Sec. A—Personnel data:																	
3 Field.....	6				2		5	1		5	1			3	2	1		
3 Surg.....	4				3		3	1		4				3	1			
8 Field.....																		
18 Surg.....																		
24 Evac.....	5				3		5			5				3	2			
27 Surg.....	10				7		7	3		10				6	4			
67 Evac.....	44				26		39	5		43	1			36	6	2		
85 Evac.....	23				9		8	15		23				22	1			
91 Evac.....	8				3		8			8				5	3			
93 Evac.....	16				13		11	5		16				13	3			
95 Evac.....	21				18		17	4		21				21				
6 Conv. Ctr.....	3				3		3			3				2	1			
Subtotal.....	140				87		106	34		138	2			114	23	3		
Nha Be.....			3		3		3			3				3				
NSF Cam Ranh.....			1		1		1			1				1				
1st Med. Btn.....				3	2		2	1		3				3				
483d USAF Hos.....	67		3		68		68	9		77				65	12			
377th USAF Dis.....	3				4		1	3		4				4				
366th USAF Dis.....		4			6		6	2		8				6	2			
35th USAF Dis.....		3			3			3		3				3				
12th USAF Dis.....	1	2			1		2	1		3				1	2			
Total.....	211	21	7	3	175		189	53		240	2			200	39	3		

Hospital or mortuary	Number of deaths						Race			Rank				Age				
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV	Total	CAU	NEG	Other	E1-E5	E6-E9	WO	Com off	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. B—Deaths resulting from drug abuse:																		
Tan Son Nhut.....	9		1				6	4		10				8				2
Da Nang.....	7			1			4	4		7	1			5	2			1
483d USAF Hos.....		1					1			1				1				
Total.....	16	1	1	1			11	8		18	1			14	2			3

SECTION C—DRUG ABUSE RELATED OUTPATIENT VISITS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Out-patient visits.....	1,404	27	11	22	0

SECTION E—TYPE OF DRUG ABUSE

	Narcotics		Dangerous drugs user	Marihuana user	Other user
	Addict	Nonaddict			
USA.....	123	28	8	2	50
USAF.....	16	3	2		
USN.....	4	3			
USMC.....	1	1	1		
DOD CIV.....					

SECTION D—TRANSFERS—TRANSFERS OF PATIENTS OUT OF COUNTRY WITH DRUG RELATED DIAGNOSES

	USA	USAG	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Transfers to PACOM.....	1	0	0	1	0
Transfers to CONUS.....	1	2	0	0	0

SECTION F—REHABILITATION EFFORTS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC
Admission under amnesty program.....	141	0	0	0

Name, grade and title of person to contact for additional information: Kenneth G. Hermann Capt., USAF, MSC, Statistician, MACMD—PS.

Typed name, grade and title of approving officer: David L. Fowler, Maj., MSC, USA, Chief Administrative Division.

HOSPITAL UTILIZATION REPORT

For use of this form, see MACV Directive 190-4

From: Office of the Command Surgeon HQ MACV.
To: Drug Suppression Division MACPM.
Reports control symbol MACV RCS 6260-1, period covered: Jan. 1-31, 1971.

Hospital	Number of patients discharged						Race			Rank				Age				
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	Under 2 yrs. svc.	DOD CIV	CAU	NEG	Other	E1/E5	E6/E9	WO	COM OFF	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. A—Personnel data:																		
3rd Field.....	10	1			10		8	3		11				10				1
3rd Surg.....	5		1		4		6			6				6				
8th Field.....	5				4		5			5				5				
18th Surg.....	6				5		4	2		6				5				
24th Evac.....	3				1		3			3				3				
27th Surg.....	18				15		15	3		18				14				
67th Evac.....	51				30		47	4		51				39	11		1	
85th Evac.....	12				8		10	2		12				9	2			1
91st Evac.....	8				6		6	2		8				4	3			1
93rd Evac.....	17				15		17			17				15	1		1	
95th Evac.....	9				7		7	2		9				8	1			
6th CC.....	4				2		4			4				4				
Subtotal.....	148	1	1		107		130	18		150				119	26		3	2
1st Med Batn.....	2				4		2	2		4				3	1			
Nha Be.....	1				2		2			2				1	1			
7th AF ¹	41	14			48		42	13		55				46	9			
Total.....	191	15	3	2	161		178	33		211				169	37		3	2

¹ Will be detailed by location on future reports.

Hospital	Number of deaths						Race			Rank				Age				
	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD civ	Total	CAU	NEG	Other	E1-E5	E6-E9	WO	COM off	18-21	22-25	26-29	Over 30	
Sec. B—Deaths resulting from drug abuse: ¹																		
TSN Mortuary.....	7					7	4	3		6	1			4		3		
DA Nang Mort.....	6					6	4	2		6				6				
1st Med Batn.....				3		3	1	2		3				2	1			
7th AF.....		1				1	1			1				1				
Total.....	13	1	0	3		17	10	7		16	1			12	5			

¹ Clinically suspected deaths, proven deaths on separate summary attached.

SECTION C—DRUG ABUSE RELATED OUTPATIENT VISITS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Outpatient visits.....	*1,864	28	23	6	4

* Includes 890 visits to medical units oreanic to other units.

SECTION D—TRANSFERS—TRANSFERS OF PATIENTS OUT OF COUNTRY WITH DRUG RELATED DIAGNOSES

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC	DOD CIV
Transfers to PACOM.....	10	0	0	0	0
Transfers to CONUS.....	8	0	0	0	0

¹ See separate summary of autopsy proven deaths.

SECTION E—TYPE OF DRUG ABUSE

	Narcotics		Dangerous drugs user	Marihuana user	Other user
	Addict	Nonaddict			
USA.....	96	26	40	2	26
USAF.....	7	3	3	1	1
USN.....	2	0	0	0	1
USMC.....	0	0	1	0	0
DOD CIV.....	0	0	0	0	0

SECTION F—REHABILITATION EFFORTS

	USA	USAF	USN	USMC
Admissions under amnesty program.....	111	0	0	0

SECTION G—GENERAL COMMENTS

Name, grade and title of person to contact for additional information: Kenneth G. Hermann Capt., USAF, MSC, Statistician, MACMD; telephone number: 923-4055.

CHILEAN NATIONALIZATION OF COPPER MINES: POLITICAL VICTORY, ECONOMIC SETBACK

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the nationalization of copper mines in Chile has broad and permanent implications. Although only a relatively small percentage of copper from Chile comes permanently to the United States, several American-owned companies—including the two largest, Kennecott and Anaconda—have extensive investments in the industry there and the treatment accorded them is a matter of national concern. Another important fact is that while the nationalization of the copper mines had been publicized as a promise for economic progress, it may turn out to be an economic setback. The developments have been of particular interest in my home city of Waterbury, Conn.—one of the brass centers of the world—but they should also be of interest to anyone studying the economics of nationalization and socialization of industries. Juan de Onis writes an interesting perspective on this whole operation in the July 18 issue of the New York Times. It is clear from Mr. de Onis' article that the nationalization of copper mines in Chile, while a political victory for President Salvador Allende Gossens, could mean economic retrogression for his country.

The article follows:

CHILE: IF THE COPPER HAD BEEN OURS

SANTIAGO.—For weeks, Government-paid advertisements in the Chilean newspapers have been showing pictures of shack-dwellers and naked, undernourished children over a title reading: "This would not have happened if the copper had been ours."

Last week, the Government of President Salvador Allende Gossens finally put into effect its long-standing plans for nationalizing the country's copper mines. The official message to Chileans was that the mines would now finance a program of economic development and social reform.

But whether the promise will be borne out is questionable.

In ideological terms, the Government has been building a strong case for nationalism. A publication of the Chilean States Copper Corporation blames "our weak industrial

development, our primitive agriculture, unemployment, low salaries and thousands of premature deaths among children" on the remittance of profits abroad by United States copper investors.

President Allende said that nationalization would obtain "our second independence—the break in economic dependence" on the United States copper companies, which began operating here with low-grade ores in 1910. At the time, Chile had neither the capital nor the know-how to introduce large-scale production.

These official views passed over the fact that the Chilean Government, through joint ownership and taxes, has been receiving 85 percent of the gross profits of all the copper companies and that copper provides nearly 80 percent of Federal revenues.

Under the former government of President Eduardo Frei Montalva, a Christian Democrat, the State Copper Corporation acquired a 51 percent interest in the major properties of Kennecott and Anaconda, the two largest United States companies. At the same time, the Frei Administration attracted an investment of about \$500-million from United States sources for the expansion of copper production.

These investments have been largely completed, and the Allende Government, which took office last November, fell heir to a copper industry that has nearly doubled its productive potential of six years ago—if the expansion program is carried to its conclusion.

The nationalization strategy of extracting profits from copper to finance the rest of the economy depends heavily, therefore, on whether the copper industry performs under socialist management as lucratively as the Marxists claim was the case under United States management. The rate of profit remittance during the last decade was close of \$80-million a year, according to Dr. Allende.

An important factor influencing the profit that can be taken out of the nationalized mines in the near future will be the compensation that is to be paid to the United States copper interests. The three American companies involved claim investments of about \$700-million, much of which came as United States bank loans for the expansion program.

Left-wing radicals here oppose any payment. But Dr. Allende has publicly pledged to pay off the bank obligations, which include \$220-million to the Export-Import Bank.

But the higher the amount of compensation and the shorter the terms for payment, the less the nationalized properties will provide for the economic and social development program that Dr. Allende has pledged will accompany the "construction of socialism" during his six-year term.

The critical issue in the compensation problem would appear to be how little the Government can persuade or oblige the companies to accept before bringing a claim of unfair treatment, a situation that would produce a clash with the United States Government. Since 1965, the copper companies have insured a large part of their investments here with the United States Government's Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which provides protection against expropriation without due compensation.

Internally, the Government faces serious difficulties in the management of the five nationalized mines, which produce 80 per cent of Chile's copper.

Since Dr. Allende was elected, there has been an exodus of more than 200 top-level managers, supervisors and technicians from the copper companies; in the great majority, these were Chileans who have left the country for mining jobs abroad or have gone into private activities here.

Many of the top managerial and technical personnel began looking for jobs abroad as soon as Dr. Allende was elected. Others, who wanted to stay on despite the imposition of a wage ceiling and elimination of payments in United States dollars, quit because of what they described as political harassment, frustration over labor discipline and production problems.

"With these people working, we might have been able to keep the mines running properly, but with politicians and union leaders calling the shots, the mines are going to be a mess," said a Chilean construction manager who has worked for the copper companies.

Production under the expansion program is already well behind schedule. It is unlikely that the copper output will go beyond 700,000 metric tons this year, compared with 685,000 in 1970.

And, while the prices last year were over 6 cents a pound, this year they have barely averaged 50 cents a pound. Each cent of price decline costs Chile \$17-million a year in exchange income and \$14-million in fiscal revenues.

So while nationalization appears to have been a political plum for Dr. Allende, because it satisfies a point of pride with many Chileans, it does not promise the economic bonanza that the Government has been leading the people to expect.

—JUAN DE ONIS.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF UMWA FUNDS

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

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1971, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordered the firm of Edward Bennett Williams, Paul R. Connolly & Joseph A. Califano disqualified from further legal representation of the United Mine Workers in a suit against the UMWA and its three top officers—W. A. "Tony" Boyle, George J. Titler, and John Owens—for an accounting and restitution of money allegedly misspent and misappropriated from the UMWA Journal (*Yablonski v. UMWA, et al.* (Civ. Act. No. 3436-69, D.C. D.C.)) Since this case has great public significance in defining the proper role of union counsel in such suits, I wish to include it in the RECORD. The use of union money to defend individual officers charged with wrongdoing toward their union is a substantial impediment to the achievement of union reform, and I believe the court acted wisely in assuring that such activity would not be permitted.

The appeal follows:

[In the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit—No. 24,945]

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Joseph A. Yablonski, et al., appellants v. United Mine Workers of America.

Decided July 21, 1971.

Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., with whom Messrs. John Silar, Elliott C. Lichtman and Clarice R. Feldman were on the brief, for appellants.

Mr. Paul R. Connolly, with whom Mr. Edward L. Carey was on the brief, for appellee.

Before McGowan, Robinson and Wilkey, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM: This is an action under § 501 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act¹ brought by the late Joseph A. Yablonski and 48 other members of the United Mine Workers of America against the UMWA and three named officers—Boyle, President; Titler, Vice President; Owens, Secretary-Treasurer—asking for an accounting of UMWA funds disbursed by them and for restitution of funds allegedly misappropriated and misspent.

No trial on the merits has been had. The issue on this appeal is whether the law firm regularly representing the UMWA, who originally entered an appearance for the UMWA and the three individual officer-defendants, should be allowed to continue its representation of the UMWA after it withdrew as counsel for the individual defendants. The District Court found that the regular UMWA outside counsel was not disqualified from continuing its representation in this action, but for reasons enunciated *infra* we hold that in the particular circumstances of this case such representation should be discontinued.

After the action was filed in December 1969, appellant-plaintiffs filed in May 1970 a motion to disqualify counsel on the grounds (1) that the compensation of the regular UMWA counsel would continue to come from the UMWA treasury and (2) that there existed a conflict between the UMWA and the individual defendant officers. A month later the UMWA counsel withdrew as counsel for the individual defendants but remained as counsel for the UMWA, which the District Court sustained as proper.

At the outset of the lawsuit the then

counsel for all defendants set about with commendable diligence to delineate the real issues of the lawsuit, filing in behalf of the UMWA and the three individual defendants answers setting forth all customary general defenses, and filing 34 pages of interrogatories to develop more fully the scope of the case.

The appellants argue that this period of six months' prior representation in this same suit disqualifies the regular union outside counsel to continue its representation of the UMWA, even after its withdrawal as counsel for the three individual officer-defendants. With this we do not agree. It has been inferentially held that one lawyer can properly represent all defendants if a suit appears groundless, and that separate counsel is required only in a situation where there is a potential conflict between the interests of the union and those of its officers.² We regard the actions of the regular UMWA counsel during its six-month representation of both the union and its officers as an effort to ascertain the exact nature of the lawsuit and protect the interests of all defendants, and by our ruling herein do not imply any censure of counsel's action during this period of joint representation. But there does exist in our judgment a more serious barrier to the continued representation of the UMWA by its regular outside counsel in this particular lawsuit.

I. EFFECT OF OTHER LITIGATION IN WHICH REGULAR UMWA-COUNSEL REPRESENT DEFENDANT PRESIDENT BOYLE

Of far more concern is the existence of other litigation in which the regular UMWA counsel is representing Boyle, sometimes in conjunction with representation of the union, at other times not.

(1) The "reinstatement" or "reprisal" case—one of four "election" cases brought by Joseph A. Yablonski against the UMWA and its officers, alleging that the reassignment or severance of plaintiff Yablonski from certain union duties was a reprisal for his running for president against the incumbent Boyle. After the death of Yablonski the trial court dismissed the case as moot, and this action is on appeal in this court.³ Appellants here claim that if this court should hold that the trial court was wrong in dismissing the reprisal case as moot, then appellee Boyle may subsequently be required to pay substantial punitive damages to the estate of Yablonski, and thus Boyle has a personal, as distinguished from a union, interest in that appeal. Although initially the union and its officers were represented by the union general counsel in the District Court, the regular UMWA outside counsel represented both the UMWA and Boyle personally on the motion to dismiss as moot, and continues such representation on appeal in this court.

(2) Denial of attorney's fees—as an outgrowth of the UMWA election cases, attorneys for "the Yablonski group" applied for attorney's fees to be paid by the union, which the District Court denied, finding that "no malfeasance on the part of the officers has yet been established." These four cases⁴ are now on appeal. The regular UMWA counsel represents both the union and the individual officer-defendants here and did so on the merits in two of the cases in the District Court (the "Journal" and "fair election" cases, paragraph 3 *infra*) and on the motions to dismiss in all four cases, where the issue originally was the compliance of the incumbent officers with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. This series of cases is alleged to be related to the case at bar, inasmuch as paragraph 13 of the complaint herein alleges that Boyle and the other individual officer-defendants employed counsel to defend them on charges of breach of

trust and paid such counsel from UMWA funds, the regular outside UMWA counsel here involved being one of those whose representation and compensation is being challenged in this present suit.

(3) The "Journal" and "fair election" cases—during the UMWA election campaign candidate Yablonski claimed that the union newspaper was being used to promote the candidacy of incumbent President Boyle. On appeals in this court⁵ the regular UMWA counsel represented Boyle and the union, although in one aspect in the District Court which was severed and consolidated with the instant case, whether Boyle should be made to pay for some of the costs of printing of the *Journal*, the regular UMWA counsel does not represent Boyle.

4. *Blankenship v. Boyle*—a group of retired miners sued the Trustees of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1950, one of the Three Trustees being Boyle, alleging that the Fund had been mismanaged by the Trustees. Boyle was charged with using his position as a Trustee to increase pension benefits to assist his re-election campaign. The District Court ordered his removal as Trustee and this court has recently refused to stay the effectiveness of that order,⁶ although not deciding the appeal on the merits. Regular UMWA counsel represents Boyle individually in all three of the capacities in which he is sued, as Trustee of the Fund, President of the UMWA, and Director of the National Bank of Washington, as well as representing the union.

We have listed and briefly described the above actions of record in which the regular UMWA counsel represents Boyle individually. Each of these has been minutely examined by appellees' counsel to demonstrate that in no instance is the representation of Boyle individually in conflict with the good faith representation of the UMWA in this case; in effect, that the interests of the UMWA and of Boyle individually are the same. We are assured that if any conflict should arise, appellees' counsel would be prompt to withdraw as counsel to the UMWA in this case.

While the issues involved in each of the individual cases, and the past or present existence or nonexistence of any conflict, are relevant to the propriety of the regular UMWA counsel continuing its representation of the union in the case at bar, yet we do not think that this analysis is determinative of the real problem here. It is undeniable that the regular UMWA counsel have undertaken the representation of Boyle individually in many facets of his activities as a UMWA official, as a Trustee of the Fund, as a Director of the Bank owned 74% by the union. With strict fidelity to this client, such counsel could not undertake action on behalf of another client which would undermine his position personally. Yet, in this particular litigation, counsel for the UMWA should be diligent in analyzing objectively the true interests of the UMWA as an institution without being hindered by allegiance to any individual concerned.⁷

We are not required to accept at this point the charge of the appellants that the "true interest" of the union is aligned with those of the individual appellants here; this may or may not turn out to be the fact. But in the exploration and the determination of the truth or falsity of the charges brought by these individual appellants against the incumbent officers of the union and the union itself as a defendant, the UMWA needs the most objective counsel obtainable. Even if we assume the accuracy of the appellee's position at the present time that there is no visible conflict of interest, yet we cannot be sure that such will not arise in the future.

Whether facts are discovered and legal positions taken which would create such a

Footnotes at end of article.

conflict of interest between the UMWA position and the position of the individual defendant Boyle may well be determined by the approach which counsel for the UMWA takes in this case. We think that the objectives of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act⁸ would be much better served by having an unquestionably independent new counsel in this particular case. The public interest requires that the validity of appellants' charges against the UMWA management of breach of its fiduciary responsibilities be determined in a context which is as free as possible from the appearance of any potential for conflict of interest in the representation of the union itself.

II. OBJECTIVE DETERMINATION OF THE UMWA'S INSTITUTIONAL INTEREST

Counsel for the appellees here have stressed the "institutional interest" of the UMWA in all of the issues raised, and particularly the institutional interest of the union in "repose." Counsel's interpretation of the "institutional interest" of the union appears to have been broad enough to authorize UMWA counsel to undertake practically everything worthwhile in the defense of this lawsuit. After the withdrawal of the regular union counsel from representation of Boyle individually in this case, the individual practitioner selected to represent Boyle has apparently contributed little to the defense.

By far the strongest laboring oar has been stroked by the regular UMWA counsel on behalf of the union. On oral argument appellees' counsel stated that it had prepared 94 pages of answers to interrogatories that the individual practitioner representing Boyle had agreed they should do this, as the UMWA had a definite interest that all questions as to the conduct of union affairs previously were accurately answered and that the accurate answers were to be found in the union records. We can see the UMWA interest in having such interrogatories answered accurately, but we would think that since it is the individual defendants who are charged with the misconduct, their counsel would be the one to initiate and to carry the burden. It appears that, since the division of work between the UMWA counsel and counsel for the individual defendants in July 1970, until 15 March 1971 approximately 250 pages of pleadings, motions, memoranda, exhibits, affidavits and papers relating to discovery were filed by the regular UMWA counsel, while the individual defendants' counsel contributed only about 50 pages of similar documents.

In the crucial area of discovery matters, clearly representing the vast bulk of the effort expended by the parties defendant at this stage of the litigation, UMWA counsel have prepared 174 pages of answers to plaintiffs' initial interrogatories which were directed to all defendants, while counsel for the individual defendants, until 2 April 1971, some 7½ months after the interrogatories were originally served, had contended himself with filing 2 pages of answers for each individual defendant, a total of 6 pages. On 2 April 1971 counsel finally filed additional answers on behalf of defendant Boyle; however, as of the date of argument of this appeal, answers on behalf of the other individual defendants had not been filed.

Furthermore, we take judicial notice⁹ of the fact that subsequent to oral argument of this appeal, the trial court on 2 July 1971 entered Pretrial Order No. 3, which proposed to impose sanctions under F. R. Civ. P. 37 against the individual defendants, if prompt response to the plaintiffs' interrogatories were not forthcoming, and which found that the answers heretofore filed on behalf of defendant Boyle were "in large measure vague, incomplete and unresponsive and bear the indication that no bona fide effort has been

made to secure the information necessary to answer the interrogatories."

Aside from the comparative burden of work carried, some of the issues raised by the regular UMWA counsel would seem to be of more interest to the position of the officers than to the union, for example, the defense on the statute of limitations. Granted that the UMWA may have some interest in limiting the exploration of its internal documents, still the overriding interest in the cutoff date from which the officers individually might be liable, if of course they are liable at all, would seem to be that of the individual defendant-officers. Yet the trial court has noted in Pretrial Order No. 3 that "Counsel for defendant Boyle orally adopted at the April 8, 1971 hearing the Statute of Limitations defense proposed and briefed by defendant UMWA but filed no papers in support of such objection."

This points up the difficulty of defining an "institutional interest" such as that of the union. In trying to achieve a valid definition of an institution's interest, it would seem that counsel charged with this responsibility should be as independent as possible. It appears that in 18 months of representation (6 months for both the UMWA and Boyle individually, and 12 months for the UMWA alone), the regular UMWA counsel has not brought forth a single issue on which the UMWA and the Boyle individual interest have diverged.

We think the analogy of the position of a corporation and its individual officers when confronted by a stockholder derivative suit is illuminating here.¹⁰ We believe it is well established that when one group of stockholders brings a derivative suit, with the corporation as the nominal defendant and the individual officers accused of malfeasance of one sort or another, the role of both the corporate house counsel and the regular outside counsel for the corporation becomes usually a passive one. Certainly no corporate counsel purports to represent the individual officers involved, neither in the particular derivative suit nor in other litigation by virtue of which counsel necessarily must create ties of loyalty and confidentiality to the individual officers, which might preclude counsel from the most effective representation of the corporation itself. The corporation has certain definite institutional interests to be protected, and the counsel charged with this responsibility should have ties on a personal basis with neither the dissident stockholder nor the incumbent officerholders.

Purportedly a stockholder derivative suit is for the benefit of the corporation, even though the corporation is a nominal defendant, just as the appellants here assert (yet to be proved) that their action is for the benefit of the UMWA and that the individual incumbent officers are liable to the union itself for their alleged misdeeds. And, under established corporate law, if the individual officers are successful in the defense of a suit arising out of the performance of their duties as corporate officers, then they may justifiably seek reimbursement from the corporation for the costs of their successful defense.

In the ordinary case the action taken here by the regular UMWA counsel in the District Court might well have been the proper one, i.e., after establishing the nature of the lawsuit by interrogatories and filing answers on behalf of both the union and the individual officers in order fully to protect the position of all parties, then to step aside as counsel for the individual defendants and continue the representation of the union. But this particular case is a derivative action for the benefit of the union, and furthermore must be viewed in its relationship to this entire

complex of numerous cases already pending or decided in this and the District Courts in which the regular UMWA counsel has already undertaken the representation of Boyle individually. Each and every one of these cases either directly arises out of or is directly connected with the struggle for power in the UMWA being waged by the Yablonski group on one side and the incumbent officers headed by President Boyle on the other. In this situation, the best interests of the UMWA and the purposes of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act will be much better served by the disqualification of the regular union counsel in this particular suit and its continued representation of the individual Boyle in the other lawsuits.

We are cognizant that any counsel to represent the UMWA selected by President Boyle will be to some degree under his control. But such counsel will still only have one client—the UMWA—to represent in matters growing out of the union's affairs. Such counsel would never be professionally obligated to consider Boyle's personal interests, because they would not be representing him individually in related matters. And the extent of their labors would be gauged by the need to protect the UMWA position in this litigation.

Therefore, the Order of the District Court denying the appellant's motion to disqualify the regular UMWA outside counsel from representing the UMWA in this particular action is vacated, and the cause remanded to the District Court for further proceedings in accordance with this opinion.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 29 U.S.C. § 501(b) (1964) provides *inter alia*:

"When any officer, agent, shop steward, or representative of any labor organization is alleged to have violated the duties declared in subsection (a) of this section and the labor organization or its governing board or officers refuse or fail to sue or recover damages or secure an accounting or other appropriate relief within a reasonable time after being requested to do so by any member of the labor organization, such member may sue such officer, agent, shop steward, or representative in any district court of the United States or in any State court of competent jurisdiction to recover damages or secure an accounting or other appropriate relief for the benefit of the labor organization."

² *Milone v. English*, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 207, 306 F.2d 814 (1962).

³ *Yablonski v. UMWA*, No. 24,584.

⁴ Consolidated cases, all titled *Yablonski v. UMWA*, Nos. 24,560, 24,561, 24,562, and 24,563 in this court.

⁵ Appeals in this court in the "Journal" cases all captioned *Yablonski v. UMWA*, have now been terminated. In No. 23,439, appellant's motion for summary reversal was denied on 29 August 1969 and the appeal dismissed on 28 April 1970. Nos. 23,536 and 23,659, consolidated on appeal, were affirmed by order of the court on 28 November 1969. The "fair election" case, in which regular UMWA counsel represented the union and its officers in the District Court, was dismissed after UMWA counsel represented that substantial changes in election procedures would be instituted. No appeal has been taken from that dismissal.

⁶ *Blankenship v. Boyle*, No. 71-1430, Order denying stay filed 11 June 1971.

⁷ "Where, as here, union officials are charged with breach of fiduciary duty, the organization is entitled to an evaluation and representation of its institutional interests by independent counsel, unencumbered by potentially conflicting obligations to any defendant officer." *Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters v. Hoffa*, 242 F. Supp. 246, 256 (D.D.C. 1965).

We are aware, of course, that in a second opinion in the *Hoffa* case, *Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters v. Hoffa*, No. 1154-64 D.D.C. 8 September 1965, 52 CCH Lab. Cas. 23,516, the court held that by "independent counsel" it meant counsel who did not represent both the union and an officer-defendant in the same case, and that the union was free to choose a regularly retained attorney to represent its interests in a § 501 suit. The *Hoffa* case, however, did not present a situation like that of the case at bar, where the regular union counsel seeks to represent the union in a "derivative" action while at the same time representing in pending and related matters an individual officer charged in that action.

§ 29 U.S.C. § 401 (1964) sets forth the congressional declaration of findings, purposes and policy of the LMRDA, including *inter alia* the statement that "in order to accomplish the objective of a free flow of commerce it is essential that labor organizations, employers, and their officials adhere to the highest standards of responsibility and ethical conduct in administering the affairs of their organizations. . . ." The legislative history of the Act makes plain that a major congressional objective was to provide union members, as well as the Government in the public interest, with a variety of means to ensure that officials of labor organizations perform their duties in accordance with fiduciary standards. Both the Senate and House reports relating to the Act stressed the importance of such standards, the Senate Committee noting that:

Labor organizations are creations of their members; union funds belong to the members and should be expended only in furtherance of their common interest. A union treasury should not be managed as the private property of union officers, however well intentioned, but as a fund governed by fiduciary standards appropriate to this type of organization. The members who are the real owners of the money and property of the organization are entitled to a full accounting of all transactions involving their property." (S. Rep. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. 8 (1959); see also H.R. No. 741, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. 7, 8 (1959).

The House Committee strongly expressed its concern that:

"Some trade unions have acquired bureaucratic tendencies and characteristics. The relationship of the leaders of such unions to their members has in some instances become impersonal and autocratic. In some cases men who have acquired positions of power and responsibility within unions have abused their power and forsaken their responsibilities to the membership and to the public. The power and control of the affairs of a trade union by leaders who abuse their power and forsake their responsibilities inevitably leads to the elimination of efficient, honest and democratic practices within such union, and often results in irresponsible actions which are detrimental to the public interest." (H.R. No. 741, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. 6 (1959).

Appellants' complaint in the instant case alleges a state of affairs existing within the leadership of the UMWA of the magnitude of that which the House Report condemned.

* See *T.V.T. Corp. v. Basiliko*, 103 U.S. App. D.C. 181, 183, 257 F.2d 185, 187 (1958).

See *Phillips v. Osborne*, 403 F.2d 826, 831 (9th Cir. 1968); *Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters v. Hoffa*, 242 F. Supp. 246, 251 (D.D.C. 1965). Indeed, as appellees themselves noted in a motion filed in the court below, "The action by Mr. Yablonski and others is a derivative action on behalf of the union. . . ."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TEAGUE of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 26 through 28, on account of official business.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of July 26, on account of official business as member of President's Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 26 and 27, on account of official business as a member of the 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:

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

Mr. CRANE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. KEITH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SIKES in five instances, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. DEVINE in two instances.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. MIZELL in two instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in three instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 389. An act for the relief of Stephen Lance Pender, Patricia Jenifer Pender, and Denese Gene Pender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 733. An act to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Clayton Bion Craig, Arthur P. Wuth, Mrs. Lenore D. Hanks, David E. Sleeper, and DeWitt John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating 1971 as the "Year of World Minority Language Groups"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1892. An act for the relief of Stephen C. Yednock;

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Arnold D. Smith;

H.R. 2110. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfinger;

H.R. 2246. An act for the relief of Charles C. Smith;

H.R. 3344. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 3753. An act for the relief of Sergeant Ernie D. Bethea, U.S. Marine Corps (retired);

H.R. 6217. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H.R. 7271. An act to authorize appropriations for the Commission on Civil Rights; and

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution designating the week of August 1, 1971, as "American Trial Lawyers Week."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JULY 8, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Permanent staff:		
Christine S. Gallagher	Chief clerk	\$15,853.83
Lacey C. Sharp	General counsel	15,853.83
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	17,816.05
Louis T. Easley	Staff consultant	12,860.26
Betty M. Prezioso	Secretary to general counsel	8,477.42
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	8,477.42
Martha S. Hannah	Subcommittee clerk	8,477.42
Marjorie B. Johnson	Secretary to associate counsel	8,477.42
Peggy L. Pecora	Calendar clerk (From Feb. 1)	7,131.80
Catherine L. Bernhardt	Calendar clerk (Until Jan. 17)	762.52
George F. Misslbeck	Printing editor	9,457.43
Fowler C. West	Staff consultant (From Apr. 1)	4,166.66
Investigative staff:		
Mildred Baxley	Staff assistant	8,477.42
Fred T. Ward	Staff consultant	8,764.55
Mary Perry Shaw	Staff assistant	6,300.35
Doris Lucile Farmaco	do	6,300.35
Bert Allan Watson	do	2,967.50
Nancy C. Coons	Staff assistant (From February 1)	4,132.20
John A. Knebel	Assistant counsel (until February 7)	2,807.74
Doris E. Swisher	Staff assistant	5,842.06
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$250,000.00		
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1971..... \$45,793.38		
Total amount expended from..... to		
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 204,206.62		

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul M. Wilson	Clerk and staff director	\$17,504.91
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	17,332.67
Robert M. Moyer	do	17,332.67
G. Homer Skarin	do	17,332.67

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	\$17,332.67
Samuel R. Preston	do	17,332.67
Hunter L. Spillan	do	16,345.96
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	16,091.87
Henry A. Neil, Jr.	do	16,091.87
Keith F. Mainland	Staff assistant to chairman	15,382.16
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	15,382.16
Earl C. Sitsby	do	15,382.16
Peter J. Murphy, Jr.	do	14,355.21
William G. Boiling	do	12,369.22
John M. Garrity	do	12,127.09
Robert B. Foster	do	12,127.09
Milton B. Meredith	do	10,772.64
George A. Urian	do	9,525.71
De-rosey B. Mizelle	do	9,525.71
Robert C. Nicholas, III	do	9,525.71
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	9,525.71
Donald E. Richbourg	do	9,525.71
Thayer A. Wood	do	7,772.18
Charles W. Snodgrass	do	7,630.00
John G. Plashal	do	6,654.82
Gary C. Michalak	do	6,136.03
Bryon S. Nielson	do	6,136.03
Samuel W. Crosby	Special Assistant	15,816.38
Lawrence C. Miller	E litior	12,369.22
Paul V. Farner	Assistant E litior	8,547.97
Francis W. Sady	Administrative Assistant	7,064.08
Austin G. Smith	Clerical Assistant	7,064.08
Gerard J. Chouinard	do	6,654.82
Dale M. Shulaw	do	5,127.81
Daniel V. Gun Shows	do	4,666.63
Kathleen Blankenship	do	2,101.43
Gemma M. Hickey	Clerk-typist	3,555.34
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	5,395.06
Gerald F. Meyer	Minority clerk (to Mar. 6, 1971)	5,018.62
Harold H. Griffin	Minority clerk (from Mar. 27, 1971)	7,050.00
Enid Morrison	Staff assistant to minority	9,810.35
Thomas H. Hardy	Clerical assistant	2,000.00
Carolyn J. Johnston	Clerk-stenographer	1,000.00
Peggy C. Ehringhaus	do	6,654.82
Jimmy R. Fairchild	Clerical assistant	1,056.32
Patricia E. Hutchinson	Clerk-stenographer	5,535.12
James W. Dyer	Clerical assistant	5,512.50
Katherine D. Coupe	Clerk-stenographer	6,654.82
Barbara B. Blum	do	6,654.82
Norma J. McCay	do	4,166.65
Mary Ann Bond	do	3,633.32
David H. Kehl	Clerical assistant	6,550.83
Ronald A. Rash	do	6,239.80
Barbara Coleman	Clerk-stenographer	4,166.65
Wallace	do	1,056.32
Helen W. Phillipsborn	do	6,654.82
Karen Lee Sahlin	do	6,654.42
Linda Steele	do	6,300.35
Laura C. Lineberry	do	6,300.35
Samuel A. Mabry	Clerical assistant	1,166.67
Naomi A. Rich	Clerk-stenographer	6,308.98
Lola B. Oberman	do	3,811.12
Mary H. Smallwood	do	6,748.76
Catherine M. Voytko	do	6,654.82
John F. Walsh	Clerical assistant	6,654.82
T. Robert Garretson	do	6,654.82
Robert M. Walker	do	4,000.00
Leta M. Buhrman	Clerk-stenographer	6,654.82
Margaret Ann Riley	do	5,089.20
Forest O. Tate, Jr.	Clerical assistant	6,654.82
Vincent Rizzutto	do	6,654.82
George F. Allen	do	4,666.68

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... \$547,552.24
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971..... 595,668.38

Total amount expended from July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1971..... 1,143,220.62

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul J. Mohr	Director (to Apr. 30, 1971)	\$10,451.18
Cornelius R. Anderson	Director (from May 1, 1971)	15,182.90
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick	1st assistant	14,062.10
Willia C. Law	2d assistant	4,516.66
Mary Alice Sauer	Administrative assistant	7,107.70
Frances May	Clerk-stenographer	6,300.35
Janet Lou Dameron	do	4,784.45
Agriculture, Department of:		
Crabtree, P.O.	Clerical assistant	1,998.62
Nielson, B. S.	do	4,492.06
Robison, J. F.	Investigator	7,664.72
Streisler, A. J.	do	15,525.30
Army Audit Agency:		
Dunn, R. J.	do	8,562.40
Central Intelligence Agency:		
Morrow, C. W.	do	9,656.13
Commerce, Department of:		
Specht, D. H.	do	6,300.36
Defense Contract Audit Agency:		
Herron, M. A.	do	7,101.20
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Babar, J. R.	do	10,307.36
Bennett, C. L.	do	12,698.88
Bosko, A. P.	do	11,085.84
Brummitt, D. A.	do	8,225.28
Carroll, G. C.	do	11,970.96
Carson, D. W.	do	12,846.24
Christensen, J.	do	7,039.84
Fenstermacher, H. E., Jr.	do	12,557.76
Fanklin, R. M.	do	11,971.96
Funkhouser, P. K.	do	10,211.04
Goudtel, J. G.	do	12,259.44
Groover, L. C., Jr.	do	10,499.52
Ly, C. M.	do	12,259.44
Law, W. C.	do	8,491.20
McGahay, H. B.	do	12,557.76
MaGee, E. H.	do	12,557.76
Mahor, M. F.	do	12,557.76
Malyniak, J., Jr.	do	11,502.88
Mansfield, J. P.	do	11,970.96
Michalski, J. E.	do	12,259.44
Morris, E. J.	do	2,543.16
Schmidt, D. A.	do	4,606.16
Scully, J. E.	do	5,179.04
Shannon, A. J.	do	12,557.76
Szoka, C. E.	do	11,970.96
Torrence, R. E.	do	5,304.00
Welch, W. H., Jr.	do	12,846.24
Wetzel, R. G.	do	9,109.68
Wood, H. B.	do	12,766.08
Health benefits 2,667.14		
Life insurance fund 1,066.70		
Retirement fund 18,665.98		
General Services Administration: Foster, G. 11,101.22		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Driver, C. 6,434.91		
Veterans Administration: O'Brien, J. F. 4,804.21		
Travel expenses 77,464.71		
Miscellaneous expenses 1,928.13		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$1,145,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 540,588.32
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1971..... 550,549.53

Total amount expended from July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971..... 1,091,137.85

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 53,862.15

GEORGE F. MAHON, Chairman.

JULY 6, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, for the permanent Committee staff, and January 3-July 1, 1971, for investigating staff inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	\$17,958.75
Frank M. Slatinshek	Assistant chief counsel	17,937.33
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member	17,836.14
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,836.14
John J. Ford	Professional staff member	15,611.96
Ralph Marshall	do	14,361.96
George Norris	Counsel	13,792.01
James F. Shumate	do	13,792.01
William H. Hogan	do	11,085.89
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	12,178.42
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	9,037.64
L. Louise Ellis	do	9,037.64
Edna E. Johnson	do	9,037.64
Dorothy R. Britton	do	9,037.64
Doris L. Scott	do	9,037.64
Innis E. McDonald	do	6,783.93
Brenda J. Gore	do	5,644.44
Ann R. Willett	do	5,644.44
Emma M. Brown	do	5,644.44
Nancy Sue Jones	do	4,356.17
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant	6,833.88
Issiah Hardy	Messenger	4,902.48
Staff, Armed Services investigating subcommittee (from Jan. 3, 1971) (Pursuant to H. Res. 201 and H. Res. 202, 92d Congress):		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	17,644.29
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	14,207.35
Richard A. Ransom	Professional staff member	13,033.43
H. Hollister Cantus	do	9,055.68
William B. Short, Jr.	Clerical staff assistant	7,342.76
Sanford T. Saunders	Security officer	6,759.46
Rose C. Beck	Clerk	6,709.11
Adeline P. Tolerton	Clerk	5,664.58
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	4,673.87
Diane W. Trowbridge	do	4,135.57
Sally A. Moore	do	4,305.32
L. Mendel Rivers, Jr.	Clerical staff assistant (from Mar. 10 through May 10)	480.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 202)	\$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971	97,335.79
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971	97,335.79
Balance unexpended, as of June 30, 1971	202,664.21
F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Chairman.	

JULY 6, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director	\$17,958.75
Ormar S. Fink	Minority professional staff member	17,958.75
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	16,236.41
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member	17,298.25
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	17,913.79
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member	17,945.64
Graham T. Northup	Professional staff member, minority	17,908.25
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority	10,653.12
Donald G. Vaughn	Administrative assistant	9,210.12
Total		143,083.08

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigative staff (H. Res. 226, 92d Cong.) full committee:		
Richard C. Barnes	Assistant clerk	\$8,791.94
Brent B. Barriere	do	355.56
Harvey S. Braunstein	Professional staff member	3,375.00
Jane N. D'Arista	Research assistant	3,592.58
Dolores K. Dougherty	Research associate	8,581.78
Susan Driggers	Secretary	619.08
Carolyn A. Easter	do	4,642.06
Allen R. Ferguson	Economist	6,000.00
Carole Fowkes	Secretary	530.54
Judy Morris Frieder	Assistant clerk	2,631.37
Linda Hechtman	do	2,731.03
Helen Hitz	Administrative assistant	9,104.20
Lawrence G. Henderson	Professional staff member	7,849.26
Linda Leah Hoff	Secretary	5,100.63
Joseph J. Jasinski	Professional staff member	14,121.91
Mary-Helen Kesecker	Secretary	4,407.20
Mary E. Kirk	Assistant clerk	5,100.63
Michael Lemov	Counsel	2,741.65
Kelsey Ray Meek	Professional staff member	4,583.34
Mildred S. Mitchell	Assistant clerk	9,036.69
Richard H. Neiman	do	2,867.05
Gayle L. Peabody	Secretary	4,676.06
Clifford E. Payne	Assistant clerk	720.52
Margaret M. Rayhawk	Research associate	7,916.75
Yan Michael Ross	Minority staff member	10,508.87
Alicia F. Shoemaker	Minority staff secretary	10,508.87
Jeanne Carolyn Smith	Secretary	1,866.66
Elizabeth Stabler	Professional staff member	11,916.22
Peter D. H. Stockton	do	6,304.16
Gary Tabak	Counsel	11,013.24
Lester Carl Thurow	Professional staff member	3,000.00
Robert E. Torrance	Assistant clerk	4,382.03
Catherine L. Warder	Secretary	52.78
Total		\$179,629.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 226—General)	\$585,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1971	\$193,773.83
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1971	\$193,773.83
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	\$391,226.17

H. Res. 226 provides total funds of \$975,000 with \$390,000 earmarked for Housing Subcommittee.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1971.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Terrence Boyle	Minority counsel	\$10,910.81
L. Marie Chaillet	Minority secretary	961.08
W. Jean Clarkson	Secretary	5,285.69
Michael T. Corbett	Assistant clerk	4,203.70
Patricia Eley	do	4,964.97

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
David Glick	Counsel	\$17,724.71
George Gross	do	17,724.71
Emily M. Hightower	Secretary	6,508.83
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member	17,724.71
Barbara Kling	Minority secretary	4,210.02
Margaret Leary	Secretary	9,036.69
Benjamin B. McKeever	Assistant counsel	4,166.66
Gerald R. McMurray	Research associate	15,896.35
Catherine Smith	Minority secretary	4,676.06
Doris Young	Assistant clerk	8,352.85
John E. Zuccotti	Special council	10,352.24
Total		142,700.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 226—Housing)	*\$390,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971	148,879.05
Total amount expended from January 3, 1971 to June 30, 1971	148,879.05
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	241,120.95

*H. Res. 226 provides total funds of \$975,000, with Committee on Banking and Currency \$390,000 earmarked for Housing Subcommittee.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	\$13,982.38
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director	12,046.38
Leonard L. Hilder	Investigator	10,772.64
James T. Clark	Clerk	14,977.38
Otheollo Steinkuller	Secretary	8,673.56
Betty C. Alexander	do	8,019.06
Peggy L. Thornton	do	8,019.06
John E. Hogan	Minority clerk	12,598.95
Camille G. Butler	Secretary	5,168.43
Whitney L. Turley	Investigator	8,884.79
Marcellus C. Garner	Clerk-typist	3,950.64
Deborah J. Blanton	(Summer intern)	541.67
Patrick E. Kelly	Assistant counsel (June 1, 1971)	1,250.00
Sara Anna Watson	Assistant counsel (Retired Feb. 28, 1971)	3,092.43
Beverly W. Pease	Research specialist	1,700.00
Margaret G. Hoffmann	Legislative assistant	1,666.67
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		220,000.00
Amount of expenditure previously reported		0
Amount expended from January 1, 1971 to July 7, 1971		27,961.56
Total amount expended from January 1, 1971 to July 7, 1971		27,961.56
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1971		192,038.44
JOHN L. McMILLAN, Chairman.		

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald M. Baker	Chief clerk and associate counsel, (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	\$17,958.75
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	11,757.60
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Research director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	General counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75
Benjamin F. Reeves	Assistant to chairman and assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr.	Legislative specialist (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	15,371.66
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	12,256.28
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	15,785.68
Minority: Michael J. Bernstein	Minority counsel for Labor (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75
Crawford C. Heerlein	Minority clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	15,585.25
Charles W. Radcliffe	Special education counsel for minority (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971).	17,958.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	(*)
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 1-June 30, 1971	196,467.72
Total amount expended from Jan. 1-June 30, 1971	196,467.72
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	(*)

*Contingent fund.

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carole J. Ansheles	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	\$475.00
Goldie A. Baldwin	Legislative Assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,393.64
Dean Gregory Barker	Assistant Clerk (from June 14 to June 30, 1971).	269.17
William H. Cable	Legislative Assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	8,300.94

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative Assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$8,581.63
Lelia T. Cornwell	Administrative Assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,393.64
Stephen J. Dryden	Assistant clerk (from June 21 to June 30, 1971).	158.33
Harry M. Feder	Assistant clerk (from June 7 to June 30, 1971).	380.00
Eydie Gaskins	Administrative assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,393.64
Katherine Clark Gibbons	Research assistant (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	6,373.70
Scott L. Gordon	Assistant clerk (from June 21 to June 30, 1971).	158.33
Ernest B. Hillenmeyer III	Assistant clerk (from June 17 to June 30, 1971).	221.67
S. G. Lippman	Special counsel—labor (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	2,617.81
Mattie L. Maynard	Research assistant (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1971).	300.00
Shirley R. Mills	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,498.59
David E. Pinkard	Assistant clerk (from June 14 to June 30, 1971).	269.17
David B. Putnam	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	4,760.23
Peter Schott	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	2,807.93
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	6,396.07
Brian E. Sullam	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	475.00
Jeanne E. Thomson	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	9,357.35
Philip S. Uesato	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1971).	420.43
John E. Warren	Junior researcher (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	4,568.27
Minority: Robert C. Andringa	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	12,408.83
Norma P. Chiriboga	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1971).	897.51
Louise W. Finke	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,049.72
Anita M. Gerhard	do	5,994.16
Will Henderson	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 31, 1971).	3,668.04
Sophia Jo Jolivet	Secretary (from June 7 to June 30, 1971).	533.34
Martin L. LaVor	Minority legislative associate (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	13,401.67
Joyce C. Lindsey	Secretary (from January 3 to April 11, 1971).	1,821.93
John C. Miller	Minority Associate Counsel for Labor (from February 21 to June 30, 1971).	10,472.24
Silvia J. Rodriguez	Secretary (from January 3 to June 30, 1971).	4,676.01
Mary Ann Rospendowski	Secretary (from January 3 to January 9, 1971).	25.03
Dorothy L. Strunk	Administrative assistant (from January 3 to May 31, 1971).	5,994.16
Dennis J. Taylor	Secretary (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	897.22
	Minority Associate Counsel (from June 14 to June 30, 1971).	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1971		\$655,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		179,779.46

Total amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971	\$179,779.46
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	475,220.54

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 1
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Nancy Davis	Secretary (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1971).	\$4,083.33
Richard E. Feeney	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	9,626.70
Harry J. Hogan	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	11,644.69
Sally K. Kirkgasler	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	5,531.72
Nancy K. Kopp	Research assistant (from Apr. 5 to June 30, 1971).	2,866.67
Bernice Sandler	Education specialist (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1971).	1,050.40
Betty L. Shupp	Clerk-typist (from Jan. 3 to Feb. 16, 1971).	496.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	none
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971	35,433.69

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971	35,433.69
--	-----------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	49,566.31
--	-----------

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to July 1, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	\$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Dennis P. Bedell	Assistant chief of staff	16,472.37
Arthur Fefferman	Chief economist	18,000.00
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	16,661.24
Herbert L. Chabot	Assistant legislation counsel	13,822.39
Robert R. Smyers	Refund counsel	16,652.82
James H. Symons	Statistical analysis	16,024.32
John Germanis	do	12,871.16
Meade Emory	Legislation attorney	13,917.25
Albert Buckberg	Economist	13,227.29
Michael D. Bird	do	13,227.29
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund attorney	12,256.28
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation attorney	11,449.51
Joseph P. Spellman	do	10,724.85
Harold Dubroff	do	10,384.86
Donald C. Evans, Jr.	Legislation attorney (as of Mar. 1, 1971).	6,591.67

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John Broadbent.....	Legislation attorney (through March 23, 1971).	\$5,375.31
Anastasia Connaughton.....	Statistical clerk.....	10,346.94
Joseph E. Fink.....	do.....	10,346.94
Leon W. Klud.....	Economist.....	8,756.11
Carl E. Bates.....	Refund attorney.....	8,557.48
Joanne McDermott.....	Secretary.....	7,733.04
Linda Savage.....	do.....	6,154.93
Blanche Nagro.....	Secretary (refund).....	6,079.65
Mary W. Gattie.....	Secretary.....	5,850.79
Jamie L. Daley.....	do.....	5,523.00
June Matthews.....	do.....	5,098.72
Amelia Del Carmen.....	do.....	5,053.61
Marcia B. Rowzie.....	do.....	4,867.00
Wanda D. Fraser.....	do.....	4,595.58
Sharon Malcom.....	Secretary (refund).....	4,006.92
Helen Strosnider.....	Secretary.....	4,000.00
Jacqueline Miller.....	Secretary (as of June 7, 1971).	666.66
Katherine Keller.....	Secretary (as of June 14, 1971).	231.39
James E. Wheeler.....	Accountant (as of June 24, 1971).	388.89
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		712,280.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (July 1, 1970 to Jan. 1, 1971).....		320,460.49
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to July 1, 1971.....		348,950.52
Total amount expended from July 1, 1970 to July 1, 1971.....		669,411.01
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1971.....		42,868.99

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 2

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeunesse M. Beaumont.....	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$7,568.74
Hugh G. Duffy.....	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	12,426.04
Jerome N. Eller.....	Labor statistics analyst (from Jan. 3 to May 31, 1971).	2,574.91
Carl Elliott.....	Special counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	636.41
James C. Hedden.....	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	2,969.52
Peter Newbould.....	Assistant clerk (from June 14 to June 30, 1971).	184.17
Ann M. O'Hara.....	Research assistant (from April 1 to June 30, 1971).	1,200.00
Bradley G. Peters.....	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	375.00
Daniel H. Pollitt.....	Special counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	3,274.24
Anne W. Risdon.....	Assistant clerk (from June 7 to June 30, 1971).	346.66
Mary Lee Stein.....	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1971).	233.58
Mark Tower.....	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	375.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	none
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971.....	32,944.52

Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971 to June 30, 1971..... 32,944.52

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 52,055.48

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 3

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to July 1, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrienne Fields.....	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$7,725.01
S. G. Lippman.....	Special counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	2,166.96
Ernest J. Mannino.....	Research assistant (from June 9 to June 28, 1971).	216.67
Mary F. McAndrew.....	Research coordinator (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	4,163.43
Robert E. Vagley.....	Director (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	15,186.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971.....	34,293.88

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971..... 34,293.88

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 50,706.12

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 4

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Gerber.....	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$5,294.57
John F. Jennings.....	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	12,126.59
Alexandra J. Kisla.....	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	7,716.21
Toni E. Painter.....	Secretary (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1971).	900.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971.....	28,038.76

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 56,961.24

Total amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971..... \$28,038.76

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971..... 56,961.24

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 5

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Loretta A. Bowen.....	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$7,136.00
Daniel H. Krivit.....	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	13,047.84
Catherine Ladnier.....	Research assistant (from Apr. 19 to June 30, 1971).	1,440.00
Marcia Sue Nelson.....	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 31, 1971).	2,835.62
Catherine R. Romano.....	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	4,415.76
Charles R. Zappala.....	Assistant clerk (from June 14 to 30, 1971).	306.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971.....	29,511.69

Total amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971..... 29,511.69

Balance unexpended, as of June 30, 1971..... 55,488.31

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 6

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack G. Duncan.....	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	\$11,511.67
Elene Nicholette.....	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 5 to Jan. 7, 1971).	630.00
Arlene Horowitz.....	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	3,776.72
Toni Rita Immerman.....	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1971).	560.36
David Lloyd-Jones.....	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971).	6,083.78
Christine Orth.....	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 25 to June 30, 1971).	3,250.00
Gladys Marie Walker.....	Clerk (from Jan. 11 to June 30, 1971).	2,798.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	none
Amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971.....	31,075.16
Total amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971.....	31,075.16
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	53,924.84

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR, No. 7

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Curtis C. Aller.....	Associate Director (from June 23 to June 30, 1971).	\$800.00
Richard J. Bela.....	Research associate (from May 1 to May 10, 1971).	428.89
Gary Goodpaster.....	Associate counsel (from May 1 to May 10, 1971).	428.89
James B. Harrison.....	Staff director (from Mar. 24 to June 30, 1971).	7,086.40
Daniel H. Pollitt.....	Associate counsel (from May 1 to May 10, 1971).	428.89
Phoebe Ann Pollitt.....	Assistant clerk (from June 14 to June 30, 1971).	184.17
Robert A. Reveles.....	Research director (from May 16 to May 31, 1971).	1,400.00
Elnora H. Teets.....	Clerk (from Mar. 24 to June 30, 1971).	3,233.33
Margaret F. ter Horst.....	Assistant clerk (from June 15 to June 30, 1971).	173.33
Jeffrey J. Watson.....	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1971).	325.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971.....	15,413.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971.....	15,413.92
Balance unexpended as of June 30 1971.....	69,586.08

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

JULY 8, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Roy J. Bullock.....	Staff administrator.....	\$17,958.75
Albert C. F. Westphal.....	Staff consultant.....	17,958.75
Franklin J. Schupp.....	do.....	17,763.74

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harry C. Cromer.....	do.....	\$17,504.91
Philip B. Billings.....	Staff consultant (deceased March 8, 1971).	5,069.96
Marian A. Czarnnecki.....	Staff consultant.....	17,504.91
Meivin O. Benson.....	do.....	14,735.81
Everett E. Bierman.....	do.....	14,023.80
John J. Brady, Jr.....	do.....	11,917.23
John H. Sullivan.....	do.....	11,917.23
Robert K. Boyer.....	Staff consultant (effective March 1, 1971).	6,666.68
John Chapman Chester.....	do.....	8,666.68
Robert Michael Finley.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (effective April 1, 1971).	5,175.00
Charles P. Witter.....	do.....	5,000.01
Clifford P. Hackett.....	do.....	6,249.99
Peter Anthony Abbruzzese.....	Staff consultant (effective May 10, 1971).	3,400.00
Michael H. Van Dusen.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (effective May 3, 1971.)	3,222.23
Goler T. Butcher.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (Effective May 10, 1971).	3,541.66
Roger B. Pool.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (Effective May 1, 1970).	2,083.33
Robert B. Boettcher.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (Effective June 7, 1971).	1,500.00
Charles S. Levy.....	Subcommittee staff consultant (Effective June 1, 1971).	1,666.67
June Nigh.....	Senior staff assistant.....	13,032.03
Helen C. Mattas.....	Staff assistant.....	11,594.38
Helen L. Hashagen.....	Staff assistant (retired Feb. 1, 1971).	1,750.72
Mary Louise O'Brien.....	Staff assistant.....	10,346.74
Dora McCracken.....	do.....	8,547.97
Jean E. Smith.....	do.....	6,758.71
Nancy C. Peden.....	Staff assistant (retired June 4, 1971).	5,773.15
Paula L. Peak.....	Staff assistant.....	8,547.97
Ray Sparks.....	do.....	8,928.64
Thelma H. Shirkey.....	do.....	4,734.51
Arlene M. Atwater.....	Staff assistant (Effective Apr. 19, 1971).	1,900.01
Shirley A. Furnier.....	Staff assistant (Effective May 19, 1971).	1,516.66
Kenneth W. Cowell.....	Clerical assistant.....	4,785.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$425,580.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	111,349.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1-June 30, 1971.....	111,349.73
Total amount expended from.....	111,349.73
Balance unexpended as of.....	314,230.27

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Chairman.

JULY 6, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Expenses—Jan. 3, 1971, through June 30, 1971:		
Full committee.....		\$2,680.85
Special investigative staff.....		30,880.40
Legislative and Military Operations Subcommittee.....		72,672.98
Government Activities Subcommittee.....		39,951.70
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.....		51,531.92
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee.....		49,713.18
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.....		35,885.10
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.....		64,473.97
Special Studies Subcommittee.....		58,368.04
Total.....		406,158.14

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Salaries: Full committee, Jan. 1-June 30, 1971:		
Herbert Roback.....	Staff director.....	\$17,958.75
Christine Ray Davis.....	Staff administrator.....	17,958.75
James A. Lanigan.....	General counsel.....	17,958.75
Miles Q. Romney.....	Associate general counsel.....	15,870.83
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto.....	Staff member.....	8,673.56
Ann E. McLachlan.....	do.....	8,406.93
Catherine S. Cash.....	do.....	6,889.58
Marilyn F. Jarvis.....	Staff member (from Apr. 1, 1971).	3,763.83
Annie M. Abbott.....	Staff member (from Apr. 1, 1971).	3,459.96
Lawrence P. Redmond.....	Professional staff member (to Jan. 2, 1971).	113.74
John Philip Carlson.....	Minority counsel.....	17,958.75
William H. Copenhaver.....	Minority professional staff member.....	14,222.66
Clara Katherine Armstrong.....	Minority research assistant (from Jan. 3, 1971).	7,655.07

Expenses, Jan. 3 through June 30, 1971: Full committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman: Expenses.....	\$2,680.85
Total.....	2,680.85

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special investigative staff, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Warren B. Buhler.....	Minority staff member (from Mar. 29, 1971).	\$4,600.00
Thomas H. Saunders.....	Minority staff member.....	8,440.05
Shirley Davenport.....	Minority secretary (from June 21, 1971).	236.11
Mabel C. Baker.....	Staff member.....	5,075.17
John L. Dodson.....	Clerical staff.....	5,032.82
Ralph T. Doty.....	do.....	3,357.07
Annie M. Abbott.....	Secretary (to Mar. 31, 1971).	3,322.14
Alan Kreshool.....	Investigator (to Jan. 31, 1971).	817.04
Total.....		30,880.40

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Elmer W. Henderson.....	Counsel.....	\$15,896.35
Douglas G. Dahlin.....	Staff attorney.....	11,447.75
John Paul Ridgely.....	Investigator.....	10,206.14
Joseph C. Luman.....	Defense analyst.....	9,680.89
Catherine L. Koebelin.....	Research assistant.....	7,855.65
Veronica B. Johnson.....	Clerk.....	7,655.07
Gloria Ann Rubin.....	Clerk-stenographer (from Mar. 1, 1971).	2,900.72
Mary Etta Haga.....	Clerk-stenographer (from June 1, 1971).	833.33
Kathryn McQ. Rosenbaum.....	Clerk-stenographer (to May 7, 1971).	3,467.43
I. Warren Harrison.....	Legal assistant (to Jan. 31, 1971).	1,315.18
Gilda K. Calderone.....	Clerk (to Jan. 31, 1971).	618.40
Expenses.....		796.07
Total.....		72,672.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman:		
Ernest C. Baynard.....	Subcommittee staff Director.....	\$15,219.39
C. Don Stephens.....	Research analyst.....	10,190.62
Paul A. Mutino.....	Counsel (from May 24, 1971).	1,901.39
Lynne Higginbotham.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	6,816.68
Mary C. Jones.....	Secretary (from June 21, 1971).	236.11
William M. Jones.....	Counsel (to Mar. 31, 1971).	4,858.46
Expenses.....		729.05
Total.....		39,951.70

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:		
James R. Naughton.....	Counsel.....	\$15,219.39
Delphis C. Goldberg.....	Professional staff member.....	15,219.39
Gilbert S. Goldhammer.....	Consultant.....	9,921.15
Pamela R. Horsmon.....	Clerk-stenographer (from Apr. 1, 1971).	2,499.99
Margaret Goldhammer.....	Secretary (from Mar. 8, 1971).	2,634.67

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie W. Vanderbilt	Secretary (to Mar. 7, 1971)	\$1,478.57
Bebe B. Terry	Clerk-stenographer (to Feb. 28, 1971)	2,050.90
Expenses		2,507.86
Total		51,531.92

Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee.
Hon. Henry S. Reuss, chairman:

Phineas Indritz	Counsel	\$15,219.39
David B. Finnegan	Assistant counsel	12,473.38
Michael B. Gross	Legal assistant (from Apr. 1, 1971)	3,510.09
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	7,838.24
Ruth M. Wallick	Stenographer (from Apr. 5, 1971)	2,532.36
Catherine L. Hartke	Stenographer (to May 31, 1971)	5,765.48
Dorothy M. Vance	Stenographer (to Mar. 7, 1971)	1,345.27
Expenses		1,136.97
Total		49,713.18

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.
Hon. John S. Monagan, Chairman:

Richard L. Still	Subcommittee staff director (from Apr. 12, 1971)	\$6,034.73
Charles A. Intriago	Assistant counsel	10,136.16
Jeremiah S. Buckley	Assistant counsel (from Apr. 1, 1971)	3,125.01
Frances M. Tuk	Clerk	4,658.81
Jane G. Cameron	Stenographer (from May 10, 1971)	1,133.34
Millicent Y. Myers	Clerk (to Apr. 12, 1971)	3,802.76
R. Michael Finley	Professional staff member (to Mar. 31, 1971)	4,965.09
Stuart E. Bossom	Legal assistant (to Jan. 31, 1971)	1,266.36
Expenses		762.84
Total		35,885.10

Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.
Hon. William S. Moorhead, Chairman:

William G. Phillips	Subcommittee staff director (from Apr. 19, 1971)	\$6,211.46
Norman G. Cornish	Deputy subcommittee staff director	15,219.39
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member	10,299.85
William R. Maloni	Professional staff member (from June 1, 1971)	1,729.71
Martha Myers	Secretary	3,856.00
Mary E. Milek	Secretary (from June 1, 1971)	625.00
Vincent J. Augliere	Senior consultant (to June 15, 1971)	13,281.28
E. Jayne Bodecker	Secretary (to May 31, 1971)	5,657.48
Jack Matteson	Professional staff member (to Mar. 31, 1971)	6,716.40
Expenses		877.40
Total		64,473.97

Special Studies Subcommittee.
Hon. Wm. J. Randall, Chairman:
Erskin Stewart

Erskin Stewart	Acting subcommittee staff director (from Apr. 1, 1971)	\$4,947.54
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	13,998.37
Herschel F. Clesner	Counsel	13,940.97
Jane F. Johnson	Stenographer (from May 5, 1971)	1,322.22
Wileen O. Moore	Stenographer	3,742.41
Louis I. Freed	Subcommittee staff director (to Mar. 31, 1971)	7,455.06
Peter S. Barash	Legal assistant (to Mar. 31, 1971)	4,750.47
Charles P. Witter	Staff member (to Mar. 31, 1971)	3,933.48
Marilyn F. Jarvis	Stenographer (to Mar. 31, 1971)	3,613.91
Expenses		663.61
Total		58,368.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 303—92d Cong.)	\$1,032,600.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3—June 30, 1971	406,158.14
Total amount expended from Jan. 3—June 30, 1971	406,158.14
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	626,441.86

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations

JULY 9, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. Walker	Staff director	\$14,416.6
Robert D. Gray	Chief auditor	15,751.78
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	15,590.19
Melvin Miller	Minority clerk	15,590.19
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	14,958.75
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	9,525.71
Thomas Foster, Sr.	Elections clerk	9,007.08
Louis J. Freed	Assistant clerk	8,124.99
Thomas W. Latham	Accounts clerk	7,811.90
Thomas A. Tangretti	Electrical and mechanical office equipment clerk	7,755.94
Mary F. Stolle	Assistant clerk	6,378.16
Evelyn H. Wilson	do	5,865.88
Judith K. Holes	do	5,789.49
Gurney S. Jaynes	do	5,740.81
Robert H. Frank	Counsel	4,497.83
John P. Padden	Assistant clerk	4,461.23
Douglass Lea	Printing clerk	4,200.00
Judith L. Vargas	Assistant clerk (minority)	3,950.64
Mary Susan Mattson	Assistant clerk	3,852.53
John G. Blair	do	3,683.34
Dianne Sue Gaujot	do	3,622.62
Curtis C. Wilkie	do	3,525.00
R. Marilyn Lee	do	3,517.92
John L. Boos	Libraries and Memorials clerk	3,500.01
Ralph W. Murphy	Assistant clerk (minority)	3,333.34
Barbara D. Lewis	Assistant clerk	2,750.01
Thomas J. Hart	do	2,602.31
Thomas D. Hart	do	1,955.55
Catherine Ann Adelman	do	1,837.17
S. Arnold Smith	Counsel	1,685.92
Charles N. Arrowsmith	Assistant clerk	1,583.33
Dorothy W. Sodeman	do	866.67
Gwenda R. Green	do	865.88
Paula Scruggs	do	840.04
Velma Youngblood	do	833.33
Lynette M. Lentina	do	667.96
Colette K. Bohatch	do	500.00
Suzanne Eaton	do	450.00
John Paul Tolson	do	383.33
Betty Lamb	do	347.22
Pamela M. Bussen	do	332.22
Charles R. Kaiser	do	300.00
Corbin R. Miller, Jr.	do	283.33
Steven Glauberman	do	249.17
Marlene F. Whiteko	do	116.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$400,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	none
Amount expended from Jan. 3—June 30, 1971	78,698.88
Total amount expended from Jan. 3—June 30, 1971	78,698.88
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	321,306.12

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Staff director and chief clerk	\$17,945.64
Milton A. Pearl	Special counsel on public lands (from Mar. 1). (Deceased Apr. 30, 1971)	6,000.00
Lewis A. Sigler	Counsel and consultant on Indian affairs	16,854.07
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mines and mining and public lands	17,091.54
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Minority counsel	15,501.44
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel and consultant on national parks and recreation	13,465.02
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on irrigation and reclamation (from June 1)	2,583.33
Robert M. Gants	Assistant minority counsel (from May 1)	3,500.00
Dixie Barton	Clerk	8,979.82
Patricia Murray	Clerk (minority)	8,979.82
Patricia Freeman	Clerk	7,913.27
Susan Gardner	do	7,369.38
Kathleen Sandy	do	7,369.38
Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 285—92d Congress:		
Milton A. Pearl	Special counsel on public lands (To Feb. 28)	5,706.61
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on Irrigation and Reclamation (To May 31)	12,124.00
Charles Conklin	Special Counsel on Public Lands and Environmental Matters (From June 13)	1,600.00
William G. Thomas	Consultant on Territorial and Insular Affairs (From Mar. 10)	8,941.68
Miriam Waddell	Clerk	6,457.13
Inez Jarvis	Clerk (from Apr. 5)	3,583.33
Nancy Lou Larson	Clerk (from Apr. 7)	3,150.00
Marsha Lane	Clerk (from June 1)	1,125.00
Marston L. Becker	Printing clerk	8,051.04
Edward Gaddis	Messenger	4,662.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$478,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971—June 30, 1971	80,586.16

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971—June 30, 1971	80,586.16
--	------------------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	397,413.84
--	------------

JULY 12, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald G. Sanders	Chief counsel	\$17,152.81
Richard L. Schultz	Associate chief counsel	13,534.95
Alfred L. Nittle	Legislative counsel	14,702.24
Glenn E. Davis	Editorial director	15,315.00
Robert M. Horner	Chief investigator	12,435.41
William G. Shaw	Research director	12,506.69
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk (retired Mar. 31, 1971) (to standing Apr. 1, 1971)	5,413.88

JULY 22, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
V. Bernice King.....	Financial secretary (from investigative).	\$4,059.84
Mary M. Valente.....	Administrative secretary.	9,048.05
Anniel Cunningham.....	Chief, files and reference section.	8,486.28
Helen M. Gittings.....	Research analyst (from standing to investigative Apr. 1, 1971).	4,189.63
Ruth I. Matthews.....	Clerk (Appt. Apr. 1, 1971).	6,000.00
Investigative committee: Victoria Appell.....	Clerk-typist (Appt. May 24, 1971).	493.33
George C. Armstrong.....	Investigator-minority (appt. Apr. 1, 1971).	3,624.99
Martha M. Beck.....	Information classifier.	3,382.70
Patricia A. Belback.....	Stenographer (appt. Apr. 20, 1971).	1,676.38
Margie D. Biggerstaff.....	Secretary.	4,784.57
Charles Bonneville.....	Investigator.	7,794.60
Daniel Butler.....	Asst. documents clerk.	4,897.16
Mary Jo Chapman.....	Clerk-stenographer (terminated Jan. 31, 1971).	488.38
S. Janice Coil.....	Secretary.	5,617.71
Susan K. Daniels.....	Information analyst.	4,323.22
Florence P. Doyle.....	Secretary.	4,692.82
Elizabeth Edinger.....	Editor.	7,594.03
Daniel Ferry.....	Asst. counsel.	9,095.78
Andrea Foy.....	Information Classifier (appt. Mar. 1, 1971).	2,166.60
James L. Gallagher.....	Research analyst-minority.	8,056.30
Ruth Ann (Gerbec) Crocitto.....	Information analyst.	3,534.40
Helen M. Gittings.....	Research analyst (appt. to investigative Apr. 1, 1971).	4,395.20
Sheila Harrison.....	Clerk-typist (appt. Mar. 6, 1971).	2,040.29
William H. Hecht.....	Executive staff asst. (appt. June 15, 1971).	1,311.11
Isobel Hurwitz.....	Information classifier.	3,492.73
L. William Ivory, Jr.....	Asst. documents clerk.	3,031.40
Doris R. Jaeck.....	Information analyst.	4,956.50
Mildred V. James.....	Clerk-typist.	3,476.08
Joan Keller.....	Secretary.	4,801.04
V. Bernice King.....	Financial secretary (terminated investigative Mar. 31, 1971).	3,818.10
John F. Lewis.....	Coordinating editor.	13,506.51
Virginia Masino.....	Receptionist.	4,163.63
Anita A. Maggio.....	Clerk (appt. June 1, 1971).	541.67
B. R. McConnon, Jr.....	Investigator (terminated Feb. 28, 1971).	2,761.29
David E. Muffley, Jr.....	Documents clerk.	4,785.20
Maureen P. Ontrich.....	Information analyst.	4,356.80
Ellen Patterson.....	Stenographer (appt. Jan. 18, 1971) (terminated Feb. 12, 1971).	400.00
Alma T. Pfaff.....	Research analyst.	5,060.91
Peggy Pixley.....	Editorial clerk.	4,956.50
William T. Poole.....	Research analyst-minority.	5,007.36
Robert Poos.....	Research Analyst.	9,095.78
Stuart Pott.....	Investigator.	6,327.77
Martha C. Poulton.....	Clerk-typist (resigned Feb. 14, 1971).	774.95
Josephine S. Randolph.....	Secretary (terminated June 16, 1971).	4,992.68
David Rigg.....	Information classifier (appt. May 24, 1971).	493.33
Audrey Rollins.....	Secretary.	4,424.02
Herbert Romerstein.....	Investigator.	8,352.85
Stephen H. Romines.....	Asst. Counsel.	9,095.78
Karen Sue Russell.....	Information Classifier.	3,492.73
Richard A. Shaw.....	Investigator.	8,599.47
Albert Solomon, Jr.....	Investigator (Appt. June 21, 1971).	555.56
Jeanne L. Spencer.....	Clerk-Stenographer (Appt. Apr. 12 1971).	1,865.27
Linda Spirt.....	Secretary-Minority.	4,625.66
John Stratton.....	Investigator.	7,794.60
Barbara C. Sweeny.....	Clerk-Stenographer.	4,298.65
Joseph Thach, Jr.....	Research Analyst (Appt. June 21 1971).	444.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$570,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 - June 30, 1971.....	244,393.27
Total amount expended from.....	.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	325,606.73

RICHARD H. ICHORD Chairman.

Name of employee Profession

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson.....	Clerk.	\$17,958.75
Kenneth J. Painter.....	First assistant clerk.	14,895.28
Marcella F. Johnson.....	Assistant clerk.	9,286.85
Frank Mahon.....	Printing editor.	9,801.73
Hazel J. Collie.....	Staff assistant.	9,244.24
Elsie M. Karpowich.....	Clerical assistant (thru May 31, 1971).	6,114.98
Mary Ryan.....	Clerical assistant.	7,351.98
Edwin E. Thomas.....	Staff assistant.	6,915.74
Marion M. Burson.....	Staff assistant (minority).	14,895.28
Professional staff:		
James M. Menger.....	Professional staff member.	17,958.75
William J. Dixon.....	do.	17,958.75
Robert F. Guthrie.....	do.	17,958.75
Kurt Borchardt.....	do.	17,958.75
Charles B. Curtis.....	Professional staff member (from June 1, 1971).	2,916.67
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 170 and 290:		
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.....	Minority counsel.	17,958.75
A. Bennett Schram.....	Staff assistant (minority) (from May 3, 1971).	3,222.23
Henry Thomas Greene.....	Staff assistant (minority) (from May 3, 1971).	3,222.23
Helen M. Dubino.....	Staff assistant (minority).	13,915.99
Barbara Bullard.....	Clerical assistant (minority).	6,153.32
Diane R. Tretter.....	do.	4,632.64
Darlene McMullen.....	do.	3,995.92
Eleanor A. Dinkins.....	Clerical assistant.	7,351.98
Theodore H. Focty.....	Special counsel (C.O.B. Mar. 21, 1971).	6,695.80
Dennis C. Shumaker.....	Clerical assistant.	3,681.46
Violet M. McCarthy.....	do.	5,833.44
Anne P. Lebbon.....	do.	4,262.81
F. Martin Kuhn.....	Staff assistant (C.O.B. Jan. 21, 1971).	1,361.81
James T. Glenn.....	Staff assistant (C.O.B. Jan. 2, 1971).	129.70
Michael A. Taylor.....	Staff assistant.	12,506.01
Walter J. Graham, Jr.....	do.	12,506.01
Stephan E. Lawton.....	Staff assistant (from Apr. 1, 1971).	6,436.26
Samuel A. Young, Jr.....	Attorney (Mar. 1, 1971 to C.O.B. May 31, 1971).	5,499.99
Thomas D. Hart.....	Legislative assistant (C.O.B. Jan. 15, 1971).	873.93
Judith Anne Messer.....	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 22, 1971).	1,820.84
Diane G. Kirchenbauer.....	Clerical assistant (from May 10, 1971).	1,629.16
Barboura C. Flues.....	Clerical assistant (from May 3, 1971).	1,772.23
William H. Painter.....	Special counsel (from June 14, 1971).	1,416.67
Joseph T. Kelley.....	Messenger (from June 7, 1971).	400.00
Randall R. Eley.....	Intern (from June 2, 1971).	483.33
Robert P. Sweeney.....	Staff assistant (from June 1, 1971).	916.67
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Daniel J. Manelli.....	Acting chief counsel.	14,594.05
William T. Bruhan.....	Staff assistant.	13,957.53
James F. Broder.....	Special assistant.	12,942.05
James R. Connor.....	Staff assistant.	12,942.05
James P. Kelly.....	Chief investigator (C.O.B. Apr. 14, 1971).	8,008.22

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
------------------	------------	--

Benjamin J. Smethurst.....	Special assistant.....	\$13,957.53
Robert L. Rebein.....	Staff attorney (C.O.B. June 19, 1971).	13,096.45
Mark J. Raabe.....	Attorney.....	12,541.34
Michael F. Barrett, Jr.....	do.....	11,170.85
Michael J. Parker.....	Attorney (from Mar. 19, 1971).	6,233.32
Elizabeth G. Paola.....	Clerical assistant.....	7,351.98
Lucy M. Gossett.....	Clerical assistant (C.O.B. Jan. 31, 1971).	1,042.60
Elizabeth A. Eastman.....	Clerical assistant.....	6,570.35
Russell D. Mosher.....	Staff assistant.....	5,189.42
Sylvia S. Dodge.....	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 19, 1971).	2,239.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$989,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 - June 30, 1971.....	288,325.76
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 - June 30, 1971.....	288,325.76

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1971..... 700,674.24

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,

Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick.....	Staff director.....	\$17,958.75
Benjamin L. Zelenko.....	General counsel.....	17,619.80
Kenneth L. Harkins.....	Chief counsel, antitrust (from Apr. 1, 1971).	8,875.11
Herbert Fuchs.....	Counsel.....	17,298.25
Garner J. Cline.....	do.....	15,344.75
William F. Shattuck.....	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1971).	7,764.33
Donald G. Benn.....	Associate counsel.....	14,293.35
R. Frederick Jett.....	Counsel.....	14,023.80
Jerome M. Zeifman.....	do.....	13,787.89
Frances Christy.....	Clerical staff.....	9,827.64
Jane C. Caldwell.....	do.....	9,013.93
Gertrude Clara Burak.....	do.....	8,019.06
Carrie Lou Allen.....	do.....	7,587.52
Lorraine W. Beland.....	do.....	7,587.52
Roberta E. Eisenberg.....	do.....	7,328.29
Joanne E. Bell.....	Clerical staff.....	3,742.41
Pearl L. Chellman.....	do.....	4,790.51
Daniel L. Cohen.....	Assistant counsel (from June 7, 1971).	866.66
George A. Dalley.....	Assistant counsel (from June 21, 1971).	513.89
Arthur P. Endress, Jr.....	Assistant counsel (from Apr. 19, 1971).	2,800.01
James B. Farr.....	Messenger-clerk (from Apr. 24, 1971).	1,751.40
Paul S. Fenton.....	Associate counsel (through Feb. 28, 1971).	2,326.18
Mary Shea Gaffney.....	Clerical staff.....	4,550.04
Samuel A. Garrison, III.....	Associate counsel (from May 1, 1971).	3,166.66
Alma B. Haardt.....	Clerical staff.....	6,242.22
Alice E. Hamlin.....	Clerical staff (from May 5, 1971).	1,213.33
Herbert E. Hoffman.....	Special counsel for Federal criminal law reform (from June 7, 1971).	2,395.83
William Thomas Hutton.....	Assistant counsel (through Feb. 20, 1971).	1,750.32
Florence C. Johnson.....	Clerical staff (from Apr. 1, 1971).	2,385.00
Alfred S. Joseph III.....	Assistant counsel (from Apr. 19, 1971).	3,640.01

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Judith Kahn	Clerical staff	\$3,636.09
Michael Kelemonick	do	6,584.40
Florence T. McGrady	do	6,584.40
Thomas E. Mooney	Assistant counsel	9,270.97
Robert A. Pauley	Associate counsel	1,416.67
(from June 14, 1971).		
Franklin G. Polk	Associate counsel	14,154.41
Ruth T. Pratt	Clerical staff (from June 7, 1971).	763.89
Mary G. Sourwine	Clerical staff	6,156.53
Annelie Tischbein	do	4,487.41
Louis S. Vance	Messenger-clerk	4,625.66
Nancy L. Viener	Clerical staff (from June 24, 1971).	50.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$350,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 3, 1971, through June 30, 1971	106,978.89
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971	243,021.11

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1970	\$42,973.22
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971	16,217.08
Balance June 30, 1971	26,756.14
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1970	124,847.49
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971	32,795.25
Balance June 30, 1971	92,052.24
C. Revision of the laws, 1971:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1970	18,566.54
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1971	17,255.16
Balance June 30, 1971	1,311.38

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to July 1, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ralph E. Casey	Chief counsel	\$12,000.00
Robert J. Ables	do	2,958.78
Ned P. Everett	Counsel	14,945.68
Ernest J. Corrado	do	12,248.15
Leonard L. Sutter	do	7,758.35
Robert J. McElroy	Chief clerk	16,884.83
William B. Winfield	Clerk	11,755.80
Francis P. Still	Assistant clerk	9,082.16
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	8,691.44
Albert J. Dennis	Investigator	10,032.39
Richard N. Sharood	Minority counsel	12,893.01
William C. Rountree	do	6,000.00
Virginia L. Noah	Secretary (minority)	8,230.59
Investigative staff:		
Ralph E. Casey	Special counsel	5,958.78
Francis D. Heyward	Counsel	6,500.01
Alfred Ronald Santo	do	3,999.99
Frank M. Potter, Jr.	do	3,000.00
Donald A. Watt	Editor	9,491.60
Lucy L. Summers	Secretary	6,101.49
Diane G. Kirchenbauer	do	3,582.74
Jane C. Wojcik	do	7,317.04
Pauline M. Dickerson	do	7,701.69
Norman M. Barnes	Investigator	5,018.08
Ronald W. C. Watt	Assistant clerk	2,659.24
Eleanor P. Mohler	do	5,257.88
Ruth I. Hoffman	do	2,499.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$291,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	88,942.76
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1971	0
Total amount expended from — to —	0

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971... 202,557.24
EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Martiny, John H.	Chief counsel	\$17,958.75
Gaughan, Vincent M.	Staff director and special counsel	10,986.12
Bray, Bun Benton	Associate staff director	17,706.83
Smiroldo, Victor C.	Counsel	17,706.83
Irvine, William A.	Assistant staff director	17,706.83
Kazy, Theodore J.	Senior staff assistant	17,706.83
Fortune, Francis C.	Coordinator	14,090.04
Lockhart, Robert E.	Assistant counsel	8,170.00
Thornton, Elsie E.	Chief clerk	12,135.16
Wells, Barbara M.	Secretary	8,598.09
Simons, Blanche M.	Secretary	8,077.66
Investigative Staff, pursuant to H. Res. 217 and 279 of the 92d Congress, 1st Session.		
Barton, Richard A.	Staff assistant	10,794.19
Bates, Kathryn E.	Secretary	6,005.00
Bebick, Joan E.	do	4,928.06
Blackmore, Ruby	Staff assistant (from June 7).	400.00
Borger, Deanne L.	Secretary	5,631.16
Brown, Lorraine L.	do	4,854.77
Ciaravella, Jo Ann	do	4,880.57
Coultrap, Ray H.	Staff assistant	6,808.71
Davis, Stewart A.	do	6,688.87
Devlin, Ralph J.	do	13,609.79
Fenstermacher, Frederic	Intern (from June 1)	325.00
Ferdon, Julie	do	300.00
Fussell, Glenda J.	Secretary	1,800.00
Gabusi, John B.	Staff assistant	11,603.40
Gould, George B.	do	12,196.32
Green, Thelma R.	Secretary	1,135.19
Griffith, Thomas B.	Intern (from June 1)	300.00
Harding, Delois	Secretary	4,461.02
Hitchcock, John E.	Intern (from June 1)	325.00
Howard, Alton M.	Printing editor	9,255.47
Jelonek, Susan	Intern (from June 1 to June 30)	325.00
Kennedy, Thomas R.	Staff assistant	11,497.01
Lloyd, Max T.	do	13,681.42
Meyer, Robert J.	Intern (from June 21)	133.33
Miller, Michael D.	Intern (from June 28)	204.17
Moore, Robert M.	Intern (from June 16)	204.17
Myers, Lois G.	Secretary	6,165.51
Napier, Margaret G.	Secretary	5,003.63
Neuman, Robert A.	Staff assistant	4,615.71
Palmer, Fred D.	Research assistant	6,404.00
Pendleton, Maria R.	Document clerk	7,964.48
Peters, Dorothy L.	Assistant document clerk	6,829.85
Raymond, Anthony J.	Staff assistant	11,335.33
Snipes, Justine P.	Secretary	6,989.33
Spencer, Walter A.	Intern (from June 1)	325.00
Ward, Sara L.	Secretary	7,816.59
Williss, Donna L.	do	726.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$533,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30	203,375.45
Total amount expended from — to —	0

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971... 329,624.55
THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	\$17,958.75
Lester Edelman	Counsel	14,944.09
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	17,813.95
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk (terminated Mar. 15, 1971).	4,690.69
Lloyd A. Rivard	Engineer consultant	15,404.86
Carl H. Schwartz, Jr.	Consultant—projects and programs (as of Jan. 18, 1971).	6,821.44
James L. Oberstar	Administrator	15,687.24
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant	10,809.03
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	9,107.77
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	7,471.42
Eria S. Youmans	Minority executive staff assistant (as of Feb. 1, 1971).	7,365.01
Gordon E. Wood	Minority professional staff (as of Mar. 1, 1971).	6,938.32
Investigating staff:		
Richard C. Peet	Assistant minority counsel	15,152.94
Audrey G. Warren	Subcommittee clerk (terminated Mar. 31, 1971).	5,309.80
Sheldon S. Gilbert	Associate minority counsel (terminated Feb. 1, 1971).	1,536.32
Augusta P. Peterson	Subcommittee clerk (terminated May 31, 1971).	6,944.52
Robert F. Spence	Subcommittee clerk	8,457.51
Joseph A. Italiano, Jr.	Editorial assistant	8,685.37
Eria S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant (as of Feb. 1, 1971, transferred to Standing Committee).	1,206.30
Linda L. Williams	Minority staff assistant	5,178.05
Nancy B. Vitali	Staff assistant	4,785.20
Peggy Lynn Clements	do	5,153.15
Harvey C. Simms, Jr.	Clerical assistant (terminated Feb. 1, 1971).	445.65
Emily L. Kausch	Staff assistant	5,473.63
Cynthia J. Van Sant	do	3,911.02
Rosmari E. Gaughan	do	3,750.75
Robert G. Marshall	Subcommittee clerk	6,490.32
Ruth Costello	Staff assistant (as of Jan. 23, 1971).	6,494.46
Toby Stein	Staff assistant (as of Feb. 1, 1971).	3,120.85
Patricia A. Hill	Minority staff assistant (as of Feb. 10, 1971).	3,916.65
Richard E. Barnett	Minority staff assistant (as of Mar. 1, 1971).	3,490.00
Brenda C. Jones	Minority staff assistant (as of April 13, 1971).	1,950.00
Robert F. Loftus	Technical staff assistant (as of May 3, 1971).	4,672.23
John P. Carrier	Staff assistant (as of June 1, 1971).	1,500.00
Peter R. Jutro	Staff assistant (as of June 7, 1971).	512.00
William Corcoran	Staff assistant (as of June 16, 1971).	216.66
Marie M. Lynch	Subcommittee clerk (as of June 27, 1971).	135.56
Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	17,619.54
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	16,968.29
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Associate counsel	13,087.28
John P. O'Hara	do	13,087.28
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	do	13,248.43
Robert G. Lawrence	do	14,787.80
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	15,971.22
Sherman S. Willse	Professional staff member	13,087.28
Paul R. S. Yates	Professional minority staff member	14,113.15
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	8,362.76
Stuart M. Harrison	Staff Assistant (terminated) (Mar. 31, 1971).	4,733.70
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	6,344.88
Martha E. Downie	Minority staff assistant	6,277.63

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Betty Hay	Administrative assistant	\$6,958.54
Shirley R. Knighten	Staff assistant	5,802.06
Carol Dahlstedt	Staff assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1971)	3,125.01
William O. Nolen	Investigator (as of May 1, 1971)	3,333.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 351)		\$1,072,670.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		297,897.99
Total amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		297,897.99
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971		774,772.01

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

JULY 15, 1971.
COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to July 1, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurie C. Battle	Staff director and counsel—P.	\$17,985.75
Robert D. Hynes, Jr.	Minority counsel—P.	17,255.16
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel—P.	10,629.23
Winifred L. Watts	Secretary—C.	8,027.86
Jonna Lynne Cullen	do.	7,168.75
Margaret Anne Bundick	do.	4,725.00
Total		65,791.75
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended from Jan. 1-June 30, 1971		268.23
Total amount expended from Jan. 1-June 30, 1971		268.23
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971		4,731.77

WILLIAM M. COLMER,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1971.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Chas. F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel	\$17,958.75
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel	17,737.59
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	17,737.59
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do.	17,031.22
James E. Wilson, Jr.	Technical consultant	16,261.96
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	7,116.39

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emily Dodson	do.	\$6,819.75
Carol F. Rodgers	do.	6,654.82
June C. Stafford	do.	6,654.82
Kieran U. Cashman	do.	5,506.44
Carl Swartz	Minority staff (from Feb. 23)	8,000.00
Investigative staff (H. Res. 247):		
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	16,261.96
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	16,261.96
Philip P. Dickinson	do.	14,098.39
W. H. Boone	Technical consultant (from Mar. 22)	9,848.59
William G. Wells, Jr.	do.	13,534.95
K. Guild Nichols, Jr.	Staff consultant	9,193.06
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant	14,752.64
William L. Ofutt	Minority staff (to Apr. 30)	4,877.98
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	8,673.56
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant	8,001.42
Martha N. Rees	Secretary	6,369.48
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	7,037.87
Patricia J. Schwartz	Secretary	4,906.69
Barbara J. Jackson	do.	4,726.07
Colleen P. Dunphy	Clerk-typist (from June 24)	69.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$380,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		0
Amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		162,304.44
Total amount expended from Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		162,304.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971		217,695.56

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1971.
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff director	\$17,958.75
Bennett Wolfe	Assistant staff director	14,886.90
Robert G. Allett	Senior staff member	16,841.75
Mariann R. Mackenzie	Secretary	10,000.02
Tempie W. Whittington	Assistant clerk	4,999.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 236; 3-23-71)		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		380.25
Amount expended from Mar. 23-June 30, 1971		380.25
Total amount expended from Mar. 23-June 30, 1971		380.25
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971		24,619.85

MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1971.
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing Committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	\$17,945.64
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1971)	8,566.75
Donald C. Knapp	Counsel (Apr. 10-June 30, 1971)	8,100.00
John R. Holden	Professional staff (minority)	15,348.59
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	15,348.59
George W. Fisher	Clerk	17,463.00
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk	10,740.73
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	7,483.62
Morvie Ann Colby	do.	7,272.24
Marjorie J. Kidd	do.	6,889.58
Arthur M. Gottschalk	Professional aide (minority) (from Mar. 22, 1971)	5,775.00
Rita W. Schwall	Clerk-stenographer (Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1971)	2,554.44
Patricia J. Wilton	Clerk-Stenographer (Apr. 1-June 30, 1971)	2,740.53
Investigative Staff:		
Rita W. Schwall	do.	2,612.49
Patricia J. Wilton	Clerk-stenographer (Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1971)	2,688.82
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	15,247.85
Audrey A. Pawelson	Clerk-stenographer	5,429.35
Candis L. Grew	do.	4,445.90
Helen Lee Fletcher	do.	3,235.35
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	4,293.04
Michael John Wootton	Intern (minority)	700.00
Courtenay E. Baskin	Clerk-stenographer	583.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		52,829.55
Amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		52,829.55
Total amount expended, Jan. 3-June 30, 1971		52,829.55
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971		97,170.45

OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

JULY 1, 1971.
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Martin, Jr.	Chief counsel (P)	\$17,958.75
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority counsel (P)	17,945.64
John Patrick Baker	Assistant chief counsel (P)	16,927.92
Robert B. Hill	Professional staff (P)	11,418.52
William Kane	do.	15,590.19
James W. Kelley	do.	15,590.19
Harold Lamar	do.	15,590.19
A. L. Singleton, Jr.	do.	14,569.74
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	7,046.65
Virginia Butler	do.	8,626.23
William C. Byrd	do.	5,825.95
Mary Clare Fitzgerald	do.	5,244.24
William Fullerton	do.	15,590.19
Grace S. Kagan	do.	8,626.23
June Kendall	do.	9,870.55
Mary Matthews	do.	5,359.76
Elizabeth Price	Staff assistant (C) to May 31, 1971	6,153.35
Vivian Jean Ratliff	do.	4,999.74
Gloria Shaver	do.	8,218.94
Eileen Sonnett	do.	7,223.78
Shirley Vallance	Staff assistant (C) to Jan. 3, 1971	58.99
Judith VanDerSchaaf	Staff assistant (C)	5,049.62
Carole Vazis	do.	6,099.12
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	7,129.57
Walter B. Little	do.	7,128.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$75,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30 1971.....	3,015.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1971.....	3,015.87
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	71,984.13

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1971.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Stephen N. Abrams.....	Press assistant.....	\$5,528.00
Weston Adams.....	Associate counsel (to Jan. 2, 1971).....	132.71
Stuart R. Allen.....	Chief investigator.....	13,130.15
Ronald Barbatoc.....	Assistant counsel.....	8,755.26
Avanell K. Bass.....	Office manager (to Feb. 28, 1971).....	2,147.75
Leroy C. Bedell, Jr.....	Investigator.....	8,398.32
Michael William Blommer.....	Associate chief counsel (from Mar. 1, 1971).....	8,333.32
Beverly Bondy.....	Secretary (to Jan. 1, 1971).....	45.43
Marian Canty.....	Secretary to the Chairman.....	5,798.85
Frederick B. Collison.....	Investigator.....	6,959.36
Joseph M. Cribben.....	Associate chief investigator.....	12,256.24
Elsworth D. Dory.....	Investigator.....	8,329.14
Mary Faye Downey.....	Secretary.....	3,457.15
Lina Mabel Duran.....	do.....	5,566.46
Hazel K. Edwards.....	Secretary to the associate chief counsel.....	5,566.46
Roberta S. Gerson.....	Secretary to the chief counsel.....	5,721.54
Mary N. Goulart.....	Finance officer.....	7,009.21
Deborah Hastings.....	Research assistant.....	5,237.08
Patricia C. Hester.....	Secretary.....	4,454.34
Alvin J. Lorman.....	Investigator.....	4,198.22
Raphael J. Madden.....	Research assistant.....	3,681.46
H. Christopher Nolde.....	Associate counsel (from Feb. 9, 1971).....	9,987.95
Paul L. Perito.....	Chief counsel.....	17,916.56
Michael D. Petit.....	Press officer (to Jan. 2, 1971).....	106.41
Mary G. Poore.....	Secretary/office manager.....	5,721.54
Andrew Radding.....	Assistant counsel.....	7,966.17
Larry T. Reid.....	Associate chief counsel (to Jan. 2, 1971).....	161.97
Jordan Payman Rose.....	Assistant counsel (from May 17, 1971).....	2,140.17
Alberta E. Sandel.....	Secretary (to Jan. 2, 1971).....	45.43
Margaret M. Schauer.....	Secretary.....	5,292.24
James F. Southerland.....	Executive director (to Jan. 2, 1971).....	166.69

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime.

JUNE 30, 1971.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESTAURANT

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell.....	Staff director.....	\$9,357.35
Judy A. Crowe.....	Secretary.....	3,684.14
Total.....		13,041.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$43,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	0
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1971 to June 30, 1971.....	13,215.79
Total amount expended from.....	
to	
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	29,784.21

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1971.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emilia E. Parrish.....	Secretary.....	\$5,545.83
Marilyn Wilkinson.....	Secretary.....	1,703.37
William A. Keel, Jr.....	Research analyst.....	17,761.50
Myrtle Ruth Foutch.....	Clerk.....	8,736.12
Donna M. Santoro.....	Secretary.....	4,131.53
Henry A. Robinson.....	Counsel.....	15,610.33
Robert M. Walker.....	Staff assistant.....	1,742.25
Leslie R. Pennington.....	Printing editor.....	8,654.97
Carol Ann Fowkes.....	Secretary.....	2,617.33
Susan E. Driggers.....	Secretary.....	3,054.13
Michael R. Lemov.....	Consultant.....	13,525.47
Clifford E. Payne, Jr.....	Staff assistant.....	3,554.56
Justinus Gould.....	Counsel.....	15,610.33
Donald B. Roe.....	Counsel.....	8,654.97
Joanna G. O'Rourke.....	Secretary.....	2,141.19
Mary Ellen Owens.....	Secretary.....	2,851.51
Howard Greenberg.....	Staff Director.....	17,761.50
Linda W. Kinkead.....	Secretary.....	5,651.02
Donna R. Stagnito.....	do.....	41.67
Charles E. O'Connor.....	General counsel.....	14,761.50
John Rayburn.....	Counsel.....	1,666.67
T. J. Oden.....	do.....	8,654.97
Christine Santoro.....	Secretary.....	3,620.13
Dorothy M. Jordan.....	do.....	2,197.21
Linda Louise Spakes.....	do.....	2,333.34
Mary Biddle Dick.....	Secretary, minority.....	1,166.66
Margaret L. Carpenter.....	do.....	5,168.43
Fred Wertheimer.....	Minority counsel.....	4,153.57
Bernadette O. Romanesk.....	Secretary, minority.....	4,415.61
James R. Phalen.....	Assistant minority counsel.....	6,329.08
John M. Finn.....	Minority counsel.....	10,401.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$530,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended, Jan. 3, 1971-June 30, 1971.....	206,596.99
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1971-June 30, 1971.....	206,596.99
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	323,403.01

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

JULY 23, 1971.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eugene F. Peters.....	Executive director (from Mar. 19).....	\$10,300.00
Nicholas A. Masters.....	Staff director (from Apr. 1).....	8,000.01
Donald G. Tacheron.....	Director of research (from Apr. 1).....	8,000.01
Raymond L. Gooch.....	Staff counsel (from June 1).....	2,083.33
George Meader.....	Staff counsel (from June 11).....	1,241.33
Cynthia K. Watkins.....	Clerk (from Mar. 24).....	2,559.73
Louis Meyer Gerber.....	Clerk (from Apr. 9).....	2,166.67
Francis Joseph Butler.....	Clerk (from May 14).....	1,175.00
Wilma R. Berarducci.....	Clerk (from May 17).....	977.78
James J. Hennelly.....	Clerk (from June 1).....	340.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	0
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	0
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30.....	\$37,238.96

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30.....	37,238.96
Balance unexpended as of.....	0

JACK BROOKS,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1971.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1971, to June 30, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren.....	Clerk and counsel.....	\$15,382.16
Charles S. Brewton.....	General counsel.....	15,113.53
George T. Ault.....	Professional staff member.....	10,472.50
Cary H. Copeland.....	do.....	8,964.63
Mattie I. Echols.....	Secretary.....	5,420.79
Thomas L. McNamara.....	Professional staff member.....	3,295.72
William Bruce Woodard.....	Clerk assistant.....	1,062.50
Helen O. McDaniel.....	do.....	1,000.00
Joel V. Lumer.....	Staff assistant.....	1,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$128,930.00
--	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	60,299.92
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1971.....	61,938.66
Total amount expended, July 1, 1970-June 30, 1971.....	122,238.58

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1971.....	6,691.42
---	----------

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

987. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed budget amendments for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1972 (H. Doc. No. 92-146); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

988. A letter from the Acting Director of ACTION, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional funds for ACTION; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

989. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 71-18, pertaining to certain military assistance, pursuant to section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

990. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1971 progress report on the Western U.S. water plan, pursuant to title II of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

992. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of the determination of the Interior Department on deferment of the 1971 construction payment due the United States from the San Angelo Water Supply Corp., in connection with the San Angelo reclamation project, Texas, pursuant to 78 Stat. 584; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 853), as amended (16 U.S.C. 460k-460k-4) to release certain restrictions on acquisition of lands for recreational development at fish and wildlife areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

994. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the second annual report on the work incentive program, pursuant to section 440 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. BOLAND: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 9382 (Rept. No. 92-377). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 760. A bill to revise and improve the laws relating to the documentation of vessels; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8432. A bill to authorize emergency loan guarantees to major business enterprises; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 9910. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10090. A bill making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of

Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McFALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 9667 (Rept. No. 92-382). 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. BARING (for himself, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. McCLOY, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 10062. 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. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10063. A bill to promote fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no income tax shall be imposed on servicemen who die while in active service or as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while in active duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10065. A bill to redesignate the Washington National Airport as "Neil Armstrong Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 10066. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods for disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10067. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10068. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to encourage physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other medical personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10069. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to impose certain limitations on the disposal of and contracts for the acquisition of chemical, biological, and radiological warfare agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10070. A bill to require the Council on Environmental Quality to make a full and complete investigation and study of national policy with respect to the discharging of material into the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10071. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 10072. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to exempt from the draft physicians who agree to practice at least 4 years in rural and inner city doctor-shortage area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain

tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 10074. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to extend minimum wage and overtime compensation protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, to improve standards of overtime compensation protection, to provide improved means of enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10075. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia, to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10076. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Rumania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10077. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreement with any country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 10078. A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 10079. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 10080. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish a separate board to review the discharges and dismissals of servicemen for narcotic-drug-related causes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ADABBO, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FORSTYHE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. THONE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. KEE, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 10081. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish and carry out a bottled drinking water control program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BURTON, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 10082. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish and carry out a bottled drinking water control program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 10083. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10084. A bill to provide maternity benefits for pregnant wives of certain former servicemen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10085. A bill to prohibit the introduction or delivery for introduction into commerce of the chemical compound known as polychlorinated biphenyl; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. SKUBITZ) (by request):

H.R. 10086. A bill to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10087. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 10090. A bill making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 803. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Florida, or in the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution providing for the display in the Capitol Building of a

portion of the moon; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. HULL, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Volunteer Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 806. 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. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 378. Concurrent resolution: support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 380. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

247. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the east side division of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

248. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to services of the Federal Government to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

249. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to exempting public employees' benefit and pension plans from the provisions of the proposed Employee Benefit Security Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Edgar Buchowiecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 10089. 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.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

113. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL HEALTH PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Johns Hopkins University Hospital has just opened an out-patient facility for children. The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine has pioneered in techniques to combat disease, and emphasized the importance of children's medical services.

At this point I want to insert an article from the Baltimore Sun of July 11 about the new Johns Hopkins University Hospital outpatient facility for children.

HOPKINS PROGRAM KEEPS KIDS WELL

(By Marion D. Gutman)

The Edwards A. Park Building, the Johns Hopkins Hospital's new out-patient facility for children, will open tomorrow and its first tenant, the Comprehensive Child Care Program, will occupy the third floor.

Dr. Robert H. Drachman, director of both this program and the new building, calls the addition to the Hopkins facilities "representative of a new and major commitment on the part of the hospital to provide comprehensive health services to the children in the area. It is the only new building in the history of the hospital that has been dedi-

cated solely and specifically to giving out-patient care to children."

The building bears the name of Dr. Edwards A. Park, internationally known professor of pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins Hospital from 1927 to 1946. It is on Monument street, just east of Broadway, and adjoins the Children's Medical and Surgical Building. Cost of construction was about \$3,000,000; most of this came from private gifts and endowments. Federal funds account for about one-fifth of the total.

A distinctive feature is the first-floor trauma center, for children only. It was established to spare children, already traumatized by their own emergencies, the sight of adults in various stages of distress.

The first floor will also contain a laboratory equipped to analyze and test minute quantities of blood, X-ray facilities, and offices for social workers, nutritionists, and school counselors.

The second and third floors of the building will be devoted to treatment of minor illnesses and preventive care. The prototype for these services, according to Dr. Drachman, will be the Comprehensive Child Care Program, generally considered a major breakthrough in providing health care to inner-city children.

ONE OF 60

The Hopkins Program is one of 60 throughout the country with funds allocated by the Children's and Youth Act of 1966. Baltimore has five, and the Hopkins program cares for the largest number of children.

The four others are attached to University Hospital, Sinal Hospital, City Hospitals and

the Greater Baltimore Medical Center. Each is committed to serving the disadvantaged in its immediate vicinity. Provident Hospital operates a Neighborhood Health Center, which serves adults as well as children and is funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Hopkins Comprehensive Child Care Program extends to portions of the nine census tracts surrounding the hospital. The boundaries are roughly 25th street, Harford road, and Preston street on the north; Monument, Jefferson and Orleans streets on the south; Chester street on the east, and Caroline street and the Falls way on the west.

At the time that the program was initiated, neighborhood health facilities for the well child over 5 were meager. Those 5 and under had the advantage of routine checkups and immunizations in the Eastern Health District's Well-Baby Clinics. Sick children were seen in the Harriet Lane out-patient department or in the emergency room. But the only health resources available to children over 5, with no apparent ailment, were the private physicians. Those who offered pediatric care were few and widely scattered. Furthermore, private medical attention was beyond the financial capabilities of most families.

The Comprehensive Child Care Program offers for the child under 18 routine checkups, immunizations, dental care, hearing, speech, and vision examinations, family counseling, and of course, treatment of the ill child. This service is free because of federal funding. The clinic is open until 9 P.M., Monday through Friday, for the convenience of the working parent.