tenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Carlisle, Ellis L., [redacted].
Carreker, Larry E., [redacted].
Murphy, Rick L., [redacted].
Ortiz, Julio E., [redacted].
Powers, Donald G., [redacted].
Reid, John A., [redacted].

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 5 (legislative day of August 3) 1971:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Peter G. Nash, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. William A. Browne, [redacted] FG, Mississippi Air National Guard.
Col. William S. Elmore [redacted] FG, Alaska Air National Guard.
Col. Wendell G. Garrett [redacted] FG, Indiana Air National Guard.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Cirilo L, Adan, Jr., to be captain, and ending Gary A. Zuelsdorf, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 28, 1971.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, August 6, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.—Ephesians 4: 3.

God of grace and goodness, from whom cometh our help for the present and our hope for the future, ere we depart for our recess we invoke Thy blessing upon us and upon our country.

As we leave this Chamber, we commit ourselves with our loved ones to Thee, praying that the benediction of Thy presence may rest upon our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who work with them. In spite of our weaknesses and our shortcomings, speak Thou to us and through us that Thy kingdom may come. Thy will be done, and Thy peace be spread abroad in all human hearts.

"God save America, 'mid all her splendors;
Save her from pride and from luxury.
Enthrone in her heart the unseen and eternal:
Right be her might and truth keep her free."
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. 2596. An act to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the Executive Protective Service, to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2600. An act to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability;

H.R. 7718. An act to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America; and

H.R. 8794. An act to provide for the payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services provided certain retired, disabled officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes.

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. 4713. An act to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies; and

H.R. 9844. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

S. 291. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 996. An act relating to the transportation of mail by the U.S. Postal Service;

S. 1245. An act to amend the Act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data;

S. 1989. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the renewal of certain star route contracts;

S. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; and

S. 2393. An act to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to make areas suffering from economic disasters eligible for emergency Federal aid, to improve the aid which would become available to economic disaster areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9844) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRIBUTE PAID JOHN MURPHY BY CONGRESSMAN SIKES

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the good work done by Members of Congress seldom makes the headlines. It is one of the tragedies of modern news reporting that only the sensational is sought. Yet there is a great deal of sound, constructive work done by dedicated Members of the House and they do this out of devotion to their responsibilities.

One of the best examples of constructive and capable work is being performed by our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, whose work on drug problems, particularly as these problems affect servicemen, has been outstanding. He has examined the problem firsthand in the United States and abroad and he is probably better informed than any other Member of Congress on this serious and aggravated situation. His statements before the House and before the committees reveal the depth of his knowledge and the extent of his activities to provide useful information and constructive solutions. JOHN MURPHY'S work deserves the plaudits of the Nation. In particular, should we in the House express our appreciation for his untiring efforts in this field.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON U.S. MAGISTRATES AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled the following hearings:

On September 9, 1971, the subcommittee will hold hearings on H.R. 7375, to

remove the statutory ceiling on salaries payable to U.S. magistrates, and H.R. 9180, to provide for the temporary assignment of a U.S. magistrate from one judicial district to another.

On September 10, 1971, the subcommittee will hold hearings on H.R. 9223, to increase the limit on dues for U.S. membership in the International Criminal Police Organization.

These hearings will begin at 10 a.m. of the respective dates and will be held in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon indicated that he would not sell his "investments in the American economy—whether it is in stocks or real estate or what have you."

I am afraid that the President is talking to the wrong people.

Most of the people in the United States do not have these types of investment. Their investments in the American economy are in washing machines and refrigerators—and the clothing and food that goes into these appliances.

Their investments in the American economy are in their jobs—and whether that job is still going to be there tomorrow.

This year might be a good year for the President's view of the American investor—and next year might be a very good year for that same investor.

Most of the people, however, are looking to right now, and they want strong steps taken to curb inflation and unemployment.

I have advised President Nixon today of the results of one of the questions which I asked in my recent questionnaire sent throughout my district.

I asked: With unemployment and inflation seriously affecting the economy, do you feel the President should use the powers already granted him by Congress to freeze prices and wages?

The results: Nearly 4 to 1 said "yes."

THE TRANSICARE ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I recently held hearings in my congressional district—New York's 27th Congressional District—concerning the problems of the elderly. I have been inserting the transcript of these hearings into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the past few days, and it is quite clear from the testimony that the needs of our older citizens have been shamefully neglected. Many older citizens are forced to live in isolation under conditions of extreme hardship.

One area which was repeatedly mentioned during the hearing was the difficulty that many older people have in getting adequate transportation. This unavailability of adequate transportation has a very adverse impact on the lives of older people. It hampers the elderly in their efforts to get good medical care and other health care services. Obviously, you cannot get any benefit from a doctor you cannot get to see.

Today, I am taking a limited step in solving this problem by introducing the Transicare Act of 1971. This bill would amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include transportation as a medical expense covered by part B of the medicare program.

We have long recognized that adequate transportation and the ability to get good medical care go hand in hand. For instance, the Internal Revenue Service allows tax deductions for transportation which is "primarily for and essential to" the receipt of medical services. I have adopted this same test in my bill for a determination of whether payment should be made for the cost of transportation to and from a place where covered services are provided. This legislation provides for regulations to carry out the purposes of the act. The text of the act is as follows:

H.R. 10483

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for transportation to and from the place where an individual receives services covered under that program or under the hospital insurance program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Transicare Act of 1971."

SEC. 2. Section 1861(s)(7) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(7) transportation of an individual to and from a place where he is furnished services with respect to which benefits are payable under this title (including ambulance service where the use of other methods of transportation is contraindicated by his condition), when determined under regulations to be primarily for and essential to the receipt of such services;".

SEC. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to transportation which occurs (or is commenced) on or after the first day of the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

This amendment, if adopted, would not lead to a significant increase in the cost of premiums paid by participants in the supplementary medical insurance program.

It is difficult to accurately estimate the cost of the program. For one thing, the Internal Revenue Service has no figures available on how much money is deducted from tax returns annually for the cost of transportation as a medical expense.

It is safe to say, however, that the cost will not be prohibitive.

For example, there are 19.7 million participants in the medicare program. An extremely generous estimate would be that every medicare participant will go to the doctor six times a year, and spend $4 on transportation each trip. This would represent a total expenditure of $480 million per year, of which 80 percent would be reimbursable. Since half of the cost of the program is met by the Federal Government, the consequent increase in medicare premiums under this exaggerated example would be approximately $9 per year, or 75 cents per month.

However, there are many factors which act to lessen this cost. First, we know that every participant will not go to a doctor six times a year. Also, $4 per person per trip is much more than the average person will pay, because this amount is equivalent to a long taxicab ride. Second, the first $50 spent per year on medical expenses is not payable under medicare, and in a majority of instances, the transportation expense will not be large enough to push covered expenditures significantly past the $50 level. In fact, as things presently stand, only 45 percent of the medicare participants actually exceed the $50 deductible level, and it is questionable how much of this excess would be for transportation.

I think we are talking about a program that will cost at the very most in the neighborhood of $380 million per year, but probably much less. This area would be an appropriate matter for further investigation, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means will give the question of cost its prompt and thorough attention.

The inability of older people to get adequate transportation is not a whimsical contention. Our transportation system in this country is built around the use of the private automobile, and those persons who do not own an automobile or are unable to operate one are very limited in their mobility.

Many older people do not own cars because they cannot afford them or because it is difficult for them to get insurance. In addition, because they may be in poor health, many older people cannot get driver's licenses or perhaps do not trust themselves behind the wheel.

Also, modern superhighways with their high speeds and complicated routing systems can make driving difficult as can the extremely congested traffic conditions we experience in our larger cities.

As a consequence of this situation, many older people are forced to rely upon public transportation systems such as trains, buses, and taxicabs. These vehicles present obstacles in themselves.

For instance, bus stops and train stations can be one or more blocks away from a person's home, and frequently they are a great distance. Since there is a good chance that an older person will experience some difficulty in walking long distances, that person is not likely to use public transportation unless he really is forced to.

In addition, the infrequency of buses which are run over commuter routes, the necessity of making several transfers, the crowding conditions, the fear of crime while waiting for the bus, have all acted to deter the older person from using the transportation which is available to him.

Certainly the legislation I am proposing today will not solve the mobility crisis experienced by our older citizens. There is no single solution.

But access to good medical care must be seen as among the most urgent needs of our older citizens, and this legislation would make it possible for almost all of the participants in the medicare program to afford visiting the doctor. Also, if the participant in medicare is given access to transportation, it is possible that he might not require a doctor to make a house call when he might otherwise have no alternative.

One of things we are just beginning to realize about our deteriorating health-care system in America is that our emphasis has been placed on the curative aspects of medical treatment. We have done very little to prevent illness, and the doctor gets to the patient only after illness has occurred. The older person, who is probably living on a fixed income, is not going to spend the money to get to a doctor unless the trip is absolutely necessary. This financial restriction removes any opportunity the doctor or the older person has to discover a potentially dangerous physical condition and correct it before it does any damage.

I would like to emphasize that payment for transportation under this bill will be subject to the same regulations which effect other types of payment for covered services—medicare pays for 80 percent of the cost of medical services after the first $50, which the participant must pay himself.

This legislation must be seen as one skirmish in our battle to solve the mobility crisis of older Americans. It is not a panacea.

The difficulties which confront older people in getting transportation are in some degree shared by all of us in this automobile-dominated transportation system. The reason for this bill is that these problems affect the older person more severely, and the older person, because of low income and possible infirmity, is not as able to overcome these difficulties.

THE MINE LAW IS BEING UNDERMINED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Congress, in enacting the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 742, Dec. 30, 1969) declared that—

"(a) *the first priority and concern of all in the coal mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner.*

* * * * *

"(c) *there is an urgent need* to provide more effective means and measures for improving working conditions and practices in the Nation's coal mines in order to prevent . . . *occupational diseases originating in such mines.*" (Italics supplied.)

The coal operators, the Interior Department, and officials of the Bureau of Mines have consistently chosen to ignore this declaration. They look upon the law with disdain. They seek to subvert it. The small coal operators have once again sued to test the constitutionality of the civil penalty provisions of the law—see McKinney, et al. against Morton, et al., filed June 29, 1971, No. 1414, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Kentucky.

IGNORING INTENT OF CONGRESS

Today, I want to report to the House another example of this. Once again, the Bureau of Mines—this time apparently with the tacit approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—has quietly found, in cooperation with coal operators, a new way to undermine the law and to ignore this congressional declaration of policy.

Title II of the 1969 law established interim mandatory health standards designed primarily to reduce the incidence of the dreaded "black lung" disease which is so prevalent among the Nation's coal miners. Miners exposed to excessive respirable dust concentrations contract this disease. The objective of the law is to control this disease through the establishment of a respirable dust standards for the active workings of a mine. Under the law, each coal operator must "continuously maintain the average concentration of respirable dust in the mine atmosphere during each shift to which each miner in the active workings of such mine is exposed at or below 3 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air." By the end of 1972, this standard will be 2 milligrams. Provision is also made for sampling the dust levels. Violations of the standard results in civil penalties and mine closures.

When Congress considered this feature of the law, the Senate, and many of us in the House, urged that the measurement be on a single shift basis and that if the dust level exceeds the standard at any time "during any shift," it would be a violation. The House version permitted measurements to be taken and averaged over several shifts and if the average exceeded the level, there was a violation. The conferees resolved this difficulty as follows (H. Conf. Rept. 91–761, Dec. 16, 1969, p. 75):

"The substitute adopted by the conference requires the operator to maintain continuously the average concentration of respirable dust in the mine atmosphere during each shift to which each miner is exposed at or below the established maximum standard or the permitted maximum standard. *It also provides that the term 'average concentration' means that, for a maximum period of 18 months after enactment, measurements of a minimum number of the same production shifts in consecutive order are authorized to obtain a statistically valid sample. At the end of this 18-month period, it requires that the measurements be over one production shift only, unless the Secretary and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare find, in accordance with the standard-setting procedure of section 101, that single-shift measurements will not accurately represent the atmospheric conditions during the measured shift to which the miner is continuously exposed.*" (Italics supplied).

MEASUREMENT AVERAGED OVER ONE PRODUCTION SHIFT

Thus, as of June 30, 1971, the measurements, under the law, were to be averaged "over one production shift only" rather than over several shifts, unless both Secretaries found by then that such single shift measurements were not possible from the standpoint of technology. It should be noted that even when a single shift measurement is prescribed, the act contemplates that more than one shift at each mine would be sampled each month to avoid the possibility of doctoring the sample. But the average at the end of each shift could not exceed the standard.

June 30, 1971, came and went without these agencies meeting the requirements of the law.

Finally, Secretary of the Interior Morton and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Richardson published in the Federal Register on July 17, 1971 (36 F.R. 13286), a proposed "Notice of Finding that Single Shift Measurements of Respirable Dust will not Accurately Represent Atmospheric Conditions During Such Shift." The notice gives interested persons 30 days to comment thereon. The text of the proposed "notice" appears at the end of my remarks.

The notice states that in "April, 1971, a statistical analysis was conducted by the Bureau of Mines, using as a basis the current basic samples for the 2,179 working sections in compliance with the dust standard on the date of the analysis." These samples were derived from 21,790 samples taken over a 3-month period ending on April 13, 1971. These measurements were used by both Secretaries to make the finding that a "single shift" measurement was not possible.

FAULTY DATA USED FOR FINDING

In my opinion, the data upon which the Secretaries made this finding are faulty and therefore the finding is in error. Let me explain.

First. No effort was made by the Bureau to take test samples in order to make this finding. Instead, the Bureau of Mines relied entirely on operator samples submitted to it under the regular sampling program. Many miners have told me that these samples, in many cases, are not reliable. It is alleged in at least one mine, a miner wearing a personal sampler began a shift near the face where the dust is highest, but part way through the shift he was moved back to a less dustier area of the mine while still wearing the sampler. More than likely, the average of that sample would show no violation of the standard.

Even if this alleged doctoring of the sample did not occur here, it can hardly be said that the Bureau and HEW met the requirements of the law when they failed to conduct any sampling before making this finding. The regulator has a duty under the law to conduct independent sampling to make this finding.

The Bureau of Mines did not establish until the last 2 weeks of April 1971 an effective spot health inspection program. At the end of May 1971, 400 spot health inspections were made. The results of the samples taken by the inspectors are apparently still being compared to the results obtained by the operators.

LETTERS TO SECRETARIES MORTON AND RICHARDSON

Second. No effort was made to take single shift measurements with side-by-side instruments sampling the mine atmosphere and to determine the variations between instruments.

I wrote to Secretary Morton and Sec-

retary Richardson on July 2, 1971, pointing out to them how faulty this data is. I urged that the published notice of July 17 be rescinded and new findings be made.

I also pointed out to them that the notice does not indicate when the two agencies will again review their finding to determine, in light of later technology, whether or not single shift measurements are possible. The notice implies that, having made this finding, both agencies will never consider the matter again.

HIGH PRODUCTION AT EXPENSE OF HEALTH?

The Secretaries apparently are following the administration's strict constructionist philosophy that since the law did not specifically call for such future review, none should be made. Perhaps the administration feels that the miner's health is not as important as the operator's production and the fear of brownouts. If they review the finding 6 months or 1 year from now, they may find that technology will accurately permit single shift measurements. But the operators do not want this. They prefer multiple shift measurements, because such measurements result in less violations.

I urged both Secretaries to provide for such review.

Mr. Speaker, when I delved more deeply into the development of this notice, I found evidence that the Bureau of Mines and HEW did not follow the procedures established in the law for making the above finding.

VIOLATION OF THE LAW

The law quite clearly states in section 101 that there must be consultation with "the Secretary of Labor, and with other interested Federal agencies, appropriate representatives of State agencies, appropriate representatives of the coal mine operators and miners, other interested persons and organizations, and so forth."

Of course, the law is more often than not observed in the breach by the Bureau of Mines. That is exactly what happened in the case of this finding.

On June 23, 1971, the Bureau held an unpublicized meeting to "consult" on the single-shift measurement requirement of the law. It was a cozy meeting with Bureau and HEW officials, the coal operators, and a single representative from United Mine Workers of America.

A LOADED MEETING

The participants were: Mr. Green, Solicitor's Office, Interior Department; Mr. Peluso, Bureau of Mines; Mr. Suder, Bureau of Mines; Mr. Fannick, Bureau of Mines; Mr. Philips, Bureau of Mines, Mr. Sutton, HEW; Dr. L. Kerr, United Mine Workers of America; Mr. Vines, BCOA; Mr. Zanolli, BCOA; Mr. Kobrick, Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Mr. Calhoun, Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co.; Mr. Connor, J & L Coal Co.; Mr. Morse, United States Steel; Mr. Smith, National Steel; Mr. Parisi, Consolidation Coal Co.; and Mr. Holcomb, small mine operators.

The States were not represented.

The Secretary of Labor was not represented.

No coal miners were there.

Other interested persons and organizations were not represented.

Just a quiet little get-together with the operators, who, as you can see, dominated the meeting, and one lonely member of the UMW.

What did they do? Why they killed the single-shift measurement idea of Congress. The operators vehemently attacked the idea. Dr. Kerr opposed it because he thought that only one sample would be taken a month. He said the operators could manipulate a single sample too easily. But Bureau of Mines officials knew full well that more than one sample per month was contemplated. They never told Dr. Kerr this, however, until after the meeting and after the decision was made.

THE COAL OPERATORS ALWAYS GET THE WORD

Let me now tell you of another bit of chicanery between the Bureau and the operators.

The day before this meeting Bureau officials gave to the Bituminous Coal Operators Association advance copies of proposed changes in the regulations governing dust sampling.

These changes were to be discussed at the meeting. They included a reduction in the number of samples to be taken from 10 to five and the provision that if any one sample exceeded 3.5 milligrams, the operator would be found in violation. The 0.5 milligram was added to the 3-milligram standard apparently to compensate for variations that occur in the instruments and inaccuracies that occur in weighing of the sample.

VIGOROUS OPPOSITION BY COAL OPERATORS

Dr. Kerr was not given a copy of the proposed changes before the meeting or, for that matter, at the meeting. In fact, they were never discussed because of the vigorous opposition expressed by the operators to single shift measurements. Instead, they were quietly discarded or shelved.

Mr. Speaker, in my letter to Secretary Morton and to Secretary Richardson I describe these last two outrageous events. I said that since the procedures outlined in the law which were to be followed in making this finding were abandoned by the Bureau and by Health, Education, and Welfare, and since the substituted procedures were, at the very least, suspect, I also urged "that the published notice be rescinded."

HOW CAN A REGULATORY AGENCY BE SO CALLOUS?

I find it difficult to understand how a regulatory agency charged by Congress with a duty to protect the coal industry's "most precious resource—the miner" could be so callous. The officials of this Bureau have constantly ignored the law in favor of the operator and coal production.

How many examples of this maladministration do we need before we act to correct the situation?

Once again I urge, as I have for many months, that Congress enact legislation to transfer the Bureau of Mines' health and safety regulatory functions to the Department of Labor.

The text of the joint Interior-Health, Education, and Welfare notice of July 17, 1971, and my letters to Secretaries Morton and Richardson are as follows:

JOINT INTERIOR-HEW REGULATIONS OF JULY 17, 1971 (36 F.R. 13286)

Office of the Secretary, Coal Mine Health and Safety—

Notice of Finding That Single Shift Measurements of Respirable Dust Will Not Accurately Represent Atmospheric Conditions During Such Shift

Section 202(f) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 801; 83 Stat. 742) provides that the term "average concentration" means a determination which accurately represents the atmospheric conditions with regard to respirable dust to which each miner in the active workings of a mine is exposed (1) as measured, during the period ending June 30, 1971, over a number of continuous production shifts to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (2) as measured thereafter, over a single shift only, unless the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare find, in accordance with the provisions of section 101 of the Act, that such single shift measurement will not, after applying valid statistical techniques to such measurement, accurately represent such atmospheric conditions during such shift, that is, the shifts during which the miner is continuously exposed to respirable dust.

Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with section 101 of the Act, and based on the data summarized below, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare find that single shift measurement of respirable dust will not, after applying valid statistical techniques to such measurement, accurately represent the atmospheric conditions to which the miner is continuously exposed.

In April 1971, a statistical analysis was conducted by the Bureau of Mines, using as a basis the current basic samples for the 2,179 working sections in compliance with the dust standard on the date of the analysis. In accordance with the sampling procedures set forth in Part 70, Subchapter O, Chapter I, Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, these current basic samples were submitted to the Bureau over a period of time prior to the date the analysis was conducted. The average concentration of the current 10 basic samples was compared with the average of the two most recently submitted samples of respirable dust, then to the three most recently submitted samples, then to the four most recently submitted samples, etc. The results of these comparisons showed that the average of the two most recently submitted samples of respirable dust was statistically equivalent to the average concentration of the current basic samples for each working section in only 9.6 percent of the comparisons. Figure 1 lists the results of the comparisons and shows that a single shift measurement would not after applying valid statistical techniques, accurately represent the atmospheric conditions to which the miner is continuously exposed.

Figure 1

Percent which is statistically equivalent to the average of the 10 basic samples

Number of samples:	
3	9.6
3	25.1
4	42.3
5	55.7
6	67.2
7	76.5
8	85.2
9	92.7
10	100

The data from which the above summary has been prepared are available upon request from the Chief, Division of Health, Coal Mine

Health and Safety, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.

Interested persons may submit written comments, suggestions, or objections to the Director, Bureau of Mines, Washington, D.C. 20240, no later than 30 days following publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Dated: July 12, 1971.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior.

Dated: July 12, 1971.

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[FR Doc. 71-10150 Filed 7-16-71; 8:47 am]

LETTER OF JULY 21, 1971 TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

JULY 21, 1971.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MORTON: On July 17, 1971, there was published in the Federal Register (36 F.R. 13286) a proposed "Notice of Finding" by Secretaries of the Interior and Health, Education and Welfare as follows:

"Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with section 101 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, and based on the data summarized below, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare find *that single shift measurement of respirable dust will not, after applying valid statistical techniques to such measurement, accurately represent the atmospheric conditions to which the miner is continuously exposed.*" (Italics supplied.)

Section 202(f) of the Act requires that beginning 18 months after December 30, 1969, "respirable dust to which each miner in the active workings of a mine is exposed" must be "measured . . . over a single shift only unless" both Secretaries make the above finding.

I am concerned about the adequacy of the data upon which this finding is based, and about the procedures employed by both Departments in making this finding.

The proposed notice states that in "April, 1971, a statistical analysis was conducted by the Bureau of Mines, using as a basis the current basic samples for the 2,179 working sections in compliance with the dust standard on the date of the analysis." I understand that these samples were derived from 21,790 samples taken over a three-month period ending on April 13, 1971. Thus, the measurements used to make this finding were taken over more than a single shift. Apparently, no effort was made to take single shift measurements with side-by-side sampling and to determine the variations between instruments within the shift. I fail to understand how both Departments can make the above finding without taking such single shift measurements.

I understand that the Bureau of Mines held a meeting on June 23, 1971, to discuss this finding. The participants were:

Mr. Green, Solicitor's Office.
Mr. Peluso, Bureau of Mines.
Mr. Suder, Bureau of Mines.
Mr. Fannick, Bureau of Mines.
Mr. Philips, Bureau of Mines.
Mr. Sutton, HEW.
Dr. L. Kerr, United Mine Workers of America.
Mr. Vines, B.C.O.A.
Mr. Zanolli, B.C.O.A.
Mr. Kobrivk, Bethlehem Steel Corporation.
Mr. Calhoun, Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co.
Mr. Connor, J & L Coal Co.
Mr. Morse, U.S. Steel.
Mr. Smith, National Steel.
Mr. Parisi, Consolidation Coal Co.
Mr. Holcomb, Small Mine Operators.

No public notice was ever given of the meeting. Moreover, the Secretary of Labor was not represented at the meeting, nor was an opportunity provided to permit "other interested persons and organizations" to attend, as required by section 101 of the law.

On the day before the meeting, Bureau officials gave to B.C.O.A. officials copies of a draft of a proposal to amend part 70 of the regulations relating to sampling. The draft would have reduced the number of shifts to be measured from 10 to "5 consecutive normal production shifts." It also provided that if any sample exceeded 3.5 miligrams, the operator would be cited for a violation. Dr. Kerr apparently was not given a copy of this draft regulation which was to be discussed at the meeting of June 23.

Due to the vigorous opposition of the B.C.O.A. and the coal operators to a single shift measurement, this draft regulation was never discussed, but was quietly discarded.

In view of the fact that the procedures set forth in section 101 of the Act have not been followed, that the procedures followed are highly suspect, and that the data used by both Departments to support the above finding is faulty, I urge that the published notice be rescinded and new findings be made in accordance with the law. I also urge that the Department publish and adopt the draft regulation given to the B.C.O.A.

The published notice implies that both Departments will *never* review this finding again. Even if we assume that this finding is correct today, technology might develop which would permit valid single shift measurements. I urge that the notice indicate that the matter will be reviewed again in six months or one year.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

PRINCIPAL SUGGESTED REVISIONS OF THE BUREAU OF MINES TO PART 70 OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS RE: DUST SAMPLING GIVEN TO BCOA ON JUNE 22, 1971

PROPOSED BUREAU CHANGE

"§ 70.210 Original sampling cycle; establishment of basic sample."

Samples of respirable dust, with respect to each working section of a coal mine, shall be taken on 5 consecutive normal production shifts, each of which is worked on a separate calendar day, beginning on a normal production shift on the first prodouction day in such working section, except that, with respect to working sections located in multi-section mines, original sampling may be conducted in accordance with the provisions of § 70.241 of this part. For each working section, this series of 5 samples, or a series of 5 samples submitted in accordance with the provisions of § 70.230 of this part, shall constitute the basic sample with respect to that working section.

§ 70.211 Violation of dust standard; original sampling cycle.

(a) If the data recorded pursuant to § 70.261 for an original sampling cycle with respect to a working section of a coal mine establish a cumulative concentration of respirable dust in excess of the cumulative concentration stated in paragraph (b) of this section with respect to the particular applicable limit, without regard to the number of samples analyzed, or if any single sample analyzed by the Bureau in accordance with § 70.261 exceeds the particular applicable limit by more than 0.5 milligram, the Secretary shall issue a notice to the operator that he is in violation of paragraph (a) of § 70.100, or § 70.101 of this Part 70. Paragraph (a) of § 70.100 prescribes a limit of 3.0 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air. Section 70.101 prescribes the respirable dust standard when quartz is present.

(b) The cumulative concentration of respirable dust recorded from samples may be as follows:

(1) When a limit of 3.0 milligrams per cubic meter of air is in effect, the cumulative concentration shall not exceed 15 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air.

(2) If any other limit is in effect under a standard based on the presence of quartz the cumulative concentration shall not exceed 5 times the specified limit of respirable dust per cubic meter of air.

IN SUPPORT OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BATTLE TO COMBAT INFLATION

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to comment today on new developments which will help this Nation to control inflation.

On Tuesday, Congressman MONAGAN and I were joined by more than 50 other Members of the House in reintroducing legislation setting up a high-level Emergency Guidance Board to administer a national system of voluntary wage and price guidelines.

The next day, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, EDWARD BROOKE, and 12 cosponsors introduced similar legislation.

These two actions are symptomatic of the growing national awareness that management, labor, and the Government must work as partners to stem the dangerous rise of inflation by utilizing "sophisticated jawboning" to control prices, profits, and wages.

This growing awareness has been felt at the White House and I welcome the President's announcement of Wednesday, that he is willing to explore the idea by way of congressional hearings.

The President said:

It is essential that government use its power where it can be effective to stop the escalation, or at least temper the escalation, in the wage-price spiral.

The President rejects, at this time, the imposition of "permanent wage and price controls in America," and I concur with him in this. However, it is evident that the administration now sees value in exploring the merits of a voluntary wage and price guidelines system.

Such a temporary system, as I proposed as early as last year, would not impose wage and price controls, but make it incumbent upon major national business enterprises and labor organizations to defend publicly whatever proposals they might have for raising prices and wages, which could continue the skyrocketing inflationary spiral.

Now that hearings have been announced in the Senate, and Speaker ALBERT has announced support for similar hearings in the House, I am confident we can move ahead following the recess to supply the administration the information it requires in order to support the establishment of responsible and practical machinery to aid in the battle to combat inflation.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY WELLINGTON

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, to those who truly love the law, its service can

be a real fulfillment. Such a man was Harry Wellington of Troy, Mo.

For many years he served the judges, lawyers, and their clients, and his last 20 years were spent as a circuit court reporter in Pike, Lincoln, and St. Charles Counties, Mo. He was not an unobtrusive man and part of the pleasure in attending court was to watch Harry interrupt a judge, slow down a lawyer, or admonish a witness.

He was not afraid of work and there were many nights, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays when you would see his car at the courthouse and the light shining in the room where he worked. I know there was at least one lawyer to whom he occasionally made suggestions which spared the young lawyer embarrassing moments in court.

When the court is in session, the script awards the judge the center stage and the contesting lawyers have most of the speaking parts. It is easy, therefore, to forget the clerks, bailiffs, and court reporters whose services are essential to a well-run court. They are not furniture. They live and breathe and serve the law and indeed some like Harry Wellington enrich our society through their devotion to duty.

TRADE WITH RED CHINA

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, there is no way to have fair textile trade with Communist China. The enslaved people of Red China are paid less than 10 cents an hour in wages. They are paid as low as 3 cents an hour. Our Government must make it crystal clear now to China that there is no textile market in the United States. Already we are flooded with cheap, low-wage imports from Asia.

Mr. Speaker, no one is proposing that Brazil import coffee or that Honduras import bananas. It is more incredible that anyone should propose that we import textiles which we already produce in surplus. If trade is resumed with China we should export to them textiles and purchase from China those goods which we do not have.

Mr. Speaker, the following resolution unanimously was adopted by the joint textile committee of the South Carolina General Assembly. This resolution arrived in my office a moment ago, signed by the chairman of the committee, Hon. John D. Long III.

A resolution to urge the United States Government to refrain from any action which would result in textile trade agreements with the Peoples Republic of China until the problems now existing as a result of textile imports from other Southeast Asia countries are satisfactorily resolved.

Whereas, it appears that diplomatic relations between the United States and mainland China are turning toward a closer relationship; and

Whereas, there has already occured a relaxation of trade restrictions between the two countries and further increases in trade are probable in the near future; and

Whereas, the textile industry in this country has suffered for many years from imports of textiles from southeast Asian countries produced with cheap labor and the flood of such imports, unabated by any government action, continues today; and

Whereas, any increase in textile imports from mainland China would result in economic disaster to our textile industry and would cause a further increase in unemployment of thousands of textile workers in the United States. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the South Carolina General Assembly Committee assigned to study problems of the textile industry: That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the Congress of the United States be, and hereby are, memorialized to take no action at any level of government which would result in trade agreements with the Peoples Republic of China under which textiles could be imported into the United Sates until such time as effective action is taken by the executive branch of the government or the Congress to restrict all foreign imports of textiles to levels which would restore the strength and economic well-being to our vital textile industry, now suffering severely from foreign imports.

WORST TRADE DEFICIT SINCE 1873

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is my latest newsletter to my South Carolina constituents:

THE WORST SINCE 1893

Japan has no unemployment. The United States has 4,600,000 people unemployed—over 6.2% of the total work force. Unemployment among minority groups and among the textile industry is much higher, yet Japan insists on pouring more cheap, low-wage foreign textile goods into the United States.

In South Carolina over 20% of the textile industry employees are from the minority race. The national average employment of blacks in industry is only 12%. Forty-seven thousand women in South Carolina are employed in our textile industry—one-third of total textile employment. Mills continue to close in South Carolina as a result of increasing cheap, low-wage foreign imports. Curtailment of the work week seriously affects the purchasing power of our people. Retail stores, wholesalers—virtually every business in Western South Carolina depends on the textile payroll. Schools, hospitals, state and local governments, our church institutions depend largely on textile revenue.

We enacted into law a few days ago an extension of the Appalachia program which will cost over a billion and a half dollars. There are over 400,000 textile jobs in the Appalachian region threatened by low-wage imports. It does not make sense to vote billions to aid Appalachia on one hand and let 400,000 jobs go down the drain on the other.

We face the worst trade deficit since 1893—78 years ago during the panic of that year. I remember as a small boy my father talking of the "Panic of '93." In the second quarter of 1971 our imports exceeded exports by $803,000,000—the worst for any quarter in 25 years. Should this continue through 1971, we would have a trade deficit of 2.5 billion dollars.

A large part of this trade deficit is due to the large volume of low-wage textile imports flooding our country. The textile industry and its 2.4 million employees are seriously threatened. We are in a depression—the worse kind of depression with inflation, declining employment, and a curtailed work week—all at the same time.

No retail store, wholesale establishment, or for that matter any business can long stay in business by buying more than it sells. We cannot stay in the textile business by importing more and more cheap low-wage foreign imports. The United States cannot stay in business any more than an individual by buying abroad more than it sells. No one would advocate Brazil importing coffee or that Honduras import bananas, or that India import tea, or that Malaya import coconuts and rubber; yet the free traders, the economic "brain trust," want the United States to import textiles which we have in surplus. This is utterly incredible. Now textile trade with Communist China is looming on the horizon. There is no way for the United States to have fair textile trade with Communist China when the hourly wage the Reds pay their enslaved workers is less than 10¢ an hour and in some cases less than 3¢ an hour.

The President assured the nation when campaigning in 1968 that the textile industry would be protected from excessive cheap low-wage foreign imports. Nothing to this date has been done.

The President can:

(1) impose quotas on cheap low-wage foreign imports. The President has the power to do so under the law in the interest of the national defense and the general economy.

(2) negotiate trade agreements under the law which would limit the cheap low-wage foreign imports.

(3) recommend to the Congress legislation limiting these cheap low-wage imports.

Again, I have urged the President to exercise his full powers and prerogatives to protect the American people from exploitation and economic ruin.

Chairman Wilbur Mills introduced and guided through the House of Representatives last year a fair trade bill which would protect our industry. The President did not recommend the passage of this bill because of added features concerning shoes. But without shoes, it could not have passed the House of Representatives and the bill ultimately failed further consideration.

Again, this year on January 22nd, Chairman Wilbur Mills and many others of us in the House introduced a fair trade bill which would save our textile industry. So far this year, the President has not recommended that this bill be considered.

I am urging the President to endorse this bill and I am urging Mr. Mills to push for passage of this legislation as the situation hourly grows more critical.

Today for two hours, various members of the House of Representatives took the floor calling this worsening situation to the attention of the Congress and urging legislation and urging the President to act.

As Secretary of the House Informal Textile Committee, I participated in this debate on the floor. We will continue to exert every effort to save our textile industry and the jobs of its employees.

Congress will recess for the month of August. I will return to our Greenwood office where I and my staff will be at your service.

BIG-BUS BILL

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the July 31 issue of the Christian Science Monitor deals with the big-bus bill, H.R. 4354.

BIGGER HIGH-ROAD BUSES GET CONGRESSIONAL PUSH

(By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—A bill to permit bigger buses on interstate highways is rolling smoothly through Congress.

It is pulling away from critics' arguments that:

Bigger and heavier buses will lead inevitably to bigger and heavier trucks.

And bigger buses and trucks will be a safety hazard—harder to pass, with still more wind turbulence to sway autos as they barrel along superhighways.

Already the bill has outdistanced the reach of its most persistent critic, Rep. Fred Schwengel (R) of Iowa. It now awaits fall Senate committee action following House passage July 21—by 213 to 179 on the most crucial vote.

Senate passage this year or next seems likely. If only because no one yet has appeared in the Senate to lead opposition to the bill.

POTENTIAL OPPONENT

One who may wind up stepping forward in opposition is Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R) of Tennessee. He is a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, which will be considering the bill. An aide to Senator Baker says that "if the widening of these buses will create a hazard—and it's pretty obvious that it at least threatens to create a hazard—then you may be sure that we will oppose it.

"Actually, it is our inclination at this time to oppose it."

Others in the Senate are considering opposing the bill on grounds that larger buses would do too much damage to pavement of the interstate system. This and the safety issue were two prime reasons for the defeat during the 1960's of several efforts by the trucking industry to get Congress to pass laws enabling larger trucks to travel the highways.

TRUCK CONNECTION DENIED

One of the things that has infuriated defenders of the "fat-bus bill," as some here call it, is the effort of critics to link the present bill permitting six-inch-wider buses with the future coming of wider and longer trucks.

Rep. James J. Howard (D) of New Jersey labels this effort a "scare tactic." The present bill, a veteran truck booster, Rep. John C. Kluczynski (D) of Illinois, told the House during debate, "contains absolutely no reference to trucks in any form whatsoever, and any attempt to relate it to trucks is pure fantasy."

Representative Schwengel remained unconvinced. He called the wider-bus bill "precedentmaking." And he added: I believe it will lead to a truck bill.

The bill itself would permit states to let buses up to 102 inches wide travel on the interstate highway system. (The maximum width now is 91 inches.) States would decide whether to let the wider buses on interstate roads within their boundaries.

Supporters of the bill say widening of buses would allow seats to be widened, thus helping solve the traffic congestion problem by coaxing motorists into riding intercity buses instead. Said Mr. Kluczynski: "This bill is absolutely necessary for the good of the transportation system of America."

INTERCITY VS. INTRACITY

To which Mr. Schwengel retorted: "Encouraging people to ride intercity buses will do little to solve our urban-intercity traffic problems." He says that "The major portion of the urban traffic congestion results from intracity traffic and not intercity traffic."

Backers of the bill note that 22,000 of the nation's 127,000 commercial buses already are 102 inches wide. Proponents argue that since these generally ride big-city streets, which have narrower traffic lanes than interstate highways, these widths would be as safe on wider interstate lanes.

The redoubtable Mr. Schwengel argues that, for whatever reason, city buses have more accidents than interstate buses now, so their safety hasn't been proved. Besides, he says, since wide buses haven't been operating on higher-speed interstate roads, no one has studied the effects of the air turbulence they make—that rush of wind when buses pass that tugs at the wheel in an auto driver's hand."

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. With such striking disparities in the development of basic economic activities within the United States and the U.S.S.R. it is only natural to find equivalent inequalities in the standard of living of both nations. Such differences are further intensified by the fact that the Soviet Government has appropriated an unusually high proportion of the national output for military purposes and further industrial expansion, whereas in the United States the larger percentage of the total national product is designed to satisfy needs of the individual consumer.

Americans have four times more housing available to them, on a per capita basis than the Soviets. And new housing in the United States is being constructed at a rate 4½ times that of the Soviet Union.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 6

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the day and also the program for the week of September 6.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio's yielding.

There is no further program. We finished our legislative business prior to the recess on last evening.

We will return here on September 8, which is a Wednesday, and for Wednesday and the balance of the week there is scheduled H.R. 9727, the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act, which will be considered under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

A $1,000 RAISE FOR THE POLICE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce today with the support of 25 Members of the House my legislation to provide an exemption from income taxes for the first $5,000 of income of every law enforcement officer in the country.

The increasing crime rate is a major concern of every citizen, every community and every responsible public official. The men in the first line of defense against crime are the police, the law enforcement officers of our cities, counties, and States. They are our most valuable resource in our efforts to achieve a secure and just society.

There is, however, general recognition that we are not providing our law enforcement officers with sufficient compensation for the duties we impose upon them. We are not rewarding their dedication sufficiently to keep them on the front lines against crime and to recruit the necessary numbers to expand our law enforcement efforts.

Our local governments are hard pressed to find the funds they need for law enforcement. The ad valorem tax base is inadequate to the demands of a modern society and we have not been able to develop direct programs of assistance adequate to meet the needs. There is concern about the development of a national police force, if we provide direct Federal financial assistance. And there is concern about the liability to prevent the misuse of Federal funds if we employ block grants and other forms of "revenue sharing."

I have suggested, therefore, that we cut through these objections and provide assistance through the individual income tax return of every law enforcement officer in the land.

We can, through the legislation I have recommended, give each law enforcement officer a pay raise of more than $1,000—without setting up a new program of categorical grants and without setting up a new bureaucracy at the State or Federal levels. We simply have to authorize the individual law enforcement officer to take a $5,000 exemption on his law enforcement income when he files his income tax return.

This would further a national social purpose which is generally recognized. It would do so in a manner which has been accepted in the past—the use of income tax incentives to promote public objectives.

I am delighted to have the support of a broad spectrum of opinion in the House for this legislation, including Messrs. ANDERSON of California, ANDERSON of Tennessee, ASPIN, BEVILL, BUCHANAN, CLARK, DELLUMS, DENHOLM, EILBERG, FULTON of Pennsylvania, HALPERN, HAYS, HELSTOSKI, JONES of Tennessee, KEE, LONG of Louisiana, MADDEN, MINSHALL, MURPHY of Illinois, PERKINS, RONCALIO, THONE, WILSON of California, YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

I urge the consideration of the other Members of this legislation.

REAPING CANCER RESEARCH BENEFITS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very significant article in yesterday's Washington Star by its distinguished science writer, Miss Judith Randal.

Miss Randal discusses a report in the monthly "Hospital Practice" which demonstrates the ability of the National Cancer Institute to go beyond the basic research phase of anti-cancer study to involve a community hospital in the effort to develop and demonstrate effective cancer treatment programs.

As the original House sponsor of legislation to create a National Cancer Authority, I am pleased to see this confirmation of my contention that the problem of cancer can be approached on a broader front than has been possible in the past under our existing programs of cancer research. Our National Institutes of Health have approached medical problems as scientists and sometimes they have forgotten the physician also has something to contribute. Clinical work, as a consequence, is often neglected because the new drugs and procedures are too costly for physicians who lack access to NIH research funds.

Miss Randal points out the success of the Nassau County Medical Center in working as an outpost of the National Cancer Institute program on leukemia financed through Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. The relatively small Nassau center is able to develop significant experience in using multiple-drug and multiple-media treatment because it has received financial support and technical assistance ordinarily denied to physicians treating cancer patients at the clinical level.

It is sometimes said that we cannot use larger sums for the fight on cancer and cannot profitably take a broader approach than the one we have taken in the past through the National Institute of Health. But, as Miss Randal points out, there is much that can be done if we provide the money to supply experimental drugs to more hospitals and medical centers, when those drugs cost from $500 to $1,000 per dose, as is the case for I-asparaginase, an enzyme that exploits the differences between healthy and leukemia cells to the benefit of the leukemia victim.

There are other expensive techniques which cannot be thoroughly explored if our cancer research effort is not funded at a significantly higher level and if we do not take a much broader view of cancer research than we have in the past. And the failure to attack cancer on a broader front means many thousands of unnecessary deaths from this dread disease in years immediately ahead.

As Miss Randal has pointed out:

Cancer research is more and more supported by the taxpayers, and it is only fair that he reap its benefits as fast as they come along.

I do not think we can be satisfied with research for knowledge's sake, when so many hundreds of thousands of Americans face the agonies of cancer each year.

I include Miss Randal's article in the RECORD at this point:

CXVII——1898—Part 23

REAPING CANCER RESEARCH BENEFITS

(By Judith Randal)

At a time when the nation has been all fired up about the prospects for the conquest of various forms of cancer, one question is little asked: Should the cures materialize, what are the chances that the typical patient who goes to the typical hospital will quickly benefit?

Not great, given the complex treatment strategies, highly specialized personnel and costly drugs that are likely to be involved in dealing with so recalcitrant a disease. The average community hospital simply doesn't have these resources at its command. Yet, as is suggested by a current article about childhood leukemia, much more may be possible at this level than is generally recognized.

The article, in the monthly "Hospital Practice," is written by Dr. Carl Pochedly of the Nassau County Medical Center, a smallish hospital on Long Island. It points out, correctly, that the best hope for long-term survival from leukemia lies in therapies which—because they still are experimental—are not generally available except at high-powered research institution with programs linked to the National Cancer Institute.

But instead of despairing that these hospitals can accept just so many patients, Pochedly and Nassau County have devised another plan.

In brief, the Nassau County pediatrics unit has become an outpost of an NCI program at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City where leukemia is concerned. This has meant that its doctors must do things the way those at Mount Sinai do and accept their supervision—a situation that is bound to have created a certain amount of friction.

But it also has meant exposure to a group of professionals who live and breathe leukemia cases, exposure which, says Pochedly, has been stimulating to the Long Island staff and has improved patient care. And it has given the hospital access to research advances it otherwise could not have.

For example, the ordinary hospital and the ordinary doctor cannot obtain I-asparaginase, an enzyme that exploits the difference between healthy and leukemic cells to the patient's advantage. And even if they could obtain it, its cost—from $500 to $1,000 per dose, depending on the amount required—is prohibitive. Yet by becoming a satellite of Mount Sinai, Nassau County gets the drug from the NCI free.

The plan is not as simple as it sounds. NCI protocols, as the treatment regimens are called, are designed not only to help patients who currently have leukemia, but also to improve the outlook for future victims by comparing the relative effectiveness of a variety of drug combinations and other methods such as x-ray therapy.

All this entails careful coordination of an immense amount of laboratory and paper work so that the data can be studied, analyzed by computer and studied again. And hospital authorities must be willing to send out specimens for special testing where their own facilities are unequal to the task. In sum, it is a time-consuming, often tedious job.

In addition, the treatment for leukemia, like the treatment for most forms of cancer, places heavy burdens on the hospital staff.

The premises must be immaculate lest this already grave illness be complicated by infection. Intensive nursing care is needed and resident doctors must be on hand around the clock to give intravenous fluids. Blood platelets must be available for transfusions. And last, but not least, the patient and his family often need a social worker to help them find their way to financial aid. The drug bill alone can run to $5,000 a month.

Not every hospital, of course, can fill this bill and, indeed, those that see leukemia patients only occasionally shouldn't even try. Pochedly says. Nevertheless, the Nassau County experience suggests that many could participate as junior partners in current NCI programs, not only for leukemia, but for other types of cancer as well.

Cancer research is more and more supported by the taxpayer, and it is only fair that he reap its benefits as fast as they come along.

URGES FRANCE TO CURTAIL HEROIN

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the foreign aid bill on August 3 last, I made a statement on the floor about a visit to Marseilles, France, on July 24, by our distinguished Ambassador to France, the Honorable Arthur K. Watson, with members of his staff and me, for a conference with the head of the French Police and of the Narcotics Bureau in the Marseilles area, to impress upon them the gravest concern which the people of the United States feel about the major part of heroin coming into the United States, with all its devastating effect, originating in the laboratories of the Marseilles area and thence being smuggled into our country.

On July 23, I had had, with representatives of our mission in France, many hours of consultation with the chief of the French National Police and the head of the National Narcotics Bureau of France, to whom we had expressed in the strongest terms the concern of the House Select Committee on Crime, our Congress, and the country, about the large volume of heroin entering the United States from France.

In my conferences in Paris and in the conferences which Ambassador Watson and I had in Marseilles, we urged as strongly as we could the necessity for the Government of France to recognize the critical emergency of this problem and to take every possible step in a determined effort to stop, or sharply curtail, the processing of heroin in France and the smuggling of it out of France to the United States. We urged the French to employ such personnel as would be needed to discover and to destroy the laboratories where heroin is being made from a morphine base, and assured the French officials that the United States would expand its cooperation as needed and desired.

I am now pleased to learn that France has named one of its outstanding law enforcement officers as head of the national narcotics bureau, in an effort to stop the production of heroin in France and the smuggling of it out of France into the United States.

Interior Minister Raymond Marcellin announced July 29 that Divisional Commissioner Francois Le Mouel would head the Central Office for the Repression of Illicit Traffic in Narcotics. Mr. Le Mouel is reported to be known as the No. 1 gangbuster in France, and to have had remarkable results in his efforts to crush top French gangsters.

This is heartening news, and I am sure we all share the hope that this is the beginning of what will be a determined and effective campaign to stop the heroin traffic to the United States from Southern France.

We shall follow with the closest interest the work of Mr. Le Mouel, and I am sure he will find our Ambassador and our personnel in France at all times anxious to cooperate with him in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include the announcement of the appointment of Mr. Le Mouel, appearing in the International Herald Tribune for August 1, 1971, entitled "France Appoints Anti-Drug Chief," at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks:

FRANCE APPOINTS ANTI-DRUG CHIEF

PARIS.—France has named its No. 1 gangbuster as head of the national narcotics bureau in a move to step up the warfare on the drug traffickers who have made this country the key source of hard drugs for the United States.

Interior Minister Raymond Marcellin announced yesterday that Divisional Commissioner Francois Le Mouel would head the Central Office for the Repression of Illicit Traffic in Narcotics.

Mr. Le Mouel, Mr. Marcellin pointed out in a communique, created the national antigang squad in 1934 and has since obtained "remarkable results" against top French gangsters.

The current acting head of the drug squad, Divisional Commissioner Michel Nocquet, has been promoted to the police general staff to oversee the operation.

A GIANT STEP TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION

(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, the administration has taken a giant step toward solution of a major transportation problem this week with NASA's announcement requesting submission of proposals for the design and fabrication of two experimental transport-type jet STOL research aircraft.

I applaud this initiative in recognizing the great need for short-haul flights particularly in the high density areas and the potential of many existing airfields with short runways.

I am especially interested in a significant benefit of STOL operation which lies in its potential for reducing the effects of aircraft noise on the community.

Fairchild Industries of Germantown, Md., is one of the pioneers in the STOL aircraft industry with their Porter model. Both Argentina and Ecuador have recently placed orders for the Fairchild Porter. The Damascus, Md., Courier, carried the following story about the Fairchild Porter which I am submitting here:

STOL AIRCRAFT SALES INCREASE

GERMANTOWN, MARYLAND, July 6, 1971.—During the month of June, Fairchild Industries booked or sold nine Porter aircraft.

All are standard Porter models.

Three Porters were sold and delivered to a commercial charter operator in the Far East. Negotiations also were completed with a contract charter operator in Panama for one Porter.

As a direct result of the Argentina Navy's successful operation of its Porter in Antarctica, that organization has ordered another three Porters, which will be delivered during the third quarter of this year.

The two Porters ordered by the Ecuadorian Army this year were delivered to that country last month. The aircraft are being used to increase communications, mail and medical service in outlying areas of the Latin American country.

The Porter is a Short Takeoff and Landing (STOL) aircraft manufactured by Fairchild Industries at Hagerstown, Maryland.

Porter sales now total 37.

ONLY FAA COMPETENT TO DETERMINE SAFETY?

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called upon the Federal Aviation Administration to terminate its contractual arrangements with the sponsors of the Prince Georges County Airpark. I did so in response to the frustrations and the opposition of citizens of Prince Georges County to the construction of the airport and also to the attempts to cancel the project by county and State officials.

I would like to call this matter to the attention of my colleagues because I believe there are fundamental principles at issue which must be resolved if the FAA is to implement its mandate from Congress to create a system of airports in this country which will satisfy the needs of a majority of our citizens.

The simple truth is that the Federal Aviation Administration, in its anxiety to locate a badly needed facility to relieve the strain of general aviation at National Airport, brushed aside these objections, ignored them, and exercised its powers unwisely in my opinion.

I became aware of the magnitude of the problem in January of 1969 when citizens of Bowie, Md., appealed to me that they had never been afforded the opportunity of a public hearing as required by law.

Upon my insistence, the FAA reluctantly agreed to conduct the hearings but, when I attempted to discuss the question of safety, the hearing officer ruled that only the FAA was competent to judge such matters and that they could not be discussed in public hearing. In so ruling, he completely ignored the concern and objections expressed by two Secretaries of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Andrews Air Force Command, not to mention the citizens who live near the proposed airport. These officials had expressed concern about the location but the FAA chose to ignore their objections.

As far back as December 30, 1968, Defense Secretary Clark Clifford wrote to Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd as follows:

Since Septmember 1967, when we first became aware of the Prince Georges Airport proposal, we have endeavored to halt the project. . . . In our opinion, the location selected for this airport presents an unacceptable hazard to safety of flight, and portends operational delays to military traffic at Andrews Air Force Base. Axiomatically, this would also be true of Prince Georges Airport traffic. Essentially, our concern is that construction of this airport will initially interject an increasingly large volume of uncontrolled visual flight rule air traffic through existing arrival and departure paths serving Andrews. Safety would hinge upon the precarious principle of "see and avoid." In the mid-seventies it is expected that the instrument flight rule operations will reach a considerable volume at the proposed airport. The relatively small vectoring airspace, which is now barely adequate for Andrews operations, will be further eroded. . . .

In February, 1969, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird wrote on this question to Secretary of Transportation John Volpe:

Secretary Boyd responded to a letter from Secretary Clifford, dated December 30, 1968, which expressed concern with the Federal Aviation Administration endorsement of a new airport in the vicinity of Andrews Air Force Base. After detailed review of this correspondence, I am convinced that the establishment of Prince Georges County airport within eight miles of Andrews Air Force Base would constitute a serious flight safety hazard. The site selected for this airport lies immediately below the departure and arrival routes serving Andrews Air Force Base which would cause high performance aircraft to intermingle with slower general aviation aircraft. The large increase of uncontrolled general aviation aircraft operating in the vinicity of Andrews Air Force Base would greatly increase the possibility of mid-air collision. Takeoffs, landing, and low approaches at Andrews Air Force Base exceed 200,000 annually. Of these operations, it is estimated that approximately 55% would traverse the Prince Georges County Airport traffic area.

In addition to these two letters, the clear opposition by the Air Force was stated to me in a letter from Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans, Jr., dated July 22, 1969. Secretary Seamans writes:

The proposal of additional air traffic in one of the most heavily congested sectors in the United States and in close proximity to three nearly saturated airports would compound safety problems. Additionally, severe restrictions would be imposed on Air Force operations at Andrews. Departure routes would be complicated and restricted from those currently in existence. Arrival would be delayed because Andrews traffic would alternate with instrument flight rules traffic at Prince Georges County Airport. Terminal approach procedures would be more complicated and more difficult to execute. Paradoxically, it was for these basic reasons the Air Force and Navy moved their flying operations to Andrews from the Bolling-Anacostia complex at the request of the Federal Aviation Administration several years ago.

While the FAA may indeed have final authority to decide the matter of air safety, I believe it is reasonable to assume that it offers small consolation to the residents of the area when the U.S. Air Force and the Secretary of Defense insist that the location presents a safety hazard. Most of us, not being technically proficient in such matters, prefer to think that when the Air Force says it is dangerous, their objections at least deserve discussion in an effort to reassure the layman that the danger is nothing to worry about or that the Air Force's objections have been withdrawn.

In addition to the safety factor, however, there were serious doubts as to whether noise and air pollution had been adequately considered or whether the required compatible use zoning had been assured.

I called to the attention of the hearing officer at that first February 1969 meeting, that the county government, sponsor of the airport, had failed to take the necessary steps to halt construction of homes near the airport and that, even as we discussed the matter, new homes were being built. Evidence was presented that the noise and safety standards then in use by the FAA were outdated. There was strong evidence presented that hearing damage could result for those who lived near the airport for prolonged periods. It was virtually conceded that a proposed elementary school would have to be relocated or soundproofed at extraordinary cost because the airport might seriously interfere with the education of the children. These, and other objections by citizens and qualified witnesses, were brushed aside by the hearing examiner under the preposterous theory that the county government had assured FAA that all of these matters had already been or would be resolved. When you consider that the county officials were also the same people who selected the site in the first place, their assurances have about the same credibility as those given by the fox who was sent to guard the chicken coop.

There has also been a series of controversies surrounding the project which could hardly be said to inspire public confidence.

First, I discovered and called to the FAA's attention that the coordinator of the airpark was also the registered agent for one of the real estate firms selling land to the county upon which the airport was to be built.

Second, the FAA refused to allow the city of Bowie access to its records concerning the matter and the city was forced to secure a court order under the Freedom of Information Act to compel the FAA to allow the city access to FAA records.

And third, Prince Georges officials swore, upon accepting the grant under the Federal Aid to Airport Act, that there were no conditions which might prevent the county from finishing the project when, in fact, the city of Bowie had two suits in court at that time, the purposes of which were to halt the development of the airport.

It was for these reasons that I introduced a resolution in the 91st Congress that a metropolitan airport authority be established to oversee the site selection, acquisition, planning, and management of all airports in Metropolitan Washington. I have reintroduced the resolution with the hope that this Congress would give serious consideration to this legislation.

I am sure that my colleagues are aware of the controversy surrounding the proposed construction of the South Florida Regional Airport near the Everglades National Park.

Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel's strenuous objections to the site on grounds that the noise and air pollution would endanger the species of the Everglades resulted in a postponement of construction.

However, you may not have known that Mr. Hickel also objected to the location of a proposed Prince Georges County airport in Beltsville, Md., not too far from the planned airpark site. In August of 1970, he wrote to me saying:

> The Department of the Interior is strongly opposed to construction of the industrial airpark at the National Agricultural Research Center site. We stand ready to support our opposition when and if this proposal is given serious consideration.

The Secretary also made the point that:

> The industrial airpark would result in severe air, water, land and noise pollution. These problems would not be confined to the immediate area of the airpark but would be present within a radius of several miles surrounding it.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the then Secretary of the Interior, and I believe that his criteria should be applied to the endangered species of Bowie—the human being—who will be the victims of a poorly planned, hastily approved airport.

Mr. Speaker, when the 91st Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, it wrote that its purpose was to:

> Assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
>
> Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences.

Had these principles motivated the FAA and the former Board of County Commissioners of Prince George's County, I feel certain they would have decided that the construction of an airport near Bowie, Md., would have posed as great a danger to the human species as Mr. Hickel was certain that its construction a few miles north would have endangered other species.

Throughout the past 2½ years, FAA and the county government have maintained that nothing was wrong and have persisted in continuing, unabated, to pursue the course they initiated.

The consequence of the intransigence of FAA to listen to reason is that the Bowie Airpark became a political battleground in the 1970 election. Most of the candidates for local office campaigned and won office on a platform to stop construction of the airpark. To date, very little progress has been made and the new county government is now actively seeking ways to terminate the construction of the airpark.

On June 30, 1971, a public hearing before the Prince George's County Council was held on a bill introduced by Councilman Francis White to stop construction of the airport and sell the land to pay the debts which the county had incurred. Mr. Speaker, I insert the testimony which I made before the council at that time.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Council, I am sure most of you are aware that, since its inception, I have strenuously opposed the construction of an airport at the presently chosen site of Central Avenue and U.S. 301. I had repeatedly asked the Federal Aviation Administration to withdraw from its agreement with Prince George's County to participate in the construction of the airport under the Federal Aid to Airports Act. In November of 1969, I brought the matter to the personal attention of the President of the United States and explained at that time that there had been a failure to adhere to Federal Aviation Administration regulations governing zoning, land compatibility, and safety.

Last month, I met with Jack Shaffer, the Administrator of FAA, and again urged that the Federal Government withdraw its sponsorship of the project. The FAA is presently considering arguments which I advanced. Among these arguments are: the failure to show substantial progress over the past two years in developing the site for the airport; actions taken by the County Government to stop work on the project; and the expressed concerns by County Executive Gullett and some members of this Council concerning the financial status of the project and the desirability of the County Government to be involved in the project. I urged that FAA should now withdraw from construction of an airport at the present location.

In spite of the failure of a bill introduced by State Senator Ed Conroy to meet the test of constitutionality, it also seems obvious to me that the Maryland Legislature and the Governor were reacting to the wishes of the people by approving the measure to kill the airport.

In addition, I reminded the FAA that subsequent to its approval of the grant to Prince George's County, the Congress of the United States passed the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act call for a statement by FAA to be filed with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency to the effect that no conditions existed which would contribute to air and noise pollution of the environment or otherwise endanger the safety of the environment or its inhabitants.

The Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 covers much of the same considerations but provides additionally that, if the construction would adversely affect the environment, then the public record must indicate that no other feasible alternative sites are available.

Although the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Airport and Airways Development Act would not apply to the initial funding of the airport, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe and Mr. Russell Train, Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, have both assured me that subsequent Federal funding would require such a statement.

I believe that the criteria applied to the site selection of the airport, with regard to environmental considerations, is now outmoded and that, in the interest of assuring that the public welfare is served, the FAA should be required to apply the provisions of the Act, particularly in view of the delays in proceeding with the development of the facility.

I also want to reiterate that, while the objection of the Air Force and the Department of Defense to the present site on the basis of safety had been ignored by the FAA, these objections to the site have not been withdrawn.

These factors are germane to your consideration of this proposed ordinance introduced by Councilman White because the controversy of the Airpark has centered around the need on the one hand for the County to improve its tax base by attracting industry and, on the other hand, the rights of the people to be secure in their homes from

unwanted and unnecessary intrusion of noise, potential pollution, and the threat of accidents.

While the legal and economic merits of the Airpark may be debated by men of good will, I believe the moral and ethical merits are strongly against the location of the Airpark at this site. It would be tragic if citizens who had worked hard and earned enough money to buy a home in a wholesome and peaceful environment were then confronted with an undesirable intrusion into their community because government was too callous, or too careless, or too inattentive to its responsibilities to insure that proper planning and zoning had been achieved, or that the safety and welfare of the citizens had been guarded.

If the former Board of County Commissioners had acted to restrain the construction of houses in the vicinity, and if the FAA had demonstrated as much concern for the citizens as it had for the construction of the airport, then we may not be here today to consider the legislation which is before the Council.

As to the legislation introduced by Councilman White, he is appropriately concerned about the County Government's involvement in the industrial park business. I believe that the private sector of our economy should assume such responsibilities to the extent that they are able to do so. However, I would hope that the Council would not wholly dismiss the virtues of developing the site in question in such a way as to help ease the tax burden on the property owners of Prince Georges County, whether by public or by private means.

I am not particularly opposed to the idea of an industrial park as long as the firms locating there do not jeopardize the safety or the healthful environment of the area.

Mr. Chairman, I am providing for your information copies of the correspondence from Secretary Volpe and Mr. Train concerning the environmental aspects of the Airpark.

I would like to offer to the Council access to my Congressional files on the Prince Georges County Airpark, together with the assistance of my staff. If I may personally be of assistance to you in considering this matter, I sincerely hope that you will call upon me.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, based upon my experiences in this matter, I would like to suggest to my colleagues that when the Congress enacts new legislation such as the Environmental Policy Act and the Airport and Airways Development Act that the agency of the Federal Government affected by the legislation be required to review on-going projects to determine which ones may reasonably be required to adhere to the provisions of new legislation. Certainly, it is in the interest of the people to not allow agreements to escape such legislation where nothing has been accomplished prior to passage of such legislation and harm may be done to the environment or the people of a given area simply because the Congress was unable to act sooner.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday, September 8, 1971.

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

There was no objection.

BUTCHERED WILDLIFE: A PREVENTABLE TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the news of the brutal murder of more than 700 rare bald and golden eagles in the skies over Wyoming and Colorado last winter has shocked the Nation. This revelation follows hard on the heels of the disclosure of poisoning deaths of 23 eagles near Casper, Wyo., last June. There may still be more to come.

I feel deeply grieved, as I am sure do all Members of this House. But where do we go from here? As a cosponsor of H.R. 5060, a bill which has already passed this House, providing a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish and other animals from aircraft, I feel the time is long overdue for action. Expressions of remorse and sentiment over the eagles will not suffice.

When the House returns from recess, I intend to speak further on the issue. For the present, I think it commendable that Senator GALE MCGEE acted to bring the wholesale slaughter of eagles to light as he did. It is interesting to note the only people who openly opposed H.R. 5060, introduced by Representative DAVID OBEY and me, claimed that hunting from airplanes is absolutely necessary to protect the ranchers in certain of our Western States. Senator MCGEE comes from a State where cattle and sheep ranchers have exercised considerable political influence over long periods of time; yet he had the courage to conduct an investigation and public hearing into the eagle tragedy. I hope that other Members of both Houses will follow his leadership. Certainly the cries of indignation and outrage from one end of the country to the other show clearly there can no longer be any coverup.

Indiscriminate trapping, shooting, and poisoning have reduced some of the rarest, most beautiful and superbly adapted species of our wildlife heritage to the brink of extinction. The war on predators has been waged with little scientific knowledge of their beneficial roles, or with little moral or ethical consideration for man's responsibility in conserving natural life as an integral part of the environment.

I wish that we could obtain a concise clear-cut policy on the protection and place of predators from the Department of the Interior, which presumably is responsible for our wildlife treasures. But none has been forthcoming. On August 2, Secretary Morton, our former colleague in this House, expressed his "complete dismay and personal outrage" at the murder of the eagles. His Assistant Secretary, Nathaniel Reed, called the killings "a callous, deliberate defiance of Federal and State law." But what is going on in their own Department? The operations of one division of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, sanctioned and sheltered by one administration after another, are sinister and contemptible. Yet it continues unleashed and virtually unchallenged by the leadership of the Department.

In recent months one major periodical after another has exposed the foul deeds perpetrated by the Division of Wildlife Services of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. To quote the January 1971 issue of Field and Stream:

> The Division of Wildlife Services has one prime goal at the root of its existence—to kill wildlife. It gets away with murder, particularly of the Nation's rich heritage of predatory animals—wolves, mountain lions, coyotes, bobcats, foxes, badgers—as well as anything else that may be handy.

Yet a recent news release from the Department of the Interior quotes Assistant Secretary Reed as follows:

> No animal control work is undertaken by the Bureau unless it is clearly justified, and when undertaken, control activities are limited to the species causing damage, and where possible, only to the individuals.

This is manifestly and abundantly untrue. I am astonished that a man of Assistant Secretary Reed's prestige and stature would convey such wishful thinking. Or can it be that he is allowing the Division of Wildlife Services to prepare his public statements for him?

The other day, I reread the printed record of the hearings conducted on March 23 before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, chaired by my good friend, JOHN DINGELL of Michigan, a vigorous conservationist and outstanding legislator on the subject of "Shooting Animals From Aircraft." I recommend it to all our colleagues as background for action that must come.

On page 44, in the testimony presented by Joseph P. Linduska, Associate Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, I noted with interest the statement:

> It continues to be the position of the Department that shooting wildlife from aircraft under the guise of sport is, indeed, a reprehensible practice and one which should be outlawed.

Yet, only four pages preceding that I noted a summary of aerial hunting accidents and especially report No. 91067 of January 30, 1969, at Carter, Wyo. The plane was flown by B. D. Call, operator of the Evanston, Wyo., Airport. The plane crashed during the course of a coyote-hunting trip. Mr. E. L. Slagowski was acting as gunner. He is listed as an employee of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the predecessor agency of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Was he ever cited, disciplined, or punished for his part in this "hunt"? Not that I can tell from the official record.

According to the published record as furnished by the Federal Aviation Administration:

> Although Mr. Slagowski works for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, there is nothing in the report to indicate this flight was in connection with his official duties.

Was he engaging in the shooting of

wildlife under the guise of sport? Was it, then, a reprehensible practice by the standards of Mr. Linduska and the Department for which he speaks? If so, then the silence itself from the Department of the Interior is reprehensible.

There is something frightening about it all. How many other career civil service employees are riding shotgun in the rear seats of coyote and eagle-hunting airplanes? Must we depend forever upon the testimony of disillusioned pilots such as James Vogan to learn the facts when the public and the Congress are led to believe that everything is well in the hands of the Department of the Interior?

Insofar as Mr. Linduska's expertise on this matter is concerned, let me quote a letter from him to Mr. J. Stuart Gillespie, a deeply concerned citizen of Norwalk, Conn.:

> The animal damage control program conducted by this Bureau is authorized by Congress and conducted in cooperation with the respective States. The program is guided by a policy which recognizes the social and aesthetic values of all wild creatures and requires that methods be as selective, effective, and humane as our capabilities permit. The work is conducted and supervised by professionally trained men. The policy, incidentally, has been reviewed and generally concurred in by 30 major conservation organizations and cooperators.

My first reaction is that Mr. Linduska and his Department should be requested to produce the names of 30 major conservation organizations that concur in organized wildlife slaughter. And my second reaction is to question the profession in which his men are trained.

The answer to the latter may be found in a statement by Stanley K. Patrick, of Woodland Park, Colo., a former Government trapper for a number of years in both Alaska and Colorado. He writes:

> I can safely say that during the time I was employed the aim of a number of employees was to get all they could and have a high score at the end of the month to show they were professionals and better than the average.

In other words, the profession in which the men are trained is killing, pure and simple.

But let Mr. Patrick speak:

> I have seen employees with only a second grade education, some who have seen razors on their faces once a month and never bathed for a year. And they have that type on the force yet today. I have seen employees poach deer in North Park, Colorado. I have seen employees use hand guns so indiscriminately that the Forest Service ordered them off; however, the Predator Control kept them on and had them transferred to other areas. . . . However, there are some decent men on the force who would like to see the poison cut out altogether.

As you know Mr. Speaker, I served on the Public Land Law Review Commission and in our report entitled "One Third of the Nation's Land," published in 1970, the Commission concluded:

> We are convinced that predator control programs should be eliminated or reduced on Federal public lands in furtherance of wildlife management objectives stated above. There are long-standing programs of control that have substantially reduced and in some cases virtually eliminated certain species that are natural predators. While these programs may have been of some benefit to livestock operators in reducing cattle and sheep depredations by coyote, puma, cougar, and bear, they have upset important natural mechanisms for the population control of other species. As a result, some species, most notably deer, elk, and moose, have increased in some localities to levels far above the capacity of the natural habitat to support them.

The time is at hand for action to implement this recommendation. This is the crying need. There is no call for another study. In 1964, the Secretary of the Interior directed an Advisory Board on Wildlife Management to review the predatory control operations. One year later the Secretary, then Stewart L. Udall, ordered the old Branch of Predator and Rodent Control to be renamed the Division of Wildlife Services. Only the name was changed; out on the ground the same skulduggery continues. This is why a lawsuit has been brought against the Secretary of the Interior by the Defenders of Wildlife and the Sierra Club. How has our present distinguished Secretary responded to it? It grieves me to say that he has appointed still another committee, even while the killing goes on unabated out in the field. Moreover, the chairman of this committee is none other than Dr. Stanley Cain, the former Assistant Secretary under Mr. Udall. I can hardly imagine Cain the investigator criticizing the performance record of Cain the administrator. It simply is not going to happen.

The hour for delaying studies and rhetoric is over. Predator control programs must be eliminated at once on all Federal public lands.

Grazing permits of stockmen who utilize aircraft to kill predators must be canceled.

The field personnel of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in Wyoming should be fired. Failing that, they should be reschooled and retrained and moved elsewhere and replaced with men assigned to insure there is no further killing of eagles, coyotes, and other animals from the air.

Any pilot caught engaging in missions as despicable as those in which James O. Vogan has admitted participating must have his license revoked forthwith. In fact, Vogan's license should be revoked.

With reference to the last point, section 2 of H.R. 5060 states simply that anybody convicted of violating this act shall have his license revoked. I am shocked that the Federal Aviation Administration states this provision is not necessary because they have a provision in existing regulations providing that no person shall operate an aircraft in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the life or property of another.

There is no doubt that most of the people who are gunning down wildlife from aircraft are flying at altitudes below 500 feet above the ground. If the FAA does not consider operating a small plane at such altitudes in rough terrain, in which coyotes, wolves, and other hunted species are found, as careless flying, then I do not know what is. I think it is time for the FAA to let all licensed pilots know that such actions must cease and to start cracking down.

The people are demanding strong medicine to eliminate the disease of predator control once and for all. The great numbers of good sportsmen now realize it is undermining their true interests. Referring again to the January issue of Field and Stream, an article, titled "Predator Control: A Study in Overkill," cites a report by Dr. Robert V. Broadbent, member of the Nevada Fish and Game Commission.

"I'm not arguing that the livestock people shouldn't be able to protect what is theirs," writes Dr. Broadbent. But he then makes the point that 3 cents out of every dollar which Nevada sportsmen pay in license fees are used as matching funds for the cause of wildlife eradication. That money should be used for habitat protection of all game and nongame species, which is desperately needed. Equally shocking, this is the sole fish and game expense that completely escapes accurate cost accounting. The funds are simply delivered to the self-promoting Division of Wildlife Services, which runs its show on the basis of money available instead of proven need.

Each year the Congress appropriates about $3.5 million for predator control in the Western States. But this is only part of the story. Sportsmen, whether they know it or not, are contributing matching money through their States to build up the kitty. They are unknowingly partners of the very kind of stockmen who engineered the Wyoming eagle massacre, contributing through their private lobbying organizations. The total funds come to more than $7 million. The Congress should consider cutting the appropriation which starts it all to one-tenth, with the stipulation the money be used for research and education into the beneficial roles performed by raptorial birds like the eagle and predatory mammals like the wolves and coyotes.

According to Michael Frome, the distinguished environmental writer, "what we need everywhere is the desire and passion to conserve the life-forms, all of them. The widespread, indiscriminate poison-killing of one type of animal to protect another makes no sense."

The same holds true of shooting birds and defenseless animals from aircraft. Now is the time to turn anger and despair over the tragedy in Wyoming into action designed to conserve the life forms. There is a two-pronged method of insuring that mass butchering of our wildlife will never happen again: First, Congress must pass H.R. 5060, and second, those who are entrusted with the enforcement of that and other public laws must carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, the horror of the story about the Wyoming helicopter monsters is attracting, justifiably so, an outraged public response. One of the many articles on the subject appeared last Sunday in the New York Times. That piece, by Lewis Regenstein, also casts a searching glance at the responsibility of the Department of the Interior for the eagle tragedy. I commend his article to your attention as

a logical extension of my comments above. The article follows:

THE GOVERNMENT VS. THE EAGLE

(By Lewis Regenstein)

ARLINGTON, VA.—Last month 48 bald and golden eagles were found dead in the state of Wyoming. It is virtually certain that many more eagles have died and have not yet been found in the remote Wyoming canyon country, the one place where it was hoped they might be able to make a comeback.

About half of the eagles found had been poisoned by thallium sulfate, a chemical which the United States Department of the Interior had spread throughout the western United States as part of its efforts to exterminate coyotes. Although the Interior Department asserts that it has discontinued using thallium, there is widespread suspicion that the department is involved in the latest deaths of eagles. In any event, thallium, which is manufactured by American Smelting and Refining Company of New York City, is still readily available to sheep farmers and cattle ranchers for their own use.

What is not in doubt is that the killing of these eagles is part of a deliberate, well-planned campaign, aided and abetted by the United States Government, to wipe out all predatory animals which might compete with agricultural interests.

In describing the American eagles, it is difficult to capture the majesty of these awesome creatures. Both the Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) and the Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaëtos*) have wingspreads of six to eight feet and stand over three feet high. They mate for life and return to the same nest at the same time each year, spending the first month refurbishing their huge "eyrie."

The eagle first appeared on a United States coin in 1776, and it has been present ever since. The bald eagle became our national symbol during the Congressional assembly of 1782. As President Kennedy once put it, "The fierce beauty and proud independence of this great bird aptly symbolize the strength and freedom of America." Yet there are many Americans—some in the United States Department of the Interior—who would destroy this magnificent creature. The reason is that ranchers who raise wool and cattle believe that eagles—like coyotes—occasionally kill their livestock, particularly very young sheep or calves. Biologists dispute this, contending that eagles do not kill animals any larger than rabbits, although they may feed upon an animal that has already been killed. Despite the fact that eagles perform beneficial functions such as preying on snakes and rodents, the belief persists in many quarters that they are injurious to agriculture.

As a result, the Interior Department has gone along to some extent with this campaign to wipe out our few remaining eagles. For example, in March 1967, then Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall—who is now posing as an ardent conservationist—authorized the killing of golden eagles "for the protection of livestock" in 52 of 56 Montana counties. The law still authorizes the Secretary of Interior to permit "the taking" of bald and golden eagles "for the purpose of seasonally protecting livestock" and under other "special circumstances."

This killing of eagles for vested interest groups is not new. In Alaska, a bounty was paid on bald eagles until 1951 because they were considered "damaging" to the salmon industry. During the 36 years in which bounty payments were made, over 100,000 eagles were killed.

Today, the main causes of eagle deaths are DDT and other pesticides, high-voltage power lines, "sportsmen" and hunters—and the United States Government. Again, at the behest of cattle and sheep farmers, the Interior Department has adopted a mass and indiscriminate poisoning campaign designed to wipe out all wild animals which these ranchers consider undesirable. This massive effort involves distributing throughout the western United States tons of grain and meat baited with the deadly poisons, cyanide, strychnine and sodium monofluoroacetate, or 1080. The intent of the program is to "eliminate" such predators as coyotes, and mountain lions; but there is no way to prevent other creatures, such as eagles, from feeding on this bait or on the carcass of a poisoned animal. For years, eagles have been dying from 1080; it was present in the area and has not yet been ruled out as a cause of some of the eagle deaths in Wyoming. The Interior Department is aware of this situation and admits that eagles are "accidentally" being killed; but each year it increases both the scope and cost of this poisoning program.

The "predator control program" has already succeeded in its effort to drive the wolf, the fox, the mountain lion, the grizzly bear, the black-footed ferret, and other species of wildlife to the very brink of extinction. Why should the eagle—which is also a predator—be treated any differently?

The Interior Department has been one of the main culprits in driving the eagle toward extinction. While it is charged with the responsibility for protecting the eagles, Interior has in fact contributed to its demise—both purposefully and through neglect.

According to the new Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, there are now at most 800 nesting pairs of bald and golden eagles left in the United States. Unless Secretary Morton can bring about an immediate and drastic change in Interior's wildlife policies, our national symbol will soon be gone forever.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY IDENTIFYING AND TREATING THE VARIETIES OF ADDICTED SERVICEMEN

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, August 5, 1971, I conducted an inspection of the program at Fort Dix, N.J., for the treatment of drug-addicted servicemen. At the beginning of my visit I turned over to the fort's treatment personnel a young recruit from my district who came to my Staten Island office on Tuesday of this week and told me he was a drug addict who had been AWOL from Fort Dix since April of this year. This young man's story of his deepening addiction problem and his many fruitless attempts to get intensive medical-psychological help from the Army is being repeated thousands of times at military bases all over the world. Because I personally delivered this addict to the commanding general he will hopefully get the help he needs. But there are thousands of others who will not be so fortunate because the services are not equipped to handle large numbers of true drug addicts.

Regarding this, I submit for the RECORD testimony I gave before the Subcommittee on Health of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 30, 1971. It contains an analysis of the different types of military drug abusers I have found in various programs I have studied and an assessment of the different approaches that are needed to rehabilitate them with some hope of restoring them to a drug-free life in the military or as civilians.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that these hearings are being held on the anniversary of the advent of the massive heroin problem in Vietnam. Suddenly last summer in late July, a newly-packaged, widely-distributed, deadly, potent form of heroin was being practically given away to our troops.

By September, a majority of all servicemen hospitalized in Vietnam were drug abuse cases. By October we were losing 2 men a day from heroin overdose. By the end of 1970 the situation had gotten so bad an intelligence analyst at the American Embassy in Saigon said, "the pot-head Army of 1969 is rapidly turning into 1971's Army to heroin addicts."

The American Government was well aware of this development right from the beginning. I have obtained a copy of an Army Memorandum designated as a fact sheet designed to demonstrate the increased incidence of drug abuse deaths of Army personnel in the Republic of Vietnam during the period from 1 January 1969 to 30 September 1970. This alarming report was prepared at the request of General Creighton W. Abrams and is dated 23 October 1970. The report shows that for the first seven months of 1970 there was an average of two soldiers a month dying from drug overdoses. This was an increase of 50 percent over the monthly average for 1969. However, once the new supply of heroin reached our troops in late summer, known drug overdose deaths increased 175 percent in August and September according to the Abrams Memo.

As ominous as the report to General Abrams was, reports by American military hospitals in Vietnam indicated that many O.D.'s went undetected or unconfirmed and that our drug casualty figures were actually much higher.

U.S. medical personnel reported that when the known O.D.'s were combined with suspected overdose deaths, the increase for August and September was 1000 percent, or 46 deaths.

During the first 18 days in October 1970 there were 35 *known* overdose deaths among our troops.

At that rate, instead of the two deaths a month, we were experiencing from January through July, we were experiencing *two deaths a day.*

That percentage of increase was an astronomical 2,900 percent. Such alarming statistics should have led the government to massive remedial action immediately—not nine months later. Now that action appropriate to the problem has begun, I urge this committee which has such an excellent record in this area to use its power and prestige to properly implement those aspects of the domestic drug program which have relevance to our addicted servicemen.

As a congressman and as a former member of the military establishment, I was greatly disturbed over this growing shadow of drug addiction that has now overtaken large numbers of our soldiers, sailors and airmen.

Although I have spent many years talking to experts on drug addiction and our growing drug culture, I have recently intensified my work in this area because of my concern for our armed forces.

I have spent time at all-night drug clinics just off the streets of New York, where addicted ex-G.I.'s seek help for their problems.

During the past months I have studied

many aspects of our military drug situation throughout the United States. I will briefly tell you about some of my findings and submit for your consideration lengthier reports on the various attempts by the military to cope with the drug problem—at Fort Bragg, the Miramar Naval Air Base, and Lackland Air Force Base. Initially I would urge the committee to consider not only the short range needs of our services to meet the challenge of addicted troops, but the long range needs which must be inherent in any new federal program this committee may ultimately put into operation.

While the legislation before this committee concerns itself primarily with civilian programs for the treatment of drug abuse, it cannot separate the civilian drug problem from the military drug problem. The bulk of the hard core drug abusing G.I.'s will eventually turn up in one of the programs covered by H.R. 9264.

For example, 30% of the male addicts currently in the federal programs at Fort Worth, Texas and Lexington, Kentucky, are former servicemen, the bulk of whom became addicted or had their habits worsen during their tours in the military. Yet these facilities have not begun to receive G.I.'s addicted during the surge of heroin use which began a year ago in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, the basic assumption of the military approach to addiction seems to be that if a draftee has gotten through the trauma of being drafted, basic training and other shocks that military flesh is heir to, he has at one time *had* the self discipline and "character" to refrain from drug abuse. The services overlook the psychological fact that a youngster can be pretty disturbed and still get through the preliminaries. But once the main event comes up, Vietnam and its combination of fear, boredom and drugs, his personality can be severely altered—sometimes irrevocably. In short, it takes an addict a long time to get in the condition he is in and it will take a long time for his life style to be changed and restored to a configuration compatible with military *or* civilian life. And the limits on programs set up by the administration and the services will not suffice to do the job necessary—for the services, for the addict, and least of all for society.

What the programs I have visited will eventually accomplish will be to simply cull out those G.I.'s who are least in need of treatment and whose major hang-up may have been being in Vietnam, and return them to stateside duty or to civilian life with a good chance for remaining drug free. But the psychologically disturbed drug abuser—and they are a substantial number—will be given a "window dressing" period of several weeks of treatment and then dumped back into society.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what many of us in Congress have been fighting for five years—the unconditional release of military addicts back into our city streets with the potential to spread the drug habit even more. The idea of treating the kinds of addict-servicemen I have spent the past six months with, within 30 days is ludicrous. Even the Air Force treatment time span of up to 2½ months will not allow that service to retrieve the bulk of its addicts. And the sad fact is that the hard core users are the ones who will be released and simply "referred" to a treatment center.

I spoke to Vietnam veterans who were addicted in the early years of our Vietnam involvement and even Korean addict veterans at our Federal facilities at Fort Worth, Texas and Lexington, Kentucky. I asked them what they thought the prognosis was for a G.I. coming off of an 11 month heroin habit being "cured" in 30, 60, or even 90 days. Their response was resigned laughter. And these were veterans—Army, Navy, and Air Force—who had been unable to shake their habits in time spans ranging from two to twelve years—a few even longer. The behavioral scientists whom I have consulted—the physicians, psychiatrists, and counselors—agree that the treatment time alloted by the new White House and Pentagon directives are incongruous with the treatment time span needed for the rehabilitation of a truly addicted person.

I urge the committee to consider and provide for the peculiar needs of the military addict in any legislation it reports to the House.

The types of addicts I have seen in the services this far fall generally into four categories. They include:

Type one: The user whose basic problem was his inability to cope with being in Southeast Asia.

Type two: The conformist type of user who succumbed to group pressures of one kind or another to "go along" with drug use. And in Vietnam where drugs are everywhere and where drug use is a way of life it was easy for many G.I.'s to "fall into" the habit.

Type three: The weak personality who "caved in" under the normal pressures of service life. It wasn't the war or southeast Asia—it was the everyday discipline of military life that made him seek relief through drugs. Remember, 60% of the addicts at Fort Bragg *have never been to Vietnam.* A common statement of this type of addict was that he took drugs because he was "hassled" by his NCO's and officers. One burly paratrooper told me his sergeant made him "stand down four times a day and was always hassling me." Hassling in this case refers to the simple routine of soldiering—which reminds me of the many college students who have told me they took drugs because they didn't like the "hassle" of studying.

Type four: The true addict personality with psychopathic overtones. These were the real trouble makers. They stole, sold drugs for profit and to supply their own habits. They were multiple drug users or in constant trouble—or both—long before their service in the armed forces. They were—above all—the "con" artists of the groups I interviewed, attempting to dominate the conversations and give plausible explanations of why they were in the spot they were in. They said they were in the program by mistake; the urinalysis machine made a mistake or the service made a mistake. They really didn't belong at Mirmar or Lackland or Fort Bragg—even if *they* volunteered.

Their rationalization for all of these "mistakes" was that they were just "drug users"—they weren't really addicts—they could stop using heroin at any time. And some did stop using—many times—but usually when they were in trouble of facing long prison sentences.

Mr. Chairman, the first and second categories of users are the easiest to handle. For some of them, the geographical "cure" will come into play. Just getting out of Vietnam and away from its environment and group pressures will make them likely candidates as abstainers from hard drugs.

However, even some of the users in these not-so-serious categories have been taking drugs for such long periods of time there is a danger of severe psychological damage which will require intensive treatment and re-education.

Category three is a more difficult group to treat. Any excuse—no matter how minute—is reason enough to shoot up a plastic container of heroin. These people need long term treatment. They need the "family" type addict self-help approach—which means a long term one or two year situation. The Navy has recognized the need for this type of approach and has in its program at Miramar ex-addicts who handle part of the treatment phase of the program.

The fourth category is certainly out of the sphere of any kind of service oriented treatment program.

These addicts are recalcitrant, testing, troublemakers.

They are arrogant, autocratic and self-perpetuating.

And they are a threat to service discipline.

They are the self-elected leaders of the drug culture.

To spend defense dollars and expend valuable service treatment personnel at this level is unsound practice, medically and psychologically. They should be diligently weeded out for the good of the armed services and for their own good. But I do not advocate that we give up on them just because they are difficult. I do recommend we bind them over to the kind of treatment program that does have some hope of changing their attitudes and behavior.

That is why I recommend that the Congress consider my bill, H.R. 6172, which would help the armed services by taking the addict population off of their hands—especially those addicts I have identified in categories three and four. By distributing the service addicts into our Federal facilities on the basis of the causes of their addiction, the Congress can best help our Federal agencies—NIMH, NIH, Public Health Service, and others—to deal with them effectively.

In brief, my bill provides for:

The physical disability separation from service of drug addicted and drug dependent military personnel. This provision has been made retroactive to cover those addicted servicemen already given less than honorable discharges.

The civil commitment of drug users to treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966.

Penalties for drug offenses that are commensurate with those provided for in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

The heart of the bill will make all of Title III of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act's civil procedures applicable in the case of petitions filed by persons separated from the service. This means that it provides for the same hearing and examination that NARA provides. Once the soldier is studied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and found to be an addict, he is discharged to a hopsital of the public health service or any hospital or other facility of the public health service especially equipped to handle drug dependent persons, or any other appropriate public or private hospital or facility available to health, education, and welfare for the care and treatment of drug dependent persons including VA hospitals.

My bill is based on the assumption that the crisis of drug abuse facing the military is beyond the capacity of the individual services to cope with. My recent tour of our facilities for military drug users confirmed that assumption. The mission of the Armed Forces of America is the defense of this country. They should not be forced into the business of rehabilitating thousands of drug addicts and multiple drug users. My bill would help solve the problem of weeding out those truly addicted and drug-dependent servicemen and commit them to our already existing federal program for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts.

I recommend that this committee expand the appropriate programs under section 5 (c) of H.R. 9264 to include not only the thousands of heroin users who will be funneled into these programs by way of the armed services, but the multiple drug users who exhibit all of the psychological symptoms of

the opiate addict and who are in just as great a need for treatment.

Finally, I recommend that the director of the special action office for drug abuse prevention be given specific duties concerning his responsibilities to addicted servicemen and that the problem be given more specific attention or greater visibility in the language of the bill.

PERMISSION FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today that the Speaker may declare a recess at any time today, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

DISPATCH OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we have noticed quite a number of articles from time to time that are critical of the leadership of the House and critical of the House in general, but I have not noticed any which take cognizance of the tremendous workload of the past 3 weeks.

The Speaker announced early in the year that we would have a recess beginning on August 6. The House under his leadership has planned and geared itself to a recess beginning August 6. Committee chairmen and others have schedules set with a goal of getting as much as possible accomplished by August 6, and in fact we have done as much in the last 3 weeks as we usually do in July, August, and September put together. If the Speaker had not planned and programed the year and if it had been assumed Congress would be in session all year, far less would have been accomplished. Ten of the 14 appropriation bills have been passed by both the House and Senate. That point usually is not reached until October.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a situation that existed about 20 years ago when the labor unions were trying to get a 10-minute break per hour; they used to use as an argument in negotiations that they could do as much work in 50 minutes as they could in an hour.

Mr. Speaker, it has been proven that if the legislative schedule is properly planned that we can do as much work in July as we usually do in July, August, and September. I commend the leadership for programing the work in applying the pressure in such a way that a much greater share of the year's work has been accomplished.

SCHOOL BUSING

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the subject of the busing of schoolchildren in order to achieve racial balance in local school systems.

No issue has aroused as much public concern and emotion in recent weeks as this one. It is profoundly troubling and vexing to all Americans.

The 1954 Supreme Court decision in the Brown case, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it clear that it is illegal and unconstitutional for State and local governments to maintain a dual school system and separate schools for the purpose of segregating children by race.

I fully support these past actions. There is no justification under the principles on which our country was founded for the forced separation of children on the basis of race. The Constitution enshrines the principle of "equality under the law," and the Brown court case and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it clear that the law could no longer be used to promote inequality and to make distinctions among people on the basis of race or color.

However, recent court decisions, such as that in the Swann case, and recent administrative actions by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare seem to go substantially beyond the principle of insuring "equality under the law." These actions seem to be directed not at eliminating legal segregation, which is justified, but at achieving racial balance in our schools regardless of where people live. This is not justified.

Because of the distribution of population in America's cities, many neighborhood schools are predominantly attended by one race or another. This resulting racial imbalance is not the product of legal action or administrative policy. Instead, this kind of racial imbalance is considered to be de facto segregation; that is, segregation created solely by the distribution of population throughout the areas in which people live.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was clearly intended to abolish de jure segregation; that is, school segregation which is deliberately planned and promoted by the official actions of State and local governmental units or by the various school districts therein.

Many school systems, including those in my district, the Louisville school system and the Jefferson County school system, have made good-faith efforts in the years since 1964 to comply with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act as well as with the mandates of the court starting with the Brown case.

But now our local systems are being pressed by HEW to undertake heavy busing in order to achieve racial balance. If busing is started, people who live only blocks away from elementary and secondary schools could find their children bused miles across town merely to satisfy a strict, inflexible formula developed by a government official far removed from the local scene and insensitive to local conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied in my own mind that there is no de jure segregation in our local school systems. There simply is no forced or officially sanctioned segregation of children under law or administrative policy in my district.

Louisville was the first major city in the South to desegregate its schools. It did so in 1956 in compliance with the decision of the Supreme Court. President Eisenhower officially commended our superintendent of schools at the time, Omer Carmichael, for Louisville's leadership among the Nation's schools. Since 1956, the Louisville School Board has taken no actions to stifle the progress of integration in the city's schools.

On the contrary, the board has actively encouraged integration. HEW recognized this progress in 1965 and 1966, when Louisville was not included on a list of Kentucky school systems having vestiges of a dual school system.

And in 1969 and 1970, three separate teams from HEW studied the Louisville school system and were unable to develop any firm recommendations to significantly improve the extent of racial desegregation in the system. Nevertheless, in 1971 the board voluntarily redistricted a number of school zones to obtain better pupil distribution, and the result was a more even racial balance in the schools—this action was taken despite public resistance.

Recent court decisions in the sixth circuit have held that a school district can have some racial imbalance and still be regarded as unitary, if it has acted in good faith on desegregation. In fact, the Jefferson Circuit Court held on July 28, 1971, that the Louisville School Board's minority transfer clause was unconstitutional precisely because the district was already a unitary system.

Mr. Speaker, until such time as absolute racial balance in all schools across America, North and South, becomes the national policy, school districts, such as Louisville and Jefferson County, which have taken effective and good-faith actions to desegregate the schools should not be required to undertake extensive and disruptive busing of children out of their neighborhoods.

I have opposed forced busing in schools, which are already legally desegregated, both in public statements and in votes in Congress.

In April of this year, when the House of Representatives was considering the school aid bill, H.R. 7016, I voted to retain language in the bill which prohibited use of funds contained in the bill to force the busing of children in those school districts which were already desegregated under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

That language, which was passed by both House and Senate and was signed into law by the President, is as follows:

(Sec. 309) No part of the funds contained in this act may be used to force any school which is desegregated as that term is defined in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to force on account of race, creed, or color the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force the transfer of assignment of any student attending any elementary school so desegregated to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent.

I have gone on record in favor of this principle. Both Houses of Congress have gone on record in favor of the principle.

And the President of the United States has gone on record in favor of this principle by signing H.R. 7016 into law.

If HEW attempts to circumvent this established principle by forcing busing to achieve some artificial standard of racial balance in complete disregard of housing patterns and the mobility of our citizens, many school systems in America, including my own in Louisville and Jefferson County, will be severely damaged.

Our citizens do not object to integrated schools, but they do strongly object to having their children bused miles and miles away to a school when there is a school right around the corner from their house. Should heavy busing become the rule, community support for public education in my district will be drastically reduced. And then everybody will be hurt, black and white alike.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must keep our sights on the goal which should be foremost in mind with respect to our Nation's schools. This goal, is a quality education for all children regardless of race. This is a goal which our Nation cannot, and dare not, ignore.

This administration has proposed a bill, which has been reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor on which I serve, which would provide $1.5 billion to assist local districts in desegregating their schools.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that enacting legislation to insure desegregation of de jure school districts should be but one factor evidencing our collective interest in education.

We must also address the larger question of insuring a quality education to every child in this great country of ours.

Therefore, I have introduced this week, along with several of my colleagues on the House Education and Labor Committee, the emergency school aid bill of 1971. My bill, H.R. 10338, would provide over $7.5 billion for aid to hard-pressed local school districts—not just to pay for costs of desegregation, but also to materially improve the overall quality of education as well. This bill represents the kind of broad and realistic approach to our school problems which I favor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that we in Congress stepped back and took a look at our educational priorities. Every dollar that is spent for buses used to send our children out of their neighborhood, is money which could have gone to provide better school buildings, better equipment, better teachers, and a generally better education for all our children.

I urge my colleagues in the Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the President to support this legislation. This is the answer. This is the only answer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of a letter from Dr. Newman Walker, Louisville Superintendent of Schools, to Mr. Don M. Vernon, Southern Coordinator of the HEW Office for Civil Rights. This letter, a copy of which was sent to me, documents the good faith efforts of the Louisville school system over the last 15 years to eliminate segregation.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 2, 1971.

Mr. DON M. VERNON,
Southern Coordinator,
Office for Civil Rights, HEW,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VERNON: We appreciated the discussion with Mr. Pottinger, you and other members of your staff last week. It was very helpful to us in better understanding the current position of HEW and we are very happy to supply herewith all the information that you requested.

It is the opinion of the Louisville Board of Education that this school system is unitary and that any racial imbalance now existing in the Louisville schools is a result of housing patterns rather than any vestiges of a dual school system. We offer the following information to support this conclusion:

1. Prior to 1956 when the Louisville schools desegregated, the District had never provided any transportation for students and had followed the pattern of neighborhood school organization. From the first year of integration forward, those schools which had been and remained all or majority black were located in neighborhoods which reflected the same racial composition residentially as in the schools. (See enclosure.)

2. At the time of Louisville's step to a desegregated system, it was the first major city in the South to do so. This fact was so significant nationally that President Eisenhower invited Louisville School Superintendent Omer Carmichael to the White House for official commendation.

3. No thorough study of all Louisville School Board policies from 1956 to date or any research of local newspapers discloses any action on the part of the Board of Education to take any steps or adopt any policies which were aimed to stifle the progress of integration. In fact, to the contrary, numerous positive actions can be shown where the Board of Education actively encouraged greater integration and took steps such as the creation of a magnet school and additional park, and racial balancing of staffs. All of these things were done without any federal requirement or encouragement to do so. The educational park has been announced and architectural plans are under way for its creation. The staff balancing plan is now in its second of a three-year program, culminating in all schools having racially balanced staffs.

4. In 1965 the Louisville School District was one of the first in the nation to achieve HEW 441 status soon after this classification was created. This status was obtained without any requirement of a voluntary plan for further desegregation. In the school year 1965–66, HEW listed approximately thirty (30) school districts in Kentucky which it classed as having vestiges of the dual school system, requiring voluntary plans for desegregation from these districts. Louisville was not included in this list. It can only be concluded that, in the official opinion of HEW, Louisville was a unitary school system at that time.

5. In 1969 and 1970 two teams from HEW Title VI and one team from Title IV studied the Louisville School System. After thorough analysis, they were unable to develop any firm recommendations that they felt would significantly improve the extent of racial desegregation in the System; and, in fact, any of the plans discussed at that time were believed to be ultimately productive of greater racial isolation in the District. In 1971 the Board of Education redistricted a number of school zones in order to obtain a better distribution of pupils for the school facilities available. The net effect of these changes was to place more majority group children in schools with minority group children. (See enclosure.) This was done in spite of public resistance. The Board also adopted a minority transfer clause as a part of its attendance school assignment policies. These steps were taken by the Board in an attempt to maintain as much integration in the District as possible despite a continuing trend of quiet exodus to the suburban areas. This quiet exodus resulted in a 26 to 48 black percentage in the past 15 years. (See enclosure.)

6. Recent court decisions in the Sixth Circuit have expressed the point of view that a school district can have racial imbalance and still be unitary. Both the Civil Rights cases concerning the Cincinnati, Ohio, Board of Education and the Knoxville, Tennessee, Board of Education speak to this point. The Court has taken the posture that what is a mandate with recalcitrants for proving they are unitary is not the same test applied to school districts who have acted in good faith.

7. On Tuesday, July 28, 1971, the Board of Education received a decision in a case which earlier had been tried in the Jefferson Circuit Court which, among other findings, concluded that the Louisville School District was unitary and that the Board's previously adopted minority transfer clause was unconstitutional because of the District's unitary nature. A copy of the Court's findings is enclosed.

The Louisville Board of Education is conscientiously committed to obtaining the maximum extent of racial integration within the District; however, it finds itself in an almost impossible situation in terms of additional steps that can be taken to bring this about which will not ultimately be counter-productive to that end. The District is surrounded by four (4) school districts which are from 92 to 100 percent white. The Jefferson County System, which envelopes the Louisville District to the east, west and south, has a student population of some 98,000 children, of which only 3,000 are black. The boundary lines of the Louisville Independent School District are not coterminous with the boundaries of the City of Louisville, thus a large area within the City of Louisville is actually within the Jefferson County School District. Thus people can escape the effect of integration efforts without moving outside the City of Louisville. This geographical fact strengthens our contention that further involuntary desegregation would increase any existing racial imbalance rather than decrease it. The three smaller districts across the Ohio River in Indiana have equal percentages of white children. Persons living in any of these districts can travel to downtown Louisville in no more than ten minutes, thus illustrating why the movement out of the Louisville School District has been so available to persons wishing to avoid school integration or seeking a more pleasant suburban environment. The Louisville District is blocked by law from annexing additional territory which would enhance our chances of obtaining a desirable racial mix. The District has studied the dynamics of this type of trend in other cities throughout the nation and can find no incidences where any type of action by the inner-city school district has eliminated or reversed this flight to the suburbs. Should the System enter upon a large scale busing program within the geographic limits of the District to reduce existing racial imbalances, it is predictable beyond a doubt that the suburban exodus would accelerate dramatically. (See Havighurst, University of Chicago, or Pettigrew, Harvard University, research.) Therefore, it seems that under such circumstances the Louisville School District could look forward within very few years to such a high livel of minority group children that any meaningful integration, whether by busing or other means, would be impossible.

A correlated disadvantage of this pattern would be a lowering of the economic ability of this District to obtain quality educational programs. These are not pleasant possibili-

ties but must be faced as the realistic outcome of such action by a District now faced with its present racial balance and surrounding white districts.

Should you have any questions about the enclosed maps, statistical data, or other information, please feel free to call us. If necessary, we would be pleased to arrange another meeting with you for further discussion.

Sincerely,

NEWMAN WALKER.

BOYS' CLUBS OFFICIALS ADDRESS CONGRESSIONAL LUNCHEON

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago today I was sworn into this House of Representatives and I owe much of my success to the Boys' Clubs of America and especially to the former director of that club, Edwin F. Van Billiard.

Mr. Van Billiard recently retired as associate national director after devoting 39 years to the youth of America. At the tender age of 13 years he was left an orphan and subsequently gave back a hundredfold to thousands of boys the help he had received as a youth.

This fine man not only developed the character and personality of the boys directly under his supervision, but under his leadership about six former Boys' Club members from my hometown, Bethlehem, Pa., are now in executive positions with the Boys' Clubs of America all over the country.

He is one of the very few professionals with the Boys' Clubs who has received the highest honor which can be bestowed upon them, the Bronze Keystone Award for Outstanding Service.

For those of my colleagues who were not privileged to have been members of the Boys' Clubs in their younger days I like to direct their attention to some of the achievements and activities of the Boys' Clubs of America.

On June 8 the Boys' Clubs of America held a congressional luncheon for Members of Congress who have been involved in the Boy's Clubs activities in their home communities. This action typifies the Boys' Clubs fine record of being eager and industrious in maintaining close relations with people from all levels of American society. The Boys' Clubs of America is one of those rare organizations which all Americans can support. They have experienced extraordinary growth in their 110 year history and expect to continue this phenomenal expansion in the next 100 years. Operating in the inner cities, the Boys' Clubs provide work experience, stimulation in character development, and work skills to disadvantaged boys who so desperately need this training and involvement. The Boys' Clubs of America are providing a sorely needed nationwide service to America's future leaders and I applaud them heartily.

I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following remarks delivered by A. Boyd Hinds, national director of the Boys' Clubs of America and Albert L. Cole, chairman of the board of the Boys' Clubs of America, at the June 8 congressional luncheon.

REMARKS AT CONGRESSIONAL LUNCHEON BY A. BOYD HINDS, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Gentlemen: It is a pleasure to meet you and to let you know how much we appreciate your coming together to listen to some of the things we have been doing in Boys' Clubs of America, an organization in which we know you have a great interest.

It is now a little over 110 years ago that the first Boys' Club was started in New England. This was just after the Civil War. We are the oldest American boy organization in this country today. We have come a long way since that time and Boys' Clubs are now spread across the country to the point of where we have some 925 Clubs with 900,000 boys in all states of the union but the good state of North Dakota. We also have a Boys' Club in Puerto Rico.

Ours has been a tremendous growth and a very solid growth.

Over 34% of the members of Boys' Club today come from families on the poverty level and a very large number of our Clubs are operating in the inner cities of our great communities in which there is so much social unrest.

We have been privileged to have two Presidents of the United States as Chairmen of the Board of Boys' Clubs of America: the Honorable Herbert Hoover and President Nixon.

We were chartered by the Congress in 1956.

When Mr. Hoover was our Chairman, we decided to move into an expansion period of Boys' Clubs and he set a goal of 1,000 Clubs for a million boys. I am happy to tell you that within a year and a half—and also a year and a half ahead of the time we set to attain this goal—we will be serving a million boys through 1,000 Clubs across this country.

They will be served in large metropolitan communities as well as in the smaller towns.

Boys' Clubs, from the early days, have been greatly concerned about and have been working with the complex domestic problems that concern you as members of Congress.

In addition to developing the physical fitness of boys—stimulating the development of character and providing guidance, Boys' Clubs have been feeding hungry boys. They have been providing work skills and work experiences to disadvantaged youth. They have been providing and still are providing tutorial services, remedial reading work, and cultural enrichment to potential school dropouts.

In these days of changing needs, in addition to all of these things, they are sponsoring programs of drug abuse education along with their efforts in the areas of smoking. They are active in delinquency prevention programs, but most important of all Boys' Clubs are developing, through such groups as Keystone Clubs and other self governing groups, the type of leadership this country needs for the years ahead.

We are proposing to intensify our efforts along these lines as we go into the future as there is still much to be done.

Boys' Clubs are spreading rapidly. A new Boys' Club is being started every seven days.

What is more important, they are springing up in the "right place at the right time"—as many are being started in the inner cities.

With *your* interest and the *help of all* citizens across this country, the job Boys Clubs are now so effectively doing can even be more effective as the years go by.

Whenever we need your help, you may be sure we will call on you.

REMARKS BY ALBERT L. COLE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

It is my pleasure, as Chairman of the Board of Boys' Clubs of America, to greet you at this luncheon which might well be called a reunion of men who have had an interest, and still have, in what I consider one of the greatest organizations in this country—the Boys' Clubs of America.

I would like to make just two points.

The first is our involvement with the government and the many great projects which are going on that can be so helpful to the youth of this nation.

It is our fundamental belief that we, in Boys' Clubs of America, should do all we can to help ourselves to accomplish the goals we have set. Should some 100 other organizations in the private sector do just this, the burdens would be taken from many governmental areas.

We are involved in all of the programs Mr. Hinds enumerated. These ar things which Boys' Clubs, under their own steam in local communities, are undertaking and they are making a great contribution to the lives of thousands of youngsters.

There are, however, certain very basic areas where the problems are so great that Boys' Clubs cannot do much about them from their own budgets. In these areas we work cooperatively with governmental agencies.

For instance, for years Boys' Clubs of America, as a Congressionally chartered organization, has been able to participate in the donable surplus property program of the Defense Department. Hundreds of Boys' Clubs have benefitted by this in terms of needed material. The 250 Boys' Club camps throughout the country, as well as many of the Boys' Clubs, have also profited greatly from participation in the Food Service programs of the government. Because of this, many a hungry and malnourished youngster has been fed.

We work very closely with the Neighborhood Youth Corps in providing job sites, supervision and work experience to thousands of young people in cities across the country.

A number of our Clubs have benefitted by working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the construction of central facilities which not only house Boys' Clubs but also other vital community services.

Other Boys Clubs have been working with the Office of Economic Opportunity in various programs that are helpful to our low-income youngsters.

There is no doubt that we will be doing more of these things as time goes on and from time to time we may wish to call on you for your help in getting the cooperation that is needed.

But basically speaking, it is our belief that as much of all this as is possible should be done by Boys' Clubs of America as an agency in the private sector without asking for government help.

But the thing that really interests me about this Boys' Club Movement is what it does for individual youngsters.

Countless thousands of them are growing into manhood and will become better men because of what they have experienced in the Boys' Club.

There are always some outstanding examples. I think Congressman Rooney is one of them, as are you, and we are extremely proud of your achievements.

Each year we have a Boy of the Year selection, at which time one boy from each of the 10 Regions of Boys' Clubs of America across

the country is picked to represent that Region as an example of what a Boys' Club boy should be in the matter of service to his church, his home, his school, and his country, as well as his own private character. These young men gather in Washington and finally the one Boy of the Year is selected and installed by the President of the United States.

Over the last 15 to 20 years, in which we have had this selection process, many fine young men have evolved from it.

Probably the most outstanding example is a young man by the name of Wesley Clark. He came from the Boys' Club of Little Rock, Arkansas, from a very poor family background. Wesley was able to secure an appointment through his Boys' Club to West Point and graduated from West Point. He was the only individual to have had a higher academic record than General MacArthur. He then became a Rhodes Scholar. After that he served his country in Vietnam and we have just heard that he has been wounded in action.

Here is a young man who came from a very poor background. What he needed was a chance and the Boys' Club gave him that chance. This is what makes me so proud and happy to be part of this great Movement. I'm sure as you hear about things of this kind you, too, can be more and more proud that you have taken some part in it in the years gone by.

It is a pleasure for all of us from the National Board and from various Clubs to be here to greet you today to bring you up to date on what is going on, and to thank you for your great interest.

A LOOK AT APPROPRIATIONS

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

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include tabular material.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a growing disposition on the part of Congress and the administration in considering Federal spending to brush aside the question of whether or not we have the money in hand or in sight to pay the bills. Whopping deficits do not seem to deeply disturb the administration or the Congress very much any more.

This is a bad and dangerous trend in fiscal affairs and I feel it my responsibility to again take note of it.

We take note of our needs and wants and tend to disregard the fact that we do not have the revenues to pay our bills. Heavy borrowing from the public and from the trust funds, such as social security, does not seem to disturb us. It certainly does not disturb us sufficiently.

For the fiscal year 1971, ending June 30 last, the Federal budget went in the red by $23.2 billion on the so-called unified budget basis. But on the Federal funds basis, we went in the red by $30.2 billion. To help pay our bills, we borrowed from the trust funds about $7 billion—their surplus for the year—which must be repaid with interest. In other words, the national debt went up last year by roughly that amount, and present indications are that the debt will go up another $30 to $40 billion—perhaps more—in the current fiscal year 1972. The current statutory limit of $430 billion will have to be hiked again before the fiscal year is out.

This staggering prospect of back-to-back deficits in Federal funds of $60 or $70 billion hardly creates a ripple, yet they follow a Federal funds deficit of $13.1 billion in the fiscal year 1970.

Notwithstanding the fact that a 3-year Federal funds deficit approximating $80,000,000,000 is almost a certainty, the administration last week reported with some pride as follows:

For the third year in a row, a full employment balance or surplus has been achieved in the fiscal year 1971 after three successive years of full-employment deficits totalling more than $40 billion.

In fiscal 1971, which ended June 30, there would have been a surplus of $2.5 billion had the Nation's economy operated at full employment throughout the year.

This record is in sharp contrast to that of fiscal years 1966 through 1968, when full-employment deficits totaled more than $40 billion.

The point was that if the economy had been charging ahead at full speed and there was relatively little unemployment and tax revenues were higher as a result, we would not be having these whopping budget deficits.

To put it mildly, that is a far-fetched way to seeking consolation. It would be most unfortunate if such a happy report should induce further complacency.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence continues to accumulate that there is a continuation, both in and out of Congress and in the country generally, of a restiveness about taxes being too high but expenditures being too low to meet our needs and our wants. The emphasis is on spending, not on finding a way to raise the revenues to pay the bills. This I believe carries the seeds of danger for us as a Nation. As these whopping deficits show, either our revenues are too low, or our expenditures are too high, or perhaps it is some combination of the two.

The idea is to manage the economy. It is downright old-fashioned to consider holding spending within revenues or within shouting distance of revenues. Under the full employment budget theory as it has been working out in practice, the revenues are always around the corner and thus not in sight.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS AT THIS SESSION

What has Congress done thus far at this session about appropriations?

Relating to fiscal year 1971, we passed four measures. They had the effect of appropriating $8,061,000,000 in new money for expenditure by the Government. The budget requests were reduced $910,000,000.

With respect to fiscal year 1972, we have taken the following actions:

HOUSE ACTIONS FOR 1972

The House, in 12 measures, has approved $74,633,000,000, approximately equal to the related budget requests acted upon.

SENATE ACTION FOR 1972

The Senate, in the 12 measures, has approved $79,082,000,000, about $4.2 billion above the related budget requests.

CONFERENCE TOTALS FOR 1972

Eleven of the twelve measures for 1972 as passed by both Houses have also cleared conference. Only the public works-AEC bill—which as it now stands is $100 million above the budget—is still pending in conference.

The 11 measures involved—

Budget requests for appropriations (new budget authority) of	$70,280,622,000
Approved by Congress	72,564,993,000
Net increase	+2,284,371,000

I should note that this net increase of about $2.3 billion above the budget needs this qualification:

First. In relation to the overall budget recommendations of the President, it is an overstatement of congressional action to the extent of $1,000,000,000 which is in the budget as a proposed supplemental for special revenue sharing relating to certain housing and urban development programs as a substitute for only 6-months funding of some of those programs; Congress, in the HUD appropriation bill, funded them on a 12-month basis, and the extra 6 months shows up as an increase—more apparent than real—above the specific budget requests.

Second. Likewise, in relation to the overall budget recommendations of the President, the $2.3 billion is an understatement of congressional action to the extent of $400,000,000 in connection with proposed legislation in the budget relating to student loan funds dealt with in the education appropriation bill.

BILLS FOR 1972 STILL PENDING

Appropriation bills to be handled after the August recess are as follows: Defense, military construction, foreign aid, and District of Columbia.

Necessary authorization has not yet been provided by Congress for the aforementioned appropriation measures.

I should add that the public works-AEC bill has passed both the House and Senate but the conference has been delayed until September and the final action on that measure is not fully predictable.

The Committee on Appropriations has completed hearings on the aforementioned four bills and can move rather promptly after the authorization measures have been enacted.

There will be a catch-all supplemental bill when we return in September.

In my opinion, it is safe to say that in the four regular appropriation bills which have not yet been considered by the House, involving about $80 billion of budget requests, the budget will not be exceeded; in the overall in those measures, meaningful reductions will be made.

SOME MAJOR INCREASES ABOVE THE BUDGET FOR 1972

In respect to the 11 measures that have been enacted or have been agreed to in conference between the House and Senate and are expected to be approved by the President, I should like to list at this point some of the major spending items which have been approved for expenditure above the budget requests.

Hospital construction, $167 million.

Mental health, including alcoholism and drug abuse, $112 million.

Vocational rehabilitation, $62 million.

National Institutes of Health, $142 million.

School milk program, $104,000,000.

Food stamps, $198,000,000.

HUD water and sewer grants, $500,000,000.

REA loans, $216,000,000.

Veterans medical care programs, $190,000,000.

Urban renewal and model cities programs, $800,000,000—above the specific budget requests, but in reality offset by reason of failure to adopt the special revenue-sharing proposal of the President.

BUDGET SURPLUS OR DEFICIT, FISCAL YEARS 1969–72

Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation on budget revenues and expenditures showing the results on the unified basis and on the Federal funds basis for the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971. The original budget estimates for fiscal 1972—the current fiscal year—projected a deficit of $11.6 billion on the unified basis and $23.1 billion on the Federal funds basis, but those figures are wholly outdated; no official revision have been issued, however.

THE BUDGET SURPLUS AND DEFICIT SITUATION, FISCAL YEAR 1969–71

[In millions of dollars, rounded]

	Federal funds	Trust funds	Total of the 2	Less intragovernmental transactions that wash out	Net totals
Fiscal 1971 (preliminary actual):					
Budget receipts	$133,619	[1] $54,713	$188,332	N.A.	$188,332
Budget outlays	163,778	[1] 47,796	211,574	N.A.	211,574
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−30,159	+6,917	−23,242		−23,242
Fiscal 1971 (original budget, January 1970):					
Budget receipts	(147,600)	(64,107)	(211,707)	(−$9,605)	(202,103)
Budget outlays	(154,936)	(55,440)	(210,376)	(−9,605)	(200,771)
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	(−7,336)	(+8,667)	(+1,331)	(.....)	(+1,331)
Fiscal 1970 (actual):					
Budget receipts	143,158	59,362	202,520	−8,778	193,743
Budget outlays	156,301	49,065	205,366	−8,778	196,588
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−13,143	+10,297	−2,846		−2,845
Surplus (+) or deficit (−), 1970 and 1971	−43,302	+17,214	−26,088		−26,087
Fiscal 1969 (actual):					
Budget receipts	143,321	52,009	195,330	−7,547	187,784
Budget outlays	148,811	43,284	192,095	−7,547	184,548
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−5,490	+8,725	+3,235		+3,236
Surplus (+) or deficit (−), 1969, 1970, and 1971	−48,792	+25,939	−22,853		−22,851

[1] Intragovernmental netted out. In absence of intragovermental break-out, these figures understated by that amount (about $11,000,000,000 based on January budget revision).

AMOUNTS INVOLVED IN FISCAL YEAR 1972 BILLS

Mr. Speaker, I append a table of the amounts involved in the appropriation bills and resolutions which I have discussed.

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1972—AS OF AUGUST 6, 1971

[Note: As to fiscal year 1972 amounts only]

Bill	Budget requests considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (−)
IN THE HOUSE			
1. Education	$5,068,343,000	$4,800,088,000	[1] −$268,255,000
2. Legislative	455,744,595	449,899,605	−5,844,990
3. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,104,813,850	12,423,896,050	+319,082,200
4. State—Justice—Commerce—Judiciary	4,204,997,000	3,684,183,000	[3] −520,814,000
5. Treasury—Postal Service—General Government	4,780,576,000	4,487,676,190	−292,899,810
6. Interior	2,164,569,035	2,159,508,035	−5,061,000
7. HUD—Space—Science—Veterans	17,457,017,000	[2] 18,115,203,000	[2] +658,186,000
8. Transportation	2,833,229,997	[5] 2,559,048,997	[4] −274,181,000
Advanced 1973 appropriation	(174,321,000)	(174,321,000)	
9. Labor—HEW	19,942,996,000	20,361,247,000	+418,251,000
10. Public Works—AEC	$4,615,945,000	$4,576,173,000	−$39,772,000
11. Emergency Employment Assistance (H.J. Res. 833)	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	
12. Summer feeding programs for children (H.J. Res. 744)		17,000,000	+17,000,000
13. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	(168,569,000)		
14. Defense	(73,249,259,000)		
15. Military construction	(2,313,375,000)		
16. Foreign assistance	(3,634,775,000)		
17. Supplemental, 1972			
Total, House bills	74,628,231,477	74,633,922,877	+5,691,400
IN THE SENATE			
1. Education	$5,153,186,000	$5,615,918,000	[1] +$462,732,000
2. Legislative	535,349,607	532,297,749	−3,051,858
3. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	4,809,216,000	4,752,789,690	−56,426,310
4. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,104,813,850	13,621,677,050	+1,516,863,200
5. Interior	2,194,594,035	2,226,023,035	+31,429,000
6. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4,216,802,000	4,098,083,000	−118,719,000
7. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	17,457,017,000	[2] 18,698,518,000	[2] +1,241,501,000
8. Transportation	2,686,006,997	[5] 2,784,608,997	[5] +98,602,000
Advance 1973 appropriation	(174,321,000)	(174,321,000)	
9. Labor-HEW	20,123,637,000	21,018,317,000	+894,680,000
10. Public Works-AEC	4,615,945,000	4,716,922,000	+100,977,000
11. Emergency Employment Assistance (H.J. Res. 833)	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	
12. Summer feeding programs for children (H.J. Res. 744)		17,000,000	+17,000,000
Total, bills cleared Senate	74,896,567,489	79,082,154,521	[1] +4,185,587,032
ENACTED			
1. Education	$5,153,186,000	$5,146,311,000	[1] −$6,875,000
2. Legislative	535,349,607	529,309,749	−6,039,858
3. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	4,809,216,000	4,528,986,690	−280,229,310
4. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,104,813,850	13,276,900,050	+1,172,086,200
5. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4,216,802,000	4,067,116,000	−149,686,000
6. Interior	2,194,594,035	2,223,980,035	+29,386,000
7. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	17,457,017,000	[2] 18,339,738,000	[2] +882,721,000
8. Transportation	2,686,006,997	[5] 2,730,989,997	[5] +44,983,000
Advance 1973 appropriation	(174,321,000)	(174,321,000)	
9. Labor-HEW	20,123,637,000	20,704,662,000	+581,025,000
10. Public Works-AEC			
11. Emergency Employment Assistance (H.J. Res. 833)	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	
12. Summer feeding programs for children (H.J. Res. 744)		17,000,000	+17,000,000
Total, bills enacted	70,280,622,489	72,564,993,521	[1] +2,284,371,032

[1] As passed by both House and Senate, the education appropriation bill did not include $400,000,000 requested in the budget for purchase of student loan notes from colleges and universities, contingent upon legislative authority not yet enacted. If the $400,000,000 is excluded from all of the figures shown, the amount in the House approved bill is in effect a net increase of $131,745,000 over the budget requests considered by the House; the Senate approved bill on the same basis is $862,732,000 over the budget requests considered by the Senate; and the enacted bill on the same basis is $393,125,000 over the budget requests considered.

[2] Taking into account $850,000,000 in the budget as a proposed supplemental for special revenue sharing, or ½ year funding in certain housing and urban development programs, the House bill is $191,814,000 below the budget requests; the Senate bill is $391,501,000 above the requests; and the enacted figure is $32,721,000 above the requests.

[3] $352,715,000 of this figure is apparent, not real, because all maritime programs and one judiciary item were struck by floor points of order.

[4] Includes $235,000,000 related to prior decision to terminate the SST.

[5] House bill does not include $248,000,000 floor addition to "Federal Payment to Airport and Airway Trust Fund" since, technically, it is not new budget authority until appropriated out of the trust fund. Senate bill adds another $219,800,000 to this "Federal payment" account. Conference report adds $239,000,000 to the budget for this "Federal payment."

Prepared Aug. 6, 1971, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, what the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is trying to get across to this Congress is this:

I believe at the beginning of the fiscal year the administration estimated they would have a certain budget surplus. It did not work out that way. So, instead of having a surplus and instead of having a deficit of $23 billion and some odd, actually the Federal Government, if it operated on the basis that all businesses must operate, would have a deficit of about $30 billion; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct, in that on the Federal funds basis the deficit was about $30 billion for the fiscal year just ended, fiscal 1971.

What it will be for the fiscal year in which we now find ourselves, starting July 1, the fiscal year 1972—it could go as high certainly as $30 billion and easily as high as $40 billion on the Federal funds basis.

Mr. HALEY. Based on the present, then, we could well go up to as much as $40 billion if the Congress does not show some restraint. And, of course, you cannot blame all of this on the administration. This seems to be an annual affair—that the Congress goes ahead and votes programs and money that they just do not have and that they must go out and borrow either from trust funds or some place else and regardless of the fact that the debt of the Federal Government today is approximately $40 billion more than all the rest of the nations on the face of the earth.

Mr. MAHON. I do not seek to blame anybody for the problems which confront us. I realize the answers to the problems are difficult. I realize that the Congress and the administration and the American people must share somewhat the responsibility. I also realize that some of the matters which confront us are uncontrollable, but I do feel that it is most urgent that the Congress and the administration and the American people take heed of the situation which confronts us.

People worry about inflation, and they ought to worry about the things which are causing inflation. That is one of the reasons why I have undertaken, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee dealing with these fiscal matters, to speak out with respect to the facts which confront us.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion and the good judgment of the gentleman from Texas, if we continue this, how long is it going to be before financially the roof falls in on this great Nation?

Mr. MAHON. This is something which must be soberly considered and some way must be found to change this course and slow down the inflation pressures and see about the revenues to pay for programs or hold spending within the range of the funds in hand or the funds in prospect. So it is a time for serious thought, but it is much more popular to talk about spending for all these attractive things such as education and health and other things—and we need to spend for these things—but it is more popular to speak about these attractive and important programs than it is to speak about where are we going to get the money, and are we willing to pay for these programs. If we are not willing to pay for the programs, then in view of the heavy penalties of inflation and otherwise, we ought to proceed with these programs more cautiously.

U.S. ECONOMY IS STEADILY MOVING TOWARD FULL RECOVERY

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, those Americans who have been engaging in an exercise known as "knocking the economy" have been doing their country a terrible disservice. Not only does such criticism tend to undermine the steady recovery we are experiencing but it simply does not square with the facts.

The truth is that the U.S. economy is steadily moving toward full recovery. As proof of that we have a host of second-quarter earnings reports showing solid gains in various industries and we have the recent upsurge of sales in the auto industry, the bellweather of the economy.

The automobile companies reported record retail sales of 260,990 cars during the July 11–20 selling period. This sales increase was led by General Motors, which reported a record 10-day volume of 165,663 cars.

The sales pace from June 21 through July 20 represented a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 8½ million domestic units—or roughly a 10 million rate when imported cars are included.

The July automobile sales figures confirm earlier reports of strong retail sales activity.

Total retail sales from January to June rose at a rate of 15 percent per year, and sales for nondurables increased at a 12 percent per year rate during this period. These outlays should continue to rise as real incomes enlarge and the rate of personal saving moves down to more normal levels.

The pace of residential building is also encouraging. Seasonally adjusted housing starts ran at an annual rate of 1,881,000 units during the first 6 months of 1971. This was an increase of 48 percent over the rate for the comparable period in 1970.

The expanding rate of spending in these key categories contributed to an increase of $52 billion in the Nation's gross national product during the first half of 1971.

During that same time, the rate of inflation, seasonally adjusted, averaged 4 percent per year, well below the 6.2-percent figure for the first half of 1969 when the present administration assumed office.

There is also evidence that unemployment has begun to move down from the peak level reached last winter.

The facts are that we are taking an overheated economy back to a sustainable growth path during a period of painful transition from wartime to peacetime. The strong growth of consumer spending is a major factor in making this transition a success.

A closing note: If all the Americans who were in military uniform or in defense jobs when the present administration took office were still thus occupied, our unemployment rate would be 4.2 percent. The Republican Party wants prosperity and jobs without war.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall No. 205, the motion to table the Edwards amendment to instruct the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment to H.R. 9272.

The Senate amendment to the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce provided that no funds appropriated pursuant to the bill could be used for actions of the Subversive Activities Control Board not authorized by Congress.

I want the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "nay" on the motion to table.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING TREATMENT OF SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a concurrent resolution designed to bring to bear the influence of the United States on behalf of the persecuted Jewish minority in the Soviet Union. A bipartisan group of over 100 of my House colleagues are joining me in cosponsoring this measure.

The ill treatment of Soviet Jews cannot be shown through use of statistics or data. Documented evidence on the number of Jews who have lost their jobs or whose homes have been searched for traces of illegal Hebrew books is not available. Yet, we do have reports from those who have had the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and from Jews who have taken a great many risks and have successfully emigrated from Russia. And we have all read of the arrests that have taken place and of the trials of Soviet Jews for alleged skyjacking attempts. Our State Department has said of these trials:

> It would appear that the defendants (are being) tried for actions which are not even considered a crime in most countries.

Clearly, the Jews of the Soviet Union are being denied fundamental rights.

The sense of the Congress resolution which we are introducing today requests that the President call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and exercise of religion by all its citizens and to use all available channels, formal and informal, to convey this position. We in America pride ourselves on our tradition of religious and cultural freedom. We can no longer remain silent as the Soviet Government refuses to allow its Jewish citizens these same rights—rights that have been written into the Soviet Constitution but have never been honored.

Our resolution requests the President to demand of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice, as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The Jews in Russia are struggling to maintain their cultural and religious identity in an atmosphere of suppression. The tragedy of this situation is compounded by the Soviet Government's refusal to grant its citizens the right to emigrate to countries where religious and cultural diversity is tolerated. Moreover, the Jews of the Soviet Union, in conversations and correspondence with foreigners have often expressed the desire to journey to a land where they would be enthusiastically welcomed—the State of Israel. Indeed, those who have had the opportunity have chosen to live in Israel and to assist that country in her struggle for survival. If we do not speak out against the Soviet policy of prohibiting the right of emigration, we will, in effect, be acquiescing in the denial of this basic human right.

The resolution further calls upon the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights—a declaration that was adopted unanimously by the United Nations. I believe that the United Nations is the appropriate forum for raising this issue of international concern for it is a body that was organized to promote peaceful relations between nations as well as personal liberty within nations.

Article 55 of the U.N. Charter states that:

> The U.N. shall promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Therefore, I think the treatment of Soviet Jews is a proper subject for the United Nations to consider, treatment which is clearly in violation of this clause of the charter.

President Nixon has already voiced his own concern about the plight of Soviet Jews. In a message to American Jewish leaders on January 11, the President said:

> You may be certain also that this Administration, reflecting the traditional liberties upon which this country was founded, joins with you in urging freedom of emigration as explicitly provided in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in its commitment to cultural and religious freedom at home and abroad.

And this, in essence, is the intent of the resolution I am introducing today. Those of us who are fortunate enough to enjoy the free expression of ideas and religion have a responsibility to work for the relief of oppressed people the world over. Our country is recognized as the leader of the free world and I think it only fitting that our President play a prominent role in this undertaking.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of our resolution as well as a complete list of the cosponsors.

H. Con. Res. 390

Whereas in the Soviet Union men and women are denied a freedom recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world, indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas the Jews and other religious minorities of Russia are being denied the means to sustain their identity inside Russia and the opportunity to maintain that identity by moving elsewhere; and

Whereas the right to emigrate, which is denied Russian Jews, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; and

(3) demand of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

(4) call upon the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Begich, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Devine, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Springer, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Eilberg, Mrs. Grasso, and Mr. Yates.

Mr. Roe, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Rees, Mr. Minish, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Madden, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Howard, Mr. Fish, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Crane, Mr. Widner, and Mr. Byron.

Mr. Peyser, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. J. William Stanton of Ohio, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Brookfield, and Mr. Koch.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Bolling, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Morse, Mr. Gude, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Drinan, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. Grover, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Metcalfe, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Williams, Mr. Horton, Mr. Sarbanes, and Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Wydler, Mr. McDade, Mr. Karth, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Moss, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Kemp, Mrs. Abzug, and Mr. Fraser.

Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mr. Sisk, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Kyros, Mr. du Pont, Mr. McClory, Mr. Whitehurst, and Mr. Dow.

Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Robison of New York, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Stokes, Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. Thone, and Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Scherle, Mr. Myers, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Biester, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Pepper.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my voice in support of this resolution which expresses concern for the oppression of Soviet Jews as well as other minority groups in the U.S.S.R.

This measure will demonstrate to the Soviet Union and the world that we are aware of and concerned with this situation. It instructs the President and the State Department to use all available channels of communication, formal and informal, to demand the redress of grievances against the Russian Jewry.

Despite the fact that the Soviet constitution guarantees the free expression of cultural and religious freedoms, we know all too well that these liberties have been denied. Further, the right of free emigration, granted by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, has been all but ignored by Russia. This is especially disheartening to those thousands of Jews who wish to emigrate to their adopted home of Israel.

Passage of this resolution will focus the spotlight of truth upon injustices which until recent years have been hidden from the free world. While we can only rely on the weight of world public opinion, we do know that the Soviet Union has responded to this form of pressure in the past. I hope that passage of this measure will serve to maintain this pressure; to keep these transgressions against human dignity before the forum of world opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution addresses a problem which has traditionally been dear to the American people—the subjugation of the human spirit. The Greek philosopher Pythagoras once said that there are only two remedies for sufferings of the soul: hope and patience. I submit that the Soviet Jews have endured their pain with gallant patience as well as hope in the face of overwhelming oppression. They deserve not only our respect but strong and concerted action for their relief.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Jews of the Soviet Union are being persecuted. Let us make no bones about it. They are systematically being exterminated as a viable religious body by a totalitarian state. It may not be the mass slaughters and concentration camps of the Hitler regime in World War II, but the goal of extermination of a group of people is the same.

Can it be that we have forgotten what Hitler did just a scant 30 years ago? Can it be that we as Americans have forgotten that to preserve our own human rights and freedoms, we must fight for the rights and freedoms of peoples the world over?

Hillel, the Rabbi and teacher of great people, said:

> If I am not for myself . . . who will be

for me? If I am only for myself . . . what am I?

It appears that too many Americans are only for themselves.

The cause of Soviet Jewry is a just one. The right to emigrate is an international humanitarian right that transgressed once against one group of people in a transgression multifold against all the people of the world.

Yet we here in America stand idly by while the Soviet Union makes criminals of the Jews in their country. The only crime the Soviet Jews are guilty of is that they desire to live in accordance with their heritage. They are guilty of daring to speak and write in their own languages. They are guilty of attempting to transmit their culture to their children. They are guilty of demanding the right to live with dignity as Jews.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and my colleagues here that if they are guilty of these crimes then we are all guilty.

Not too long ago I had the privilege of successfully defending a group of 11 rabbis, two professors, and one rabbinical student against charges based on their demonstration in front of the U.S. mission to the United Nations. It necessitated my being absent from my work here in Washington, but the just cause was there.

They dared to ask the President of the United States to speak out against the Soviet treatment of the Jews in that country. They dared to request Voice of America broadcasts in Yiddish to the 3 million Soviet Jews. They dared to ask the Congress of the United States to approve 30,000 emergency U.S. visas for the Russian Jews.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that our judicial system has the courage to throw out such a ridiculous case as was brought against these noble men. However, the same time these men were being tried in this country, in the Soviet Union, at Kishinev, nine Jews were being hauled into court after being arrested in a mass roundup that began a year ago in Leningrad.

What has happened to the great Government of the United States? In 1903 the highest Government officials spoke out against the infamous Kishinev pogroms. And again in 1940, this Nation went to war to protect human rights and freedoms. Why the silence today? Has America abandoned its national tradition to fight for freedom everywhere in the world?

What we need are more courageous men such as those that I recently defended. These men were willing to speak out against injustice and denial of human rights. For the RECORD, I would like to list their names at this time so that the whole world may know that some Americans at least are still ready to fight for international freedom and human dignity.

They are:

The rabbinical leaders involved in today's action are:

Rabbi Irving Greenberg, Riverdale Jewish Center and Yeshiva University.

Rabbi Steven Riskin, Lincoln Square Synagogue (Manhattan) and Yeshiva University.

Rabbi Avraham Weiss, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun (Monsey, N.Y.) and Yeshiva University.

Rabbi Aryeh Gotlieb, Jewish Community Center of Paramus, N.J.

Rabbi Charles Sheer, Jewish Chaplain, Columbia University.

Rabbi Fred Gorsetman, Manhattan.

Rabbi David Ribner, Congregation Beth Tefila, Paramus, N.J.

Rabbi Zevulun Charlop, Young Israel of Moshulu Parkway and Yeshiva University.

Prof. James Burton, Physics Dept., Columbia University.

Rabbi David Miller, Instructor of Bible and Theology, Yeshiva University.

Rabbi Meir Havatzelet, Professor of Bible, Yeshiva University.

Prof. Nathaniel Remes, Chemistry Dept., Yeshiva University.

Rabbi David Haber, Conservative Synagogue of Carnarsie.

Rabbi Joseph Siev, Bronx.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot continue to stand still. It has before it legislation to provide for 30,000 emergency refugee visas for the Soviet Jews. This bill should be passed. It has before it a resolution calling for broadcasts in Yiddish by the Voice of America. This resolution, too, should be passed.

And, likewise, we as individuals should ask the President of the United States as the head of a free Nation to speak out against oppression. He should protest the trials of the Wishnev and Leningrad Jews. He should protest the imprisonment of the Soviet Jews who are guilty of nothing more than demanding their human rights.

Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, will speak out for us, when we are the only ones left to face totalitarianism?

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC AND FOREIGN OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in company with a number of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have today introduced a bill to be known as the "Act for the Protection of Public and Foreign Officials," which was jointly proposed by the Department of Justice and the Department of State.

I believe that it is important to the proper functioning of the Federal Government that it be able to investigate and prosecute acts of violence against its employees when it feels that it is necessary to do so. I also believe that it is essential to the conduct of our foreign affairs that the Federal Government be able to prosecute certain actions taken against foreign officials or their property.

The purpose of the legislation which I have introduced today is to fill certain gaps in the Federal law in these areas. As indicated in the declaration of congressional policy at the beginning of the bill, it is recognized that the power to punish common crimes has historically resided in the several States, and that there such power should remain; however, the Federal Government as well should have the tools provided in this bill to investigate and prosecute certain acts against government or foreign officials because such acts interfere with its conduct of domestic and foreign affairs.

Existing Federal law protects about one-third of all Federal civilian personnel from assault or killing by providing criminal sanctions for such offenses which are connected with their employment. Over a period of time, groups of employees have been added on a case-by-case basis to the list of categories of personnel protected by sections 111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code. There remains little rationale for the inclusion of some employees while others with similar functions have not yet been included. For example, many Federal employees who conduct administrative inspections for violations of Federal law are included in the list of those protected while others are not. Rather than attempt to determine which groups of Federal employees are most likely to be assaulted or murdered because of their employment and take the chance that employees who should be covered have been overlooked, the bill would make it a Federal offense to assault or kill any Federal employee because of his employment. The bill would also apply the same criminal sanctions to the murder or assault of a member of an employee's family which is committed because of the employee's job.

The portions of the bill relating to protection of foreign officials are especially important. It is essential to the conduct of our foreign relations and to the carrying out of our international obligations that the Federal Government be able to prosecute those who injure foreign officials. It is often difficult for a foreign government which does not operate under a federal system such as ours to understand why, when a crime has been committed in the United States against one of its citizens, the Federal Government cannot take direct action against the perpetrator of that crime but must instead rely upon the cooperation of the State in which the crime was committed. International incidents based upon this lack of understanding could be prevented or alleviated by the passage of legislation such as this permitting the Federal Government to investigate or prosecute certain crimes against foreign diplomats and other foreign government and international organization employees.

First, the legislation contains provisions relating to assault and killing of foreign officials or their families which closely parallel those for Federal employees. Because of the foreign relations implications of such offenses, however, the bill would confer Federal jurisdiction regardless of whether the crime was committed because of or on account of the foreign official's position or duties.

Second, the bill would make it a Federal offense to intimidate or harass a foreign official.

Third, the bill would make it a Federal offense for three or more persons to congregate for certain purposes within 100 feet of a building used or occupied by a foreign government, foreign official, or international organization and refuse to

leave when ordered to do so by a Federal or local law enforcement official. As presently drafted, the language of this latter provision of the bill may be deficient by failing to strike with necessary clarity the proper balance between the legitimate government goal of protecting foreign officials from unreasonable harassment and insult and the uniquely countervailing goal of preserving fundamental first amendment rights. I am satisfied, however, that any such deficiency can be adequately cured through the legislative process.

Fourth, to protect the property of foreign governments and international organizations, the bill would make it a felony willfully to damage or destroy such property.

The bill would also amend the Federal kidnaping law to make kidnaping in the course of air piracy an extraditable offense under treaties which would not now provide for extradition in such cases. The redrafted kidnap provision would also make kidnaping of foreign or Federal officials or members of their families a Federal offense. Finally, the kidnaping provision would be amended to remedy the defect which was found by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Jackson,* 390 U.S. 570 (1968), to invalidate the death penalty provision in the present statute, but would restore the possibility of the death penalty only for cases in which the victim dies as a result of the kidnaping.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this bill would be an important addition to the law and would permit the Federal Government better to fulfill its responsibilities to protect foreign officials of this country and to prevent interference with the operation of the Government by injury to its employees.

I would again like to point out that this legislation is not intended in any way to preempt or replace State law. Rather, it is intended to give the Federal Government jurisdiction concurrent with that of the States so that the Federal Government can investigate or prosecute those cases which it deems to involve the Government's vital interests in its own operations or in its foreign relations. I hope that the Congress will give this legislation its early and earnest attention.

ABOLITION OF OPPRESSIVE CHILD LABOR IN AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to abolish oppressive child labor in agriculture. And, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am hereby announcing hearings on this legislation to be held shortly after the House reconvenes at the conclusion of the recess.

For a great many years, Mr. Speaker, this Nation has been committed, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, to the proposition that "oppressive child labor" ought to be abolished from the land. The factories, the mines, the mills, the dangerous and unhealthy reaches of our great industrial jungles have been considered no place to employ our children. It was not an easy idea to put into the law, and to this day, it is not wholly and uniformly enforced. But at least we are, on the face of the statutes, dedicated to the proposition that children ought to have a few years of childhood allowed them before we send them off to earn a living.

But in agriculture, for a number of reasons, we have not followed this philosophy. We have consoled ourselves with the idea that "the fields are a healthful place for kids to earn a couple of bucks during their vacation from school." This is a comforting concept and it rests securely on the vision of a bucolic past in which farmwork was nonmechanized, simple labor in the fresh air and under the blue sky. All of us, I suspect, have some memories of that kind buried not very deep in our own experience, or the experience of our fathers or their fathers. When agriculture was the way of life of most Americans, when it was largely subsistence agriculture and almost wholly based on the small, single-family farm, this picture may have been true.

But, Mr. Speaker, the picture is changing. No, the picture has long since changed, and this pastoral scene is not what we are talking about when we talk about child labor on the farm today.

We are talking, first, about industrial child labor. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which can usually be counted on to paint the most favorable picture, one-third of the wage earning farmworkers in the United States in 1970 were between the ages of 14 and 17. That fraction represents 819,000 children out of a total farm wage labor force of 2,400,000. This does not count the children who work for their parents, and, Mr. Speaker, it most certainly does not count the thousands of children who are working illegally, in violation of what few laws there are, and who are most assuredly not reported to the census takers by their employers—or for that matter, by their parents, many of whom depend on the few pennies these children can earn to eke out the few more pennies the parents actually get paid for their back-breaking work in the fields.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we only count the lawful child labor force in the fields—and no one will seriously contend that this exhausts the number—we find a third of the farm wage earners are children. The actual figures, of course, are much higher.

We are talking too, Mr. Speaker, about a very dangerous industry. In the National Safety Council's annual book "Accident Facts, 1970" we discover that out of 14,200 occupational deaths in 1969 in a total work force of 79,000,000 people, agriculture, which employed only 3,800,000 workers, suffered 2,500 deaths. Manufacturing, with its nearly 20 million workers, suffered 1,900 occupational deaths.

In 1966, according to materials compiled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and provided in 1969 to the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the agricultural occupational injury rate in California, although improved from earlier years, "is still twice as high as the rate for all industries taken together. Looked at another way, agricultural injuries represented almost 8 percent of all lost-time job injuries reported in California in 1966, although less than 4 percent of all employees worked on farms."

These are statistics illustrative of an enormous amount of data, all pointing to the fact that agriculture is a dangerous enough occupation for adult wage earners who can weigh the dangers of working in a particular occupation against their own financial needs. It is most certainly a poor place for us to send the children we have forbidden to work in other industry in part because we thought the mill and the factory were too dangerous for them.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because I had just returned from a trip to Taiwan in which I participated in the official Republic of China observance of Captive Nations Week I did not have an opportunity to participate here on the floor in our annual observance of that occasion at the time. For that reason I want to make a few remarks at this time, and to include the text of some of my comments made in Taiwan, because obviously developments of the past few weeks have an important bearing on the subject matter of Captive Nations Week, particularly as it relates to the future of the Republic of China and of the captive Chinese peoples located on the mainland.

Annually we who have participated in the Captive Nations Week observance have paused to remind ourselves and the rest of the world not only of our need to prevent further Communist aggression into the free world, but also the need to work for the ultimate restoration of freedom in those nations which have already been enslaved by Communist tyranny.

This year I had the honor of addressing a large rally in Taiwan during the Republic of China's observance of Captive Nations Week and I took that opportunity to discuss what I felt should be our relationships with the Republic of China and with the Communist regime on the mainland. At that time the atmosphere was full of suggestions that there might be a change in U.S. policy toward the question of admitting Red China to the United Nations, but it was not until I returned from Taiwan that the bombshell on this question was dropped by President Nixon in his announcement of the visit of Mr. Kissinger to Peking and the projected visit of the President himself to Mainland China prior to May of

1972. Needless to say, this announcement completely altered the entire situation as regards Taiwan, and I am frank to say that it went far beyond anything that I had expected. This announcement also has raised very substantial questions, not merely in Taipei but around the world, as to where this country stands from here out, not only with regard to the effort to regain freedom for those peoples who have been captured by the Communsts, but even with regard to our desire to resist Communist aggression and expansion around the world. And the ultimate answer that is developed to this question will have an impact not merely in the Far East by also in the captive nations of Europe, like Poland, and Lithuania, and Hungary, and the Ukraine, which are still counting on our interest and our continued support for their eventual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I can best present my views on this subject by including in the RECORD at this point the full text of the remarks that I made in Taipei in connection with the Captive Nations Week observance there, together with a copy of the press release I issued here in Washington after learning of President Nixon's announcement. It is my hope that these remarks may be of interest to other Members of the House.

The material follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, TAIPEI, JULY 10, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the conference, it is a special pleasure to be able to return to the Republic of China today for my second visit here in little more than a year. I visited here a year ago in May as the acting chairman of a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee; and I am delighted to be back once again.

As one who served in the Pacific theater of war under General MacArthur during World War II, and was recalled for service during the Korean war, I have long had a deep and abiding interest in Asia. And I have been greatly impressed with the courage and determination of the people of the Republic of China, who, in spite of all the obstacles, have achieved such miracles of economic expansion and defense strength here on the island of Taiwan. We salute this great free Republic of China for what you have accomplished and for what we are confident you will continue to accomplish in the future.

I am also happy of course to have this unusual opportunity to join with the Captive Nations Committee of the Republic of China, and with your many friends and guests, to commemorate once again here in Asia our annual Captive Nations Week. In joining in these worldwide ceremonies we remind ourselves and the rest of the Asian world of our determination to continue the long and demanding struggle against the predatory and aggressive policies of the communist world. But more than that, on this occasion, as free men and women, we renew our solemn pledge to work together to speed the day when the blessings and privileges of freedom will once again be enjoyed by all those unhappy peoples, around the world, who, love freedom and who treasure a heritage of freedom, but who today, having been captured by the communist movement, are forced to live in bondage under the communist yoke. I refer especially to those captive peoples here in Asia, the people of North Korea, the people of North Viet Nam, yes, and above all the people still existing under communist tyranny on the mainland of China. God speed the day when all these captive peoples shall once again walk in freedom and in hope.

My own interest in these annual Captive Nations observance is a very personal one, since, as a very new member of the United States Congress I was one of the original co-authors of the legislation which first established our official observance of Captive Nations Week, in the United States back in 1960. And I will also tell you that I am one of those who is still pushing hard for the creation within the U.S. House of Representatives of a special Captive Nations Committee so that as a Congress we can focus our special attention on the urgency of continuing to work for the ultimate freedom of all captive peoples around the world.

I know the delegates to this great gathering will find encouragement and hope in the knowledge that in another week the people of the United States and the members of the United States Congress, pursuant to official Presidential proclamation, will join in appropriate ceremonies to dramatize our own support for these goals of freedom and self-determination for all the peoples of the world, and our continued determination to work to hasten the day when all those peoples, whether behind the Iron Curtain in Europe or behind the various bamboo curtains here in Asia, who are still condemned to live under communism will again be free.

But ladies and gentlemen, I would be less than frank with you if I did not candidly acknowledge to the delegates of this great conference that as we meet here today the climate of broad public support within the United States for the basic philosophy and the basic goals and objectives of this annual observance of ours is more shaky and unpredictable than it has been at any time since these observances were first instituted some 11 years ago.

As I see it—and I think that the members of this conference should be perfectly clear about these facts—America stands today at the brink of a very significant watershed in our post-World War II policies towards the rest of the world. And—make no mistake about this either—nobody can tell you with assurance at this point just which way the United States of America is going to move. It may seem strange to you; but the fact is that suddenly the assumptions and the convictions that have guided our world leadership role, and especially our leadership in the fight against communist aggression and encroachment, since the end of World War II are no longer accepted by our people without challenge. For the first time in a generation we find ourselves perplexed, confused, and bitterly divided, as I am sure you realize, over what it is we really want as a nation and where it is we really are headed, or ought to be headed.

Distinguished voices in the Congress—mostly in the United States Senate, to be sure, but increasingly also in the House of Representatives, I regret to say—are critical of the leadership role which America has exercised in the free world under the last six Presidents of the United States and the various elected Congresses associated with them. Suddenly today we are being told that communism is no longer a threat to the peace and stability of the world; that the Cold War and its tensions have long since disappeared; that the Soviets and the Communist Chinese are at heart nice, quiet, peaceful nations, with not the slightest interest, really, in intruding on the territory or the affairs of their neighbors, except, of course, so we are being told, as a purely defensive reaction to the allegedly aggressive international policies and actions of the United States, now, incidentally, being run so we are also told, entirely by a sinister entity called "the industrial-military complex."

We hear it proclaimed that America must not continue any longer to serve as "the world's policeman." We must abandon our long-standing commitments around the world to freedom and to free nations, we are told, and return to the self-indulgent isolationism of the 1920's—cultivating our own particular gardens, and devoting our time, attention, and our dollars exclusively to such domestic problems as poverty, racial unrest, pollution, and the like.

I am not suggesting of course that this rather curious view of the contemporary world has become, at least not yet, the controlling point of view of the people of the United States or their elected government. It certainly hasn't. But the chilling fact is—and it is high time our friends and allies around the world were clearly aware of just what is happening—that these sentiments do reflect the views of an increasingly larger segment of the American people, particularly the more vocal leaders of its intellectual and academic communities, of an increasingly larger portion of the members of the United States Congress, including a number of leading candidates for the presidency in 1972, and finally and most disturbingly, of a clear-cut majority of the printed and electronic news media, whose leaders, as you know, control tremendous power to mould public opinion, and who—as we have just seen—are immune from any prior restraints in publishing the clear and exact verbatim texts of any of the nation's most sensitive and most highly classified secrets which they can somehow get their hands on or which someone else can steal for them.

I hardly need to underline for you the profound significance of this shift in sentiment in our country, and the tremendous impact that it is likely to have, not merely on the cause of the Captive Nations, but on our whole future role in leading the fight against still further communist aggression and still further efforts at enslavement in many other crucial areas of Europe and Asia.

The reasons for this very dramatic shift in American sentiment lie of course in the frustrations of our long, costly, and still somewhat indeterminate commitment against communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Without going into detail over the complex issues involved in the Viet Nam war, and the wisdom or lack of it in the ways in which we sought to discharge our obligations there, one thing is perfectly clear. We went into Viet Nam just as we went into Korea, simply to prevent armed communist aggression from succeeding in Asia. Although the invasion of South Viet Nam by North Viet Nam was cleverly masked as a domestic insurrection, as compared with the more conventional military invasion of South Korea, the basic elements of both situations were identical. And in both cases, incidentally, this aggression by a small communist country on its non-communist neighbor was aided, abetted, and financed both by the Soviet Union and the Communist Chinese, and couldn't have lasted for a week without their help.

To be sure the relative ratios of support between these two communist powers varied from time to time during both conflicts. And whatever may be the ideological or practical differences between the Russians and Communist China, and however much these differences may support the conclusion now being expounded by so many unthinking commentators that communism is no longer a threat because it is no longer monolithic, the obvious fact is that in both conflicts both communist powers worked together, sometimes even in competition, against the interests of freedom and against the efforts of the United States. So whether communism is or isn't a monolith today, either way there is scant ground for any hope or encourage-

ment as far as the free peoples of the world are concerned.

Helping other free nations to resist aggressions of just this kind has been a cardinal principle of American foreign policy ever since 1947 and the Truman Doctrine. This was our commitment to the containment of communism, in Asia no less than in Europe. This was the same policy which was so eloquently restated by President Kennedy in his brilliant Inaugural address, as recently as 1961, which solemnly pledged that America would "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to insure the success and the survival of liberty."

So our decision in coming to the aid of the South Vietnamese was neither new nor surprising, even though South Viet Nam was admittedly a small country, was located a half a world away from the United States, and was situated in Asia instead of in Europe. But we had learned a long time ago—or some of us thought we had at least, after what happened to Czechoslovakia following Munich—that peace was indivisible, and that if military aggression can successfully make a captive of even a small and far away nation, to that extent the security and the peace of all the rest of the world—including ourselves—is weakened and diminished.

But whatever the rationale for our assistance to Viet Nam, the truth is that the long, slow progress there, and especially the indecisiveness of our military operations, gradually took a heavy toll in public understanding and support, not only for Viet Nam but also for our traditional worldwide posture against communist aggression.

So, where do we stand today on this critical issue in the United States of America? Well, first of all, let me say that there is no great difference of opinion over the desirability of ending our involvement in Indo-China as rapidly as we can practically do so, and turning over to the people of South Viet Nam and the other states of Indo-China the full burden of their own defense. Rather the crucial conflict today, and it is a remarkably bitter one, is whether we are going to be allowed to carry out that withdrawal under conditions that will give the South Vietnamese, once we leave, at least a reasonable chance to defend their own independence. If we can do that, then obviously, the basic objective of our long and costly commitment in South Viet Nam will have been largely achieved.

This, naturally, is the course which President Nixon is seeking to follow. The alternative, which the President's critics in the press and in Congress have been working hard to force upon him, would be to carry out that withdrawal from Viet Nam in a way that guarantees instead, once we have left, that the North Vietnamese communists will automatically take over control of South Viet Nam, something they of course have been fighting since 1956 to achieve. If we follow this alternative course we will, obviously, be insuring that everything for which our country has spent so much time and treasure, and for which more than 45,000 Americans have now given their lives to help secure, will have gone down the drain forever.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the central issue we face today in the United States in our Asian policy. This is what all the shouting is about. This end result, this tragic surrender and repudiation of all we have worked so hard and so long to achieve, is what President Nixon has so far stubbornly and, I believe, courageously, striven to prevent. And I for one hope the President will have enough public support in America to continue to do just that.

I say this in spite of the fact that the President is a Republican and I am a Democrat. But I deeply believe that when it comes to foreign policy, to the fate of our nation beyond its own shores, we must be Americans first and foremost and Democrats and Republicans second. All the great achievements in our world leadership role these past 30 years have been carried out with bi-partisan support. That is the way I believe it should be. And that is the way which I for one, if I have anything to say about it, am going to continue to work to see that it remains.

But to be perfectly candid, and perfectly realistic, it must be acknowledged that at this particular point no one can predict the outcome with assurance. A very large body of public opinion as of now, I am convinced, would support our withdrawal from Viet Nam regardless of what might happen to the people of South Viet Nam once we leave. Perhaps a majority of the Senate would favor this position too, provided only that we first got our own prisoners of war back home safely. At this stage I believe a majority of the House of Representatives is still firmly behind the President, but in all candor I must admit the margin is shrinking, and time is fast running out. And there is no question but that the latest Viet Cong peace offer from Paris has played into the hands of those working against the President.

I hardly need to point out to this assembly that if the President's critics do prevail, then a very heavy blow will have been struck to the cause we have all joined here today to honor.

Nevertheless, I do believe that this Great Debate now under way in the United States over the specifics of our withdrawal from Viet Nam has served to pinpoint one major truth, and that is that in a very real sense the future of what we like to regard as the free world hinges today more on the decisions we are taking and will be taking here in Asia than on those we take with regard to Europe. Here in this part of the world and in the countries which today comprise what might properly be called the Pacific Community is where the shape of the future of our whole world is almost certain to be determined.

To that extent it is especially unfortunate, I believe, that so much of our time and energies in the United States should be concentrated today only on the question of how and when we are going to withdraw from Viet Nam, because in our preoccupation we have been largely neglecting the far more important question of the future of Asia and the size and the shape of America's own role in that post-Viet Nam Asia. Do we now decide, for example, to opt entirely out of Asia now, once we leave Viet Nam? Do we opt out of all positions of leadership and responsibility now in the Pacific—despite our heavy commitments here in World War II, in the Korean war, and in Southeast Asia? Or do we instead continue to play some continuing role here in the Pacific Community? And if so, what should it be?

Most Americans, I believe, if you were to ask them directly, would probably support the broad approach to the Pacific Community that has come to be known as the Nixon Doctrine, that we should continue to have an interest in Asia and should play a major role there, but at the same time should limit our aid to economic assistance and possibly, upon occasion, to naval and air support, but should henceforth look to the free nations of Asia themselves to undertake a much larger share of the burden of their own defense, particularly in supplying the ground combat troops needed for that defense.

I am well aware that over the past two years the enunciation of the Nixon Doctrine has caused some apprehension on the part of our Asian allies for what it may represent in terms of a reduced American commitment in the Pacific. But the far more significant feature of this new doctrine, and the one that is especially relevant to the current debate over our withdrawal from Viet Nam, is not that it reduces our Pacific commitment below what it has been in the past, but that it represents a determination—in spite of all the growing domestic pressures in the United States toward isolationism—to continue to play a significant and meaningful role in support of peace, stability, and economic progress in Asia.

At the very least such a commitment would require continued support and assistance to all of the non-communist countries of Asia with whom we are already associated, either through specific bi-lateral agreements or through the broader provisions of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Communism is no less a threat in Asia than in Europe; and depending in part on the manner of our withdrawal from Viet Nam, the problem will be to keep it from becoming suddenly a far more explosive threat in Asia. Thus we can certainly do no less, and probably we shall have to do a lot more to build as firm a mutual security arrangement in the Pacific as now exists in Europe and the North Atlantic. In addition we shall also have to provide help and encouragement in expanding that purely military alliance, as has been done in Europe, into increasingly greater measures of area-wide economic and political cooperation. A start has been made on this in Asia, but much more remains to be done.

Yet even this limited kind of commitment will not come automatically from an American people wearied and disillusioned over earlier efforts to provide similar help in Southeast Asia. It is clear that those of us who share an interest in Asia and recognize the growing world importance of this region in terms of economic resources and productive manpower, must remain active and vigilant if we are to generate the level of public support necessary to underwrite the operations and funds needed to carry out even the reduced committments of the Nixon Doctrine in Asia.

After all, consider the relatively narrow margin by which the United States Senate recently defeated the effort to dismantle our NATO alliance, although that alliance has been in existence longer than SEATO, and its record of success has been far less ambiguous. And only by a hair's breadth last year did Congress defeat a legislative rider to the defense appropriations bill that would have prevented us not merely from sending American ground troops into Laos and Cambodia, as we are already prevented from doing anyway, but also from providing weapons and military equipment to those free Asian countries seeking to defend themselves against communist invasion. Obviously, if we are to be prevented even from sending to Asian countries the same kind of military assistance we have long been sending to Greece, to Turkey, to Latin America, and even to Israel, then the Nixon Doctrine is dead in Asia even before it can get started.

The most difficult question of all for the American people at the moment concerns our relations with Communist China, and I should like to conclude with just a few thoughts on this most vital topic. Let me make it abundantly clear, by the way, that on this matter, as on the others I have discussed, I speak only for myself, as one member of the United States Congress, and not for the Nixon administration.

Like most Americans I support the effort to get better acquainted with the Red Chinese, an effort, by the way, that originated in the Johnson administration, you may recall, with periodic talks in Warsaw, which never produced results, however, because of the complete intransigence of the Chinese Communists. It has always been a wise maxim to, know your enemy better. We have been expanding our contacts with the Soviets for many years, for example, including the "hot line" from Washington to Moscow, and the result has been that both of us know

and understand each other a little bit better. It has undoubtedly given them a clearer idea of the size and power of our military deterrent force. But, needless to say, it has not eliminated the sharp differences, in policy and ideology, that still separate us.

Something of the same kind might result from greater exchanges with the Red Chinese, and perhaps the results might be even more beneficial, since all indications point to the fact that as far as the United States is concerned the Chinese communists are the prisoners of their own ideology. The more they actually see of America, and Americans, the less likely are they to make a serious miscalculation about our ability to defend ourselves.

But having said all that, let me quickly add that the moment we go beyond the simple, preliminary feelers and exchanges and begin to talk about diplomatic recognition of Red China and its admission into the United Nations I see some very serious reservations.

There is really no reason for us to be misled as to just where such actions are likely to lead. Only the other day Premier Chou En Lai made it perfectly clear in several newspaper interviews that in spite of all the excitement and hoopla surrounding the new ping-pong diplomacy, the Mao government has not changed its basic line. Their primary objective, he reminded us, is still the take-over of Taiwan, just as the primary objective of the North Vietnamese government, in spite of all the diplomatic accountrements in Paris, is still the take-over of South Viet Nam. And in neither case, I might add, is diplomacy likely to change the issue in any significant degree.

So, if we want a rapprochement with Mao then we must be prepared to repudiate the Republic of China—in exactly the same way, again, as the desire for a negotiated settlement with Hanoi means ultimately the repudiation of the duly elected government of South Viet Nam.

Surely the United States has not yet come to the point where we are prepared to sacrifice our non-communist friends and allies in exchange for nothing more substantial than the appearance of smiles and friendship on the part of our communist enemies!

The lesson it seems to me is clear. So before we get ourselves in too deeply in this search for friendship and understanding on the mainland, let us reaffirm our continued policy of support, cooperation, and genuine friendship with the peoples and the government of the Republic of China.

And since these matters affecting our relations with the mainland have not yet been officially decided, it is all the more essential for those of us who believe as I do, both within Congress and outside, to speak out loud and clear against all these current efforts being made to persuade the administration this fall to switch our position at the United Nations and support the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

I believe that our government must continue to oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and do so openly and actively until such time as it renounces its aggression against the UN and goes on record in support of the peaceful principles of the UN Charter.

Secondly, we must continue our American support for the proposition that seating Red China is still an "important" question, and still requires a two-thirds majority.

Third, we must remind our own people as well as the members of the UN that the Republic of China is one of the founders of the UN, and one of the five permanent members of its Security Council. As such its exclusion from the UN, either directly or indirectly, is completely out of the question. It makes no more sense, in fact, than if one were to propose the expulsion of France or Great Britain, both likewise founders and permanent members of the Security Council, simply on the ground that neither country exercises today as decisive a role over world events as it did in the days preceding World War II, when the French Army was commonly regarded as the strongest in all Europe, and when the sun never set on the British Empire.

I just do not think that the United States can either duck or equivocate on any of these important issues. We must, I am convinced, take our stand firmly and openly, and we must seek actively once again this fall, as we have done so often in the past, to line up UN votes for our position, not just sit idly on the sidelines, as so many have lately been suggesting that we do.

Finally, if in spite of all our efforts a two-thirds majority should appear to be shaping up in the Assembly for the admission of Peking, then I would propose we move immediately to defer all action on this question for a year, to give us time to see where the Viet Nam negotiations are headed, and to explore in much greater detail the full implications of the new ping-pong diplomacy—a term, by the way, that has captured the attention of the world's headline writers but which still, as the Prime Minister of Australia reminded us just the other day in connection with his own country's conversations with Peking, has so far yielded very, very little indeed in diplomatic substance.

This has been a sober picture which I have painted for this assembly, but I have only tried to present the facts about our situation in America as they really are. I know you would want it this way, and also I am myself firmly convinced that the more clearly and frankly we face up to our problems, the more effectively we are likely to be able to deal with them.

As one who has himself watched with considerable dismay the shifting course of American public sentiment on these great issues of national security these past few years, I think I know something of the perplexity which all of you must have felt as you have been reading the headlines from America.

The nation that has stood for years in the forefront of the struggle for peace, stability, and freedom, has now begun to question its own purposes and even to doubt its own resolve.

We never sought, of course, to be the world's policeman, and indeed we have never filled that role. But we recognized from the start that if a fight was to be made against the forces of blackmail and aggression—in Asia as well as in Europe—in the days following the end of World War II, only the United States of America possessed the vision and the power to mobilize and lead the forces of the free world. We recognized that if we didn't provide that leadership, no one else could do it. And so, without any hope of national gain, but only in the conviction that helping a neighbor to preserve his freedom we were in fact defending our own, we moved to take up the long and costly burden.

Yet, disturbing as the recent changes in American sentiment may be, I must say I still share the optimism and determination expressed by our President. America still possesses the power and resources; all that we need is the courage, and the heart, and the will.

And I am convinced we will find that courage and that will, because I believe, as I know you believe, that it is better to live in freedom than in captivity, that communism is basically wrong as a political and social philosophy, that it carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction, and that right and truth ultimately will prevail.

So we do have faith that those Captive Nations whose people we honor here this week will indeed some day be free again. And in working for that freedom we are doing not only what is desirable but what is right. And no greater assignment could any body of men and women have.

As President Kennedy expressed it in his Inaugural Address, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

And we can also take heart from the same stirring words that Winston Churchill used to rally the British people in the darkest days of World War II: "Lift up your hearts. All will come right. Out of the depths of sorrow and sacrifice will be born again the glory of mankind."

NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 19.—Congressman Samuel S. Stratton proposed today to President Nixon that the U.S. use its influence in the United Nations this fall to defer all action on the question of seating Red China in the United Nations for one year, so as not to cause "very grave damage" to the Nationalist Chinese regime in Taiwan even before we can judge whether the President's impending visit to Peking "will yield anything substantive in terms of reduced tensions in the Far East."

Stratton, who returned last week from a brief trip to Taiwan where he spoke during the Chinese celebration of "Captive Nations Week," reminded the President in a letter today that the President himself had pointed out that his impending trip was not being taken "at the expense of old friends," meaning the Nationalist Chinese.

Nevertheless, Stratton pointed out, "it is perfectly obvious that, unless the United States itself takes immediate steps to forestall it, the surprise trip announcement will have the practical effect of expelling the Nationalist Chinese from the United Nations at this fall's General Assembly session. Most commentators have already pointed out that we could hardly take the lead now in a fight to block the seating of Red China after having just accepted an invitation to visit Peking before next May."

In order that the trip to Peking not damage the Nationalist Chinese in advance, Stratton said, "I believe it is most important that we move at once within the United Nations to obtain a complete postponement of the whole Chinese seating question until the fall of next year.

"The reason for this delay, of course, would be to permit you to carry out your projected visit as scheduled and to explore fully the possibilities for enhancing peace in Asia, without our being responsible, even before that trip is begun, for causing serious damage to one very old and respected friend and ally in the Far East, possibly even creating a major shift in the balance of Asian power—something, I am sure, that neither you nor the Congress would want to see occur at this juncture."

Stratton noted that the Nationalist government as well as much of the rest of the world were "eagerly awaiting" the official U.S. announcement of its position on the Chinese seating idea, expected to be made momentarily. The proposal to defer all action until after the Nixon trip had been completed, Stratton said, "would be in the best interests of our nation, and also cause the least damage within the international community while your daring diplomatic initiative is being carried forward."

The full text of Stratton's letter is attached.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 19, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your Thursday announcement of your impending visit to Pe-

king made it clear that this action was not being taken "at the expense of our old friends," meaning of course the Nationalist Chinese Government in Taipei.

Nevertheless it is perfectly obvious that, unless the United States itself takes immediate steps to forestall it, the surprise trip announcement will have the practical effect of expelling the Nationalist Chinese from the United Nations at this fall's General Assembly session. Most commentators have already pointed out that we could hardly take the lead now in a fight to block the seating of Red China after having just accepted an invitation to visit Peking before next May.

Thus, in spite of what we may say about "old friends," the mere announcement of your impending visit could do very grave damage to the Republic of China even before we can judge whether the visit itself will yield anything substantive in terms of reduced tensions in the Far East.

To make your pledge not to damage our old friends meaningful, therefore, I believe it is most important that we move at once within the United Nations to obtain a complete postponement of the whole Chinese seating question until the fall of next year.

The reason for this delay, of course, would be to permit you to carry out your projected visit as scheduled and to explore fully the possibilities for enhancing peace in Asia, without our being responsible, even before that trip is begun, for causing serious damage to one very old and respected friend and ally in the Far East, possibly even creating a major shift in the balance of Asian power—something, I am sure, that neither you nor the Congress would want to see occur at this juncture.

Since the Nationalist Chinese as well as most of the rest of the world are eagerly awaiting the official United States announcement of its decision on the Chinese seating question, I believe the action I am proposing here would be in the best interests of our nation, and also cause the least damage within the international community while your daring diplomatic initiative is being carried forward.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XXIX

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday I addressed the following letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, concerning the Sharpstown case and the conduct of the Justice Department in the matter.

AUGUST 4, 1971.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A few months ago there was public disclosure of an immense scandal in Texas. This situation is so large in size and so complex in nature that description of it defies the imagination. Though many aspects of the scandal involve only state statutes, and must be dealt with at that level, there are serious Federal questions involved, and I respectfully invite your attention to these.

The principal individual behind this great scandal was a gentleman by the name of Frank W. Sharp. According to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Sharp and his associates engaged in a great scheme to defraud banks and insurance companies and other entities under his control, to manipulate the values of stocks in such companies, to deal in unregistered stocks, and to engage in any number of other illicit activities. Ultimately a very large number of important Texas officials were involved in the scheme in one way or another, with the result that the state government was generally tainted, if not corrupted.

The United States had good reason to believe that Sharp was guilty of a number of criminal offenses. In other banking cases in Texas the Department of Justice has proceeded with a thorough and complete prosecution. Strangely enough, in the case of United States v. Frank Sharp, the Justice Department agreed to let the man plead guilty to two offenses, one involving false entry in bank records, the other involving sale of unregistered securities. The court sentenced the man to a total of five thousand dollars in fines and a three year suspended jail term.

After the sentencing, the Department of Justice asked for immunity for Mr. Sharp, and the court granted it. According to the court, it had no alternative. At a later date, however, the order was modified but only after my outcry, so that Sharp could be brought before Texas grand juries investigating the case.

There are three areas of special interest in this matter, and which I believe merit your earnest attention, and appropriate corrective action.

1. The Federal immunity statute.—It appears that there should be close Congressional review of the Federal immunity statute. In the Sharp case, it appears that immunity was granted before the government even had any idea of the extent of crimes concerned, and before it had so much as completed its investigation. There is little evidence to indicate that immunity was required, necessary or desirable in the Sharp case. If the conduct of that case is any indicator, I believe that Congress ought to review the whole matter of immunity and determine how the statute has been used.

More importantly, I believe that the immunity statute should be modified to give the judge more authority over the question. He should be allowed to evaluate the evidence for himself before granting immunity. As it stands, he must accept the decision of the government. The decision to grant immunity is momentous, and in it is bound up the whole concept of justice; such a power ought to be shared, and not be the exclusive property of the government.

2. Equal administration of justice.—In one Houston bank case, a bank president pleaded guilty to a false entry of $17,000 in his bank books. The judge sentenced him to five years and a five thousand dollar fine. By contrast, the judge sentencing Frank Sharp—not the same judge—on the identical charge, but this time involving a half million dollar entry—assessed an eighteen month suspended sentence and $2,500 fine. Another court, sentencing an interstate chicken thief, assessed three years in prison. The differences in these crimes is startling in the extreme, as is the difference in sentences assessed. I suggest that it might be desirable to review the entire sentencing procedure in Federal courts, and although it is properly the duty of judges to attempt to find the best means of rehabilitation, some method might be devised to eliminate this vast disparity in sentences.

3. Conduct of the Justice Department.—In one Texas bank case, the Justice Department brought lengthy indictments; in the Sharp case this was not done at all, though the failure of Sharp's bank involved gross improprieties and huge monetary losses. In the former case I am certain that the law has been followed to the letter, and cannot understand why this was not so in the latter case.

It might be that the reluctance of the Justice Department to proceed with vigor against Mr. Sharp is related to the fact that the present Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson, was employed by Sharp during two years of the time that Sharp concocted and carried out his grand scheme. Mr. Wilson was general counsel for at least three Sharp companies during this period, and carried out numerous assignments for Sharp, some of them involving deals of a most questionable nature.

Whether or not the Justice Department seeks to protect Wilson by failing to proceed against Sharp, there is serious question about Wilson's fitness to serve. He surely knew the nature of the deals that Sharp was making while he served as Sharp's legal adviser, and certainly did nothing to stop the scheme from developing and being carried out. I question whether a man having that kind of performance record can be trusted to be responsible for prosecution of the criminal statutes of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have detailed all these matters in a series of statements. I will be happy to furnish you additional information, and am available to you at any time. I earnestly request you to thoroughly investigate the matters above, and take such corrective action as might be required.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

A TAX ON SULFUR OXIDES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would place a tax on the emissions of sulfur oxides. The successful passage of this legislation would be a hallmark in the battle to save the environment.

Taxing polluters is regarded by virtually all economists as the most effective, most efficient, and most equitable way to make a real dent in the pollution problem.

The major thrust of the Federal Government's antipollution effort has been through the use of standards or direct regulations. These laws attempt to limit pollution by ordering the polluter to either reduce, or eliminate altogether, his harmful emissions. Anyone who has given only a cursory glance at any recent data on emissions can see what a dismal failure they have been. The major reason standards or regulations will never do the job, is that they do not encourage abatement, but tend to delay it. There is always a time lag between the date of passage of the specific legislation, and the last possible date allowed for compliance by the polluter. The longer the time lag, the easier it is to get the bill passed. Air polluters do not have to conform to the provisions of the Clean Air Act until 1976. There are no incentives to install abatement equipment now, all you have to do is state your company will comply by 1976.

Opting for the standards approach clearly demonstrates we do not feel pollution is something harmful. But sulfur oxide emissions are now estimated to cause between 1,100–2,200 excess deaths per year in New York City alone. Allowing the polluter 5 more years before he installs abatement equipment means we are allowing the sulfur oxide polluters to kill 5,000–10,000 more people in New York City before we say stop.

Once the Government commits itself

to grace periods for abatement, it naturally follows that the polluters will argue that the grace period be extended. Thus, no incentives are introduced for rapid abatement. It becomes more profitable to wait until the last possible date to install equipment; and then ask enforcing agency for an extension, which is routinely granted.

Striking and shameful evidence of this was demonstrated just last month by Environmental Protection Agency Administrator, William Ruckelshaus. A Washington Post reporter asked Mr. Ruckelshaus if the Government would shut down Ford Motor Co. in 1976 if they were the only automobile producer whose cars could not meet the 1976 requirements under the Clean Air Act. Mr. Ruckelshaus answered that in such a situation Ford Motor Co. would be granted an extension. I imagine the automobile industry was elated. The Administrator of EPA has, in fact, stated they do not have to comply. The incentives for developing low cost emission equipment are eliminated. All the polluter must do is inform the public, through advertising, that he is concerned with the environment, and is doing all he can.

Under this system the polluter allocates scarce funds to advertising instead of spending the money on research and development in pollution abatement itself. Ralph Nader's Task Force on Air Pollution found that Consolidated Edison, one of the largest polluters of sulfur oxides in New York City, spent $143,000 on all forms of air pollution research during the last 5 years. When compared to the $180,000 Consolidated Edison spent on air pollution advertising during the same period, one can see where Consolidated Edison's priorities are.

Legislation that provides incentives for abatement, not propagandizing, is necessary if we are ever to really tackle the problem. Standards or regulations will never do it.

Many polluters will argue that subsidies are the only answer. The National Association of Manufacturers favors this approach and would like to see tax credits for abatement equipment adopted. But the costs of such a program, in terms of foregone tax revenues, would most certainly escape the critical eye of congressional committees and we would not know what the program is costing us.

Second, the adoption of the use of subsidization would have the effect of introducing a new set of perverted incentives into the pollution attack. The amount of the grant or tax credit would depend on two variables: the level of emissions and the cost of the abatement equipment. There would be a strong incentive to exaggerate the level of emissions before the abatement to show more favorable results, and to exaggerate the costs of control to receive larger payments or tax credits.

Third, the costs of subsidization would be borne by the wrong people, the general taxpayer, and not the right people, the polluters or the consumer who uses the product which causes pollution.

This is not to say that subsidization would not work—it might, but the cost would be high. Nor is it to say that subsidies should be ruled out in all cases in some cases such as help to municipalities for sewer treatment, subsidies would be a good approach. But in general subsidies should not be the main thrust of the attack on pollution.

On balance, I believe that the best method of dealing with external costs of pollution is to internalize them as an economist would through the use of taxes. Through the use of a tax, we can force the producer to pay his total costs of production. Total cost for the producer would then include not only the private costs of labor, raw materials, machinery, and so forth, but also the external costs, or those which he imposes upon the environment, paid for with the tax. We determine the cost the polluter is imposing upon the environment and then present the polluter with the tax bill.

The use of a pollution tax, unlike a subsidy, puts the cost of cleaning up the environment where it belongs, on the polluter. Unlike using direct regulation under a pollution tax there is no controversy over an acceptable level of pollution—the tax is set on a sliding scale, the less pollution the less the tax. Too, unlike using direct regulation, there is no controversy over when the regulation goes into effect—the tax is put on immediately and when the pollution is corrected, the tax comes off.

When the tax goes into effect, the polluter faces three basic choices:

First, he can stop producing and stop polluting. This would occur in only a very few cases, when the level of his pollution is extremely high and the abatement equipment is prohibitively expensive.

Second, the polluter can install abatement equipment. This will occur when the cost of abatement is less than the tax.

Third, the polluter can pay the tax. This would occur only when the costs of abatement are higher than the tax. This may be a feasible solution where great economies of scale exist, such as sewage treatment. Maximum abatement with minimum cost could be achieved if the municipalities built highly efficient treatment plants, and treated all the wastes of industrial polluters. The taxes or charges levied on the polluters would pay for the construction and maintenance of the treatment facilities.

However using an air pollution tax the charges must be high enough to encourage abatement. If the air polluter is paying the tax instead of having the abatement equipment then the tax is not high enough. The tax, if properly levied, will yield very little revenue. It will, however encourage the polluter to remove all the pollutants, not just 80 or 90 percent.

Why have not we already adopted this approach of taxing polluters if this is such a good way of controlling pollution? What are the objections?

Many people concerned about the environment have felt that taxing polluters is analogous to granting a license to pollute. It was argued that the big firms would have sufficient wealth to just keep polluting and pay the tax. But this objection is probably the result of a misunderstanding of government tax policies. There are two types of taxes: revenue taxes, like the income tax, designed to bring large sums of money into the government coffers and taxes such as tariffs which are designed to motivate people to act in certain ways. A pollution tax is of the second type since the government would hope to collect little or no revenue and can raise the tax to encourage producers to install abatement equipment instead. A good example of what happens when polluters are forced to pay for the damage they do was related in a letter to my colleague, JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana recently. Without objection, I enter the letter at this point:

RADIATION LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., July 21, 1971.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I know that matters such as I am about to describe are out of the purview of your Committee but you may know to whom this letter may be usefully transmitted.

I returned from a delightful scientific meeting in New Hampshire where I was blessedly undisturbed by newspapers to find a stack of Wall Street Journals awaiting me at home on Sunday morning. As usual, I glanced through them to find out what is really going on in the world. On the back page of the July 12 issue, I discovered a story entitled "Nixon proposal to tax the fouling of the air could bring new type of pollution control." The article quotes Representative Les Aspin as saying that the idea "will reverse the entire incentive process by making it more profitable not to pollute." After a series of comments by people of different sorts favorable to such a bill, there is a statement "On the industry side, representatives of the coal, oil and mining companies say costs would skyrocket if a charge were placed on every pound of sulfur coming out of smoke stacks."

I don't presume to advise on the amount of tax that should be established if such a bill were to be passed but I would like to tell you a little story about something I learned approximately twenty years ago when I was a guest of the Canadian Institute of Chemistry at the Trail, B.C. plant of the Consolidated Smelting and Refining Company. My host told a very amusing story of the "sulfur farmers" of Washington, Idaho and Montana, who planted their farms very carefully each spring with full knowledge that there would be no crop to bring in at the harvest. The reason was that the sulfur dioxide fumes (from the burning of ores) coming down with the wind from Trail, about eight miles across the Canadian border, would effectively destroy all prospects of a crop. The farmers would, as I remember, make detailed claims to the International Claims Commission. Ultimately, that Commission would decide that the farmers had suffered losses amounting to several million dollars a year as the result of the incautious operations of the Canadian plant. Consolidated Smelting and Refining would, as a result, have to put out those millions to compensate the American farmers and everybody (except Consolidated) was happy.

Apparently, after several years of such operation, the people at Consolidated came to the conclusion that it might be a good idea to put the problem up to their chemists or at least to people who might react realistically to the problem. What they did was to convert the sulfur dioxide fumes into sulfur trioxide and then into sulfuric acid.

The trick now was to market the sulfuric acid. Trail is located at a rather high waterfall on the Columbia River. Thus, it was easy

enough to obtain considerable power from that waterfall and some of the power in turn was used to fix nitrogen to produce ammonia. The ammonia in turn was reacted with sulfuric acid to produce ammonium sulfate, which is an excellent fertilizer. Thus, the Consolidated Smelting found itself in the fertilizer business. No longer content with such triumphs, they decided to make more ammonia and convert that in turn into nitric acid. Ammonia and nitric acid give another fertilizer, ammonium nitrate, which was also sold effectively. Now, they saw many opportunities and one of the things they did was to buy potassium, or rather potassium materials from someplace in the northern United States (I think it was Montana or Idaho), which in turn was incorporated in either the nitrate or the sulfate to give very good potassium fertilizer. Of course, Consolidated paid for the potassium they purchased from the United States—but with American money!

The joker, in my mind at least, regarding all these operations is that their principal market seems to be the northwestern part of the United States and Hawaii. They now reap a profit from sale of fertilizers to the very people whom they had to pay previously in compensation for claims.

The moral of this little story is that, if the incentive exists, one may turn a loss into a profit. The people who now belch sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere have had no such incentive because they did not have to pay for the privilege. Consolidated Smelting had a real incentive because they had to pay for the privilege year after year. Ultimately, the stupidity of the situation got through to them. I am fairly confident that given similar incentives the rather brilliant people who at present find it profitable to waste sulfur dioxide will find it equally, or perhaps more, profitable to collect it and convert it into something marketable and useful both to their immediate interests and the general welfare of the public.

Sincerely,

MILTON BURTON,
Emeritus Professor of Chemistry.

Second, some people have charged that a pollution tax will raise the firms' costs and they will just pass these increased costs on to the consumer. I agree with them; that is the most equitable solution. As of now, people who live close to the polluter's firm are bearing part of the costs of his production. The consumers of his product are now paying an artificially low price. The consumers of steel are paying less for steel because part of the costs of producing steel are being borne by the people who live close to the steel plant. Thus the consumers of steel are buying steel too cheaply as the present price does not reflect the true costs of production.

More importantly, people are now buying products which cause a lot of pollution precisely because the price does not reflect the total cost. Only when all articles for sale really reflect the total cost of producing those articles will we, as consumers, really make the intelligent choices as to what we buy. Under total cost pricing products which cause pollution will cost more and people will buy less of them which is what we want.

Manufacturers claim that with a pollution tax they will suffer because their costs will increase, while foreign firms being allowed to continue to produce will undercut their prices. It is true that the cost to polluters will increase, either from paying the tax or from installation of abatement equipment, but that does not reflect an increase in total costs to the society. The costs are just transferred to the people who are really imposing them upon others.

Today I am introducing a bill that would tax sulfur oxide emissions.

Sulfur oxides cause billions of dollars worth of damage to health and property each year. The Environmental Protection Agency reports that each pound of sulfur oxides emitted causes 25 cents of health and property damage. Presently, there are over 30 million tons being emitted every year in the United States, approximately 300 pounds for every man, woman and child.

A recent study conducted in New York City has shown that sulfur oxides start causing excess deaths when the average daily concentration reaches between 0.2 and 0.4 parts per million. These concentrations existed on 30 percent of the days included in the study. If these levels exist 30 percent of the time, between 1,100 and 2,200 excess deaths are caused by sulfur oxides in New York City every year.

Various other studies have confirmed the results of the New York research. Studies in London showed that the daily death rate increased when the concentration of sulfur oxides reached 0.25 parts per million. A more distinct increase in deaths occurred when the levels reached 0.35 parts per million. In Chicago, in 1969, a temperature inversion caused the sulfur oxide level to rise so high that 100 excess deaths occurred with some of the victims less than 2 years old. The U.S. Public Health Service reports that long term adverse health effects begin when the concentration of sulfur oxide reaches 0.1 parts per million. New York City is above that level.

People buy air conditioners in order to breathe some fresh air, the utility generates more electricity, and along with it of course, more air pollution. Increased particulate and sulfur oxide emissions reduce direct sunlight so people have to turn on their lights sooner, further increasing the demand for electricity. Particulates reduce direct sunlight by as much as two-thirds in our northern urban areas.

Sulfur oxides also corrode metal. EPA reports that the corrosion rates are up to five times greater in polluted areas than in rural areas. Sulfur oxides damage all types of electrical equipment. In heavily polluted areas, there is a one-third reduction in the life of overhead power line hardware and guy wires. Sulfur oxides increase the drying time of oil-based paints, reducing their durability. It is not necessary to mention the effects of sulfur oxides on vegtation, Professor Burton's letter will suffice.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived to start taxing polluters; sulfur oxides would be a good place to begin.

I have taken a great deal of care to put together a bill that would both be effective in reducing emissions of sulfur oxides, and would be relatively easy to administer. The level of the tax would start out low, 2.5 cents per pound in 1972, and increase by 2.5 cents each year until 1975. From 1975 on, the tax will be 10 cents per pound. The increasing rate of the tax for the first 4 years will provide the necessary incentives to the polluters to start abatement immediately, because the longer they wait, the higher tax they will have to pay.

To make the tax easy and inexpensive to administer, the bill is structured in such a way there will be a minimum amount of monitoring necessary. Approximately 75 percent of the sulfur oxides emitted into the atmosphere come from the combustion of fossil fuels. Sulfur is present in varying amounts in all coal and oil. Where the sulfur oxide emission results from the burning of coal and oil, it is very simple to determine the level of emission. One pound of sulfur in fuel yields 2 pounds of sulfur oxides upon combustion. In this case, the tax will be collected on the fuel at the refinery or coal mine at double the rate of that on sulfur oxides.

The Treasury will set up a certificate system and anyone who removes sulfur oxides from stack gases will receive a rebate for the amount of sulfur oxides removed. This will leave all options open for removal. In cases where stack gas removal systems are of low cost and extremely efficient, the firm will probably purchase high sulfur fuel and get a large rebate for removal. In cases where stack gas removal is now technologically expensive, the firm will purchase very low sulfur, or desulfurized fuel. Refineries will have the incentive to find low cost desulfurization techniques as there will be a strong demand for desulfurized fuel. There are no restrictions. The market economy will guide business firms to find the lowest cost, most efficient way of doing the job.

I hope that my colleagues will give this bill careful study. I will reintroduce the bill with cosponsors, after the recess.

PAYMENTS BY POSTAL SERVICE TO RETIREMENT FUND

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for payments by the U.S. Postal Service to the civil service retirement fund for increases in the unfunded liability to the fund caused by increases in benefits for Postal Service employees.

The bill is cosponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), ranking minority member of the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Congress has established a policy that any increases in civil service retirement benefits must be accompanied by provisions for appropriate payments to the civil service retirement fund.

The bill we are introducing today applies to the extra costs incurred, or which may be incurred, by the new U.S. Postal Service.

These include the additional costs resulting from the large number of involuntary separations and early retirements by postal employees in line with the re-

cent special incentive plan of the Postal Service. It also applies to the pay increases both at management level and under union agreements, as well as to any liberalized benefits which may be authorized by the Postal Service in the future.

The bill, as introduced, seeks to make the Postal Service liable—as is the Government generally—for its share of any increase in the unfunded liability of the retirement fund.

Congress must provide funding for any increased liability which it authorizes for the rest of Government, and this bill simply seeks to fix without question the responsibility for such additional funding which is incurred by an agency which is outside the control of Congress.

There was no provision in the postal reform legislation for this liability, and the Congress no longer has any control over pay or benefits of postal personnel although the employees continue to come under the civil service retirement system.

Public Law 91–93 set the policy for stabilizing the retirement fund, including authorizing appropriations to cover any future increases within Government in unfunded liability, to be paid in 30 equal annual installments.

The new postal service is an independent corporation, formed to operate without general subsidy, and therefore provision needs to be made in law for the independent Postal Service to reimburse the retirement fund for any unfunded liabilities which it incurs.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FIRST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS, TO DATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our summer recess it is a good time to reflect on the legislative accomplishments of the first session of the 92d Congress to date.

With the help of the Library of Congress, the following compilation of our action is included in the RECORD for the benefit of Members who will be going to their districts during the recess.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS, TO DATE

THE ECONOMY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Inflation is still spiraling. Strikes and ever-increasing wage settlements beset us. At the same time, the Nation's unemployment rate remains high. Since January 1969 approximately 2.8 million persons have been added to the Nation's unemployment rolls. Today nearly 5.5 million individuals are unemployed with 1.2 million being out of work for 15 weeks or longer. According to the latest data available at this writing, the unemployment rate for veterans of the Vietnam era is 8.1 percent.

This situation is one with which the Congress is very concerned.

Emergency Employment Act of 1791

With a national unemployment rate in recent months at around 6 percent, this country needs more jobs, and it needs them now. Congress is working to meet this end. The welfare reform bill, H.R. 1, passed by the House in June, would allocate $800 million for public service jobs, giving employment to an estimated 200,000 persons. It also would provide $540 million for job training, thus augmenting existing manpower training programs.

As an immediate effect in areas of high unemployment, however, the House and Senate have approved an emergency bill designed to create between 510,000 and 200,000 city and State jobs for the unemployed. Public Law 92–54, the Emergency Employment Act, for which there was strong bipartisan political support, authorizes Federal expenditures of $1.75 billion over two years to create public jobs in the fields of health, education, police work, sanitation, and public works. Designed to provide on-the-job training to assist those who are hired to find permanent jobs, the measure also provides for prompt employment in communities which need immediate assistance.

This legislation takes into account and provides for a wide range of problems. First, it is sympathetic to the plight of the cities and sensitive to the fact that although the overall unemployment rate may decline below 4.5 percent the rate in many of our large cities could remain as high as 6 percent. Unexpected cutbacks in hard-hit industries are likewise taken into consideration.

Public Law 92–54 addresses itself to each of these problems, while not excluding the others. It provides that some, but not more than one-third, of the public service jobs created may be for unemployed professionals. At the same time, it guarantees that these professionals will not exhaust the funds available for the total program, for it limits to $12,000 the amount that may be paid to any one employee per year.

Returning veterans will be favored by the act, which directs cities and States using funds to give special consideration to unemployed veterans of the Korean and Vietnam eras. The program is triggered whenever the national rate of unemployment is 4½ percent or higher for three consecutive months. In addition, the act authorizes a "special" employment assistance program of $250 million a year for 2 years for communities where local unemployment is 6 percent or above for three months.

Finally, the act contains provisions insuring that efforts will be made to move workers out of public service jobs and into regular employment as quickly as possible. By requiring each person employed to apply for an annual review by the appropriate agency, an individual could be assured that he will not become lost in a "dead-end" job

The 150,000 jobs created by this measure will not be a cure-all to the crisis that claims over 5 million Americans who are unemployed. But this is an important move in forming a realistic approach to the severe employment and manpower problems facing the Nation.

The Congress also passed $1 billion appropriations to fund the program immediately.

Public Works Programs and Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments, S. 575

In a further step to aid the economy, Congress approved S. 575 authorizing $5,661,500,000 for accelerated public works projects and regional development programs. This public service employment legislation was designed to create jobs to do much needed work at State and local governmental levels. It has been estimated that the program would have affected some 2.5 million people, who have been added to the unemployment rolls in the last two years alone.

Specifically, Title I of the legislation would have authorized $2 billion for the extension of programs under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. Title II authorized almost $2 billion for the extension of programs under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Title II authorized $1.8 billion in extending programs under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The President, unfortunately, saw fit to veto the measure when it went to his desk for signature.

Public Works and Economic Development Act and Appalachian Regional Development Act Extensions, H.R. 9922

On July 28 the House and Senate approved another version of the vetoed public works bill, a measure which is acceptable to the Administration. The new Public Works and Economic Development Act and Appalachian Regional Development Act Extensions authorizes $3,992,500 in total for programs to be covered.

The measure, in addition, authorizes $2.4 billion for two years for public works, business loans and other projects managed by the Economic Development Administration. The amount that could be spent on accelerated public works has been reduced to approximately $500 million during the next two years. In the vetoed public works bill $2 billion had been authorized for such accelerated public works programs.

It is the purpose of the Economic Development Administration to provide Federal financial and technical assistance, in cooperation with the States, for the creation of new jobs. Grants are authorized for public works and development facilities conducive to the developments and operation of private enterprise.

H.R. 9922 establishes new criteria for designating so-called special impact areas which would be eligible for financial assistance. A sum of $800 million is authorized for grants for public works and development facilities for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Any unused authorization for which appropriations are not made in 1972 may be appropriated in fiscal year 1973.

An amount not less than 25 percent, nor more than 35 percent, of appropriations for the two fiscal years could be spent in special impact areas to assist the Secretary in maintaining a proper balance between projects that are deemed necessary for long-term development programs and projects to assist in providing urgently needed employment.

Special impact area projects would include those providing immediate work for unemployed and underemployed persons. In those areas grants-in-aid for local public works involving local cost sharing could be made to cover up to 80 percent of the costs, with a proviso that a 100 percent grant could be made if the State or local government had exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity for such purposes.

Title II, which extends the Appalachian Regional Commission for four years, authorizes $1.5 billion in funds for highway development, airport improvements, filling of abandoned mines and reclamation of strip mine areas, and land acquisition or construction projects for industrial development and expansion. The Commission itself is an excellent example of the operation of the Federal Government in working with the people in a poverty area to bring an improved way of life and to encourage a productive citizenry, rather than allowing them to be doomed to an endless cycle of welfare checks.

Emergency loan guarantees

On July 30, the House passed a $250-million loan guarantee for the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation which, the Nation's largest defense contractor claims, is needed to prevent it from being forced into bankruptcy.

Committees of both the House and Senate had reported legislation creating a $2 billion loan guarantee fund to assist other industries as well as Lockheed. However, the House bill, H.R. 8432, was amended on the floor reducing the amount from $2 billion to $250 million specifically for Lockheed.

H.R. 8432 provides in addition that the Government shall be paid the difference between the guaranteed loan's interest cost and the cost of an unguaranteed loan.

A loan review board, established by the bill, would consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board chairman, and the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Auditing is authorized to be conducted by the General Accounting Office, though not before the loan is made.

On August 2, the Senate approved the $250 million loan.

Supporters of the loan guarantee claim that it is necessary to avoid a Lockheed bankruptcy that would result in an estimated 60,000 persons being unemployed. The Lockheed emergency comes at a crucial stage in development of a new commercial plane called the TriStar, a 250-seat airbus. Although $400 million has been borrowed from the banks, the firm appealed to Congress for aid in obtaining the estimated $250 million more that would be required for completion. Lockheed contracted with the British Rolls Royce Company to build the TriStar Engine. The British Government, however, had stated that it would not continue subsidizing Rolls Royce to complete the contract unless Lockheed was assured of the additional loan by August 8, and the banks had stated they would make the loan only if the Federal Government guaranteed its repayment.

Railway strike prohibition

In May the country was faced with a railroad strike that threatened to paralyze the railroads as well as the Nation's economy. Congress was faced with emergency legislation for a temporary settlement of the striking workers. The unions on one hand were demanding a 54 percent pay increase, while the railroads were willing to give 36 percent. The strike called for by the union on March 5 was postponed temporarily March 4 when the President, under authority of the Railway Labor Act, established an emergency board to study the case and recommend a settlement.

The walkout was called for again May 17 and more than 500,000 rail workers began a strike that shut down all trains except those kept running by supervisory personnel.

Congress and the President on May 18 approved the emergency legislation, Public Law 92–17, directing striking railmen to return to work, while providing for a 13½ percent wage increase, and prohibiting future railroad strikes through October 1, 1971.

Public debt limit increase

Public Law 92–5, approved March 17, raises the federal debt ceiling to $430 billion from $395 billion through June 30, 1972. This temporary ceiling would be reduced to a permanent level of $400 billion on July 1, 1972.

During final passage, the Senate amended H.R. 4690 by adopting key social security amendments providing for a ten percent across-the-board increase in certain social payments, affecting an estimated 26,000,000 persons. The increase, in Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance benefits, was retroactive to January 1 of this year.

In approving Senate amendments, the House also adopted other provisions raising the minimum monthly payment to $70.40 from $64.000; authorizing a five percent increase in social benefits payable to individuals age 72 and over who were not insured for regular benefits; increasing the taxable wage base to $9,000 from $7,800 (effective also in January); and increasing the tax rates on employers and employees to 5.15 percent from five percent beginning in 1976.

Wage and price controls extension

Final action on a temporary extension of the President's standby authority to implement wage, price, and rent controls to June 1, 1971, came when the House on March 29 approved a Senate-passed version of S.J. Res. 55.

The temporary extension was necessary to continue the President's authority until the Senate took final action on H.R. 4246 extending his authority to March 31, 1973. H.R. 4246 had been passed by the House March 10, but since it had not been acted upon by the Senate prior to the March 31 expiration date in existing law, the temporary legislation was introduced.

On May 5, Congress cleared H.R. 4246 providing for an extension through April 30, 1972. Public Law 92–15 also prohibits the President from applying wage and price controls to a single industry unless he determines that wages or prices in the industry had increased in a grossly disproportionate rate compared to the economy as a whole.

In addition, the act extends the authority of federal banking agencies to establish ceilings on interest rates paid by financial institutions on time and savings deposits through March 31, 1973, and grants permanent authority to the President to initiate a program of voluntary credit controls to be implemented by the Federal Reserve Board.

Export-Import Bank Act

Legislation affecting our balance of international payments deficit has been sent to conference by the House and Senate. S. 581 extends the life of the Export-Import Bank for one year to June 30, 1974 and raises the ceiling on all loans, guarantees and export insurance issued by the bank from $13.5 billion to $20 billion.

As passed by the House, S. 581 retains an existing ban on the bank's financial assistance to any nation that supplied materials or aid to North Vietnam or any nation in armed conflict with the United States.

As passsed by the Senate, S. 581 contains a proviso removing a four-year old restriction that had the effect of prohibiting the bank from providing credit to the countries of eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union.

The Export-Import Bank was established in 1945 as the principal government agency to assist the financing of U.S. foreign trade by providing credits, credit guarantees and insurance to foreign businessmen for the purchase of American exports. Recently, however, the U.S. balance of payments deficit has increased by a decline in U.S. trade surplus. By strengthening the Bank it is hoped that the trade surplus decline can be reversed. The Bank offers the most efficient and effective means available to us for increasing U.S. exports.

Since 1945, the Bank has stood behind U.S. exporters in helping them meet those credit needs of their customers which the commercial banking system could not fulfill. Today the credit needs of our overseas customers have greatly increased. And in the fact of competition, we must make certain that U.S. exporters have the necessary backing to offer competitive credit. Major provisions of S. 581 would provide this backing.

Interest equalization tax

A second measure related to the U.S. balance of payments has become public law in this Congress. Public Law 92–9, signed by the President April 1, extends the Interest Equalization Tax until March 31, 1973. It is the equalization tax, which applies to purchases of foreign securities by U.S. citizens and to loans by American banks to foreign customers, that is designed to reduce the flow of capital from the country by discouraging foreigners from acquiring capital in the United States.

In passing the measure, the authority of the President to reduce the tax on new foreign securities, without reducing the tax on outstanding securities, has also been extended. The President is authorized to raise the tax to the equivalent of 1.5 percent a year or reduce it to nothing.

WELFARE AND PENSIONS

Welfare, social security, medicare and medicaid reform

One of the most complicated, yet one of the most comprehensive, bills to come before the Congress is H.R. 1, which provides for major changes in welfare, social security, medicare and medicaid programs. H.R. 1 passed the House June 2 after two days of debate. If enacted by the Senate, it will have far-reaching effects on almost every American and on the relationships between governments at all levels.

As described in a 385-page long Committee report, H.R. 1 contains five major program reforms in welfare and old-age assistance laws, as well as a number of reforms in the social security and medicare and medicaid laws.

First, the bill contains several extensive social security reforms, including an across-the-board increase in benefits of five percent as of June 1972. This is in addition to the ten percent increase enacted in March 1971.

The minimum benefit would go to $74 from $70.40 a month. The average old-age insurance benefit would go to $141 from $133 a month, and the average benefit for aged couples would go to an estimated $234 from $222 a month. An increase in special benefits for persons age 72 and over not insured for regular benefits is proposed to increased to $58 from $48 for individuals and to $76 from $72 for couples. It is the estimate of the Committee on Ways and Means that additional payments would total approximately $2.1 billion in the first full year and that over 27 million beneficiaries would become entitled to the increased payments.

This section of H.R. 1 includes a provision for automatic cost-of-living increases in benefits each January whenever the cost of living rose three percent or more between specified time periods. However, an automatic benefit increase would not go into effect if Congress voted an increase for the year in question. There are also substantial reforms in the earned income limitation in benefits for widows, widowers and dependents and in disability benefit payments. As estimated 3.4 million widows and widowers would receive $764 million in additional benefits the first year, with the new increases to become effective in January 1972.

The medicare program is broadened to include disabled social security and railroad retirement recipients, and guarantee is added that no increase in premium payments will be required unless there were a general increase in benefits. Under present law, medicare coverage does not extend to disability beneficiaries. H.R. 1 proposes health insurance protection after the disabled beneficiary had been entitled to Social Security benefits for at least 24 consecutive months. Expanded social security benefits and hospital insurance program would be financed mainly by increasing social security taxes. H.R. 1 proposes an increase in the contribution and benefit base from $7,800 to $10,200 rather than to $9,000 as provided under present law.

H.R. 1 encourages greater equity in welfare payments throughout the country under both the Family Assistance Plan and Opportunities for Families and greatly improves the administration of welfare payments. Payment provisions include uniform national payment eligibility standards. Finally, the bill provides minor income tax law reforms to permit deduction for child care expenses of working mothers and to expand and simplify the existing retirement income credit provisions.

One of the major provisos of this bill is that the receipt of welfare benefits should be a temporary status and not a way of life. In the past there has been difficulty in as-

sisting the recipient to a self-sufficiency in that all recipients have been lumped together without any realistic assessment of their ability to enter the labor force and in that authority for employment and training programs have been diffused at both the federal and state levels.

H.R. 1 creates an entirely separate program for those defined under the bill as available for employment and by assigning exclusive responsibility for this program to the Labor Department. Any eligible person not registering or taking work or training as required would subject his family to a penalty of an $800 per year reduction in benefits. Every person receiving training would receive about $30 a month as an additional incentive to stay in training.

Second, H.R. 1 reforms present programs of welfare assistance to needy families by separating applicants who are employable and assigning them a separate program called Opportunities for Families, to be administered by the Department of Labor. Designed for families with an employable adult, the program includes training and work incentives and work requirement programs, as well as day care and other services.

For families with children which do not include an employable adult, the measure establishes a Family Assistance Plan to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Once a family under this plan includes an employable adult, the family would be referred to the Opportunity for Families program. The Family Welfare Program (Title IV) was the most controversial part of the bill in the House debate. On the same day that the measure passed the House, we defeated a motion to delete Title IV entirely from the bill.

Under this Assistance Plan, a guaranteed annual income of $2,400 to a family of four with no outside income is proposed. Existing law states that the low-income family headed by the father is not eligible for AFDC if he is working full-time, although the family headed by the mother is eligible for aid whether she is working full-time, part-time or not at all. H.R. 1 proposes that a family headed by a male be eligible for assistance programs.

Railroad retirement benefits

Congress provided for a ten percent increase in retirement benefits for railroad employees. Public Law 92-46, signed July 2, provides for the benefits to June 30, 1973 and retroactive to January 1, 1971. The act also extends to June 30, 1972, the reporting date of the Commission on Railroad Retirement created to study the railroad retirement system.

By extending the reporting deadline of the Commission, whose work had been delayed due to organizational problems, Congress will have more time to consider the Commission's final report before expiration of the ten percent increase.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Lowering of the voting age in elections

On March 23 Senate Joint Resolution 7 cleared Congress as a proposed amendment to the Constitution extending the vote to citizens 18 years or older. By March 26, three days after its passage, nine state legislatures had approved the Amendment. On June 30, Ohio became the 38th state to ratify thus adding the 26th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, making it the most rapidly ratified Amendment in our history.

Last year Congress lowered the voting age to 18 for all elections when it passed the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. The Supreme Court held in December, however, that this action was valid only for Federal elections. The Constitutional Amendment lowers the voting age to 18 for state and local elections as well.

With approval of this Amendment, and last year's Voting Rights Act Amendments, approximately 11 million young people are eligible to vote. It seems entirely appropriate that in the 1970's, an era of youthful participation in national issues, that we allow and encourage participation at the polls. I hope these young adults will now exercise the franchise.

Regulation and definition of obscene mail through the mails

In an attempt to regulate the distribution of sexual materials through the mails to young persons, the House passed H.R. 8805 prohibiting the mailing of sexual matter, as defined in the bill, to minors under 17 years. This legislation also provides for violation a criminal penalty of $5,000 fine and/or five years imprisonment for the first offense, and $10,000 fine and/or ten years imprisonment for a second offense.

Two laws are presently in existence to control the distribution or sexually oriented materials through the mails. The Postal Revenue and Salary Act of 1967 contains a provision prohibiting the mailing of pandering advertisements, permitting the postal patron, in whose judgment the material seems sexually offensive, an opportunity to request no further mailings of unsolicited advertisements from mailers who have previously sent them advertisements.

The Postal Reorganization Act of the 91st Congress provided postal patrons the means by which they can register with the Postmaster General their intention not to receive sex oriented material from any mailer. Violation of this law punishable up to five years' imprisonment, a fine of $5,000 or both.

While these two laws provide a measure of protection from unsolicited pornographic mailings, they do not regulate the distribution of such materials to young persons. H.R. 8805 was approved to fill this gap.

Extending the President's reorganization authority

In May the House passed H.R. 6283 extending for two years, until April 1, 1973, the President's authority to submit reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1949. H.R. 6283 would amend the 1949 Act to limit the number of plans the President can submit to not more than one within any period of thirty consecutive days. In addition, the act would be amended to prohibit the submission of a plan that deals with more than one logically consistent subject matter.

Under the authority as provided in the Act of 1949, the President is allowed to submit to Congress reorganization plans that transfer, consolidate or abolish federal executive agencies and functions. These plans become law unless the Congress passes a resolution of disapproval within 60 days of the plan's submission. Since the 1949 Act went into effect, 90 reorganization plans have been submitted to Congress. Seventy of these have been approved.

Reorganization Plan No. 1—ACTION

Before the President's reorganization authority expired on April 1, a plan to reorganize volunteer agencies in the Federal government was submitted to Congress March 21. In voting down a resolution of disapproval, which had the effect of approval of the plan, the House on May 25 gave its sanction to the combination of several different volunteer agencies into one agency called ACTION.

The reorganization plan initially consolidates in ACTION the following programs: Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO); Auxiliary and Special Volunteer Programs, from OEO; Foster Grandparent, from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW); Retired Senior Corps of Retired Executives (RSVP) from HEW; and Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) and Active Corps of Executives (ACE), both from the Small Business Administration (SBA).

In his accompanying message the President also said he would take executive action to transfer into the new agency the Peace Corps, from the State Department, and the Office of Volunteer Action, from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition, the President stated he would submit additional legislation transferring the Teacher Corps to ACTION from HEW.

ACTION is headed by a director, deputy director and four associate directors, all nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Administration has proposed that Congress authorize the agency to spend $20 million over and above the consolidated fiscal 1972 budget level for the agencies that ACTION absorbed. This additional money would then be used to finance experiments with new programs using volunteers.

With an annual budget of approximately $180 million, ACTION has 1,600 full-time employees directing about 56,000 volunteers.

Pay system for prevailing rate Government employees

In an attempt to gain a more equitable system of wages for prevailing rate employees within the Federal Government, the House approved H.R. 9092 providing for a $181.3 million pay increase for such workers and revising a wage board system of payment. Prevailing rate employees are laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen who occupy various positions such as truckdrivers, carpenters, painters and mechanics.

The definition of prevailing rate employee has been expanded in this legislation to include approximately 140,000 employees of nonappropriated-fund activities of the Armed Forces and approximately 3,200 employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service. At the present time, the pay of most of the 800,000 employees who would be covered by this bill is fixed by administrative action in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

However, there has been a disadvantage in such a system in that the Government's prevailing rate employees—unlike most other Federal employees—are subject to continuing uncertainty about the rules and policies under which their pay is adjusted.

H.R. 9092 proposes to enact into law the established principles and policies for adjusting the pay of prevailing rate employees as for other Federal employees. In addition, the bill proposes certain needed changes in the existing pay system for these employees by providing for a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee to be established to replace the present Coordinated Federal Wage System Advisory Committee.

Civil Rights Commission, authorizations

Both Houses of Congress approved an increase in the annual authorization for the Commission on Civil Rights from $3,400,000 to $4 million. It is estimated that the authorization provided in H.R. 7271 would entail an additional cost of not more than $600,000 for fiscal year 1972. Under existing law, the term of the Commission on Civil Rights expires January 13, 1973. Unless the term of the Commission is extended, it is expected that fiscal year 1973 appropriations will be a proration of this amount.

EDUCATION

National School Lunch Act Amendments

Congress has recognized the plight of inadequately fed school children and has authorized new programs and appropriated funds to insure that hot lunches will continue to be provided to all those who need them. Public Law 92-32, signed June 30, authorizes funds for the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals.

This commitment was made by Congress last year by the unanimous passage of Public Law 91–248 requiring that every needy school child be provided a free or reduced-price meal. School districts are required by that law to provide these meals or they are barred from participating in the national school lunch program. After the bill was signed into public law the President requested a supplemental appropriation to pay schools for the additional costs for providing these meals, and Congress appropriated that amount, $209 million.

School districts have expanded their lunch programs in fulfillment of the congressional requirement. The amount appropriated, however, was insufficient to pay fully for these additional costs and hundreds of school districts were faced with the choice of discontinuing their lunch programs or going into debt. It was estimated that 12 States and cities alone reported that they were $22 million short of funds for the program this year. The purpose of Public Law 92–32 is simply to give the Secretary of Agriculture standby authority to deal with these shortages.

The law would allow the Secretary to transfer up to $50 million at his discretion to reimburse States for their additional expenses in providing free and reduced-price meals for these children during the present fiscal year. Second, the legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use an amount not to exceed $100 million during fiscal year 1972. These funds would be in addition to funds appropriated or otherwise available for this purpose.

The Secretary is authorized to use these funds when a need for additional funds is demonstrated by State educational agencies or by schools or service institutions under an agreement with the Agriculture Department for the operation of the food service programs in each State. Any funds remaining unexpended or not obligated at the end of the fiscal years 1971 and 1972 shall remain available to the Secretary for use in financing child nutrition programs in the following years.

So far the results of the food program have been dramatic. By February 1971, nearly 6.7 million needy children were receiving free or reduced-price lunches, an increase of 2.5 million above the total in February 1970. In March, the total increased to 7.1 million children. The authority provided in this law will serve as assurance to the schools that Congress will provide them sufficient funds not only now but in the future, an assurance which is particularly important to them in planning their budgets for the coming year.

Emergency School Aid Act

During this session the Senate approved $1.5 billion in emergency aid to schools desegregating during fiscal 1972–73. S. 1557, the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act of 1971, authorizes $500 million of the total for fiscal year 1972 and $1 billion for fiscal year 1973, of which 68 percent would be used for project grants to establish and maintain quality integrated schools and to aid in integration.

Of the remaining funds, 15 percent would be used for grants for metropolitan-area programs, such as education parks; nine percent would be used at the discretion of the Commissioner of Education; four percent would be used for bilingual and bicultural programs; three percent would be used for educational television; and one percent would be used for an evaluation program.

Funds would be allocated among the States on the basis of the number of minority-group children enrolled in a State's elementary and secondary schools relative to total nationwide enrollement of minority-group children. No State would receive less than $100,000.

S. 1557 prohibits funding to districts which have aided private segregated academies, demoted or dismissed a disproportionate number of minority-group teachers' separated minority-group children within classes, or limited their participation in extracurricular activities. Eligibility standards are also established and uniform guidelines for desegregation encouraged. The bill is now in the House Education and Labor Committee.

THE ENVIRONMENT

The quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's has grown into a large environmental emergency in the 1970's. The ever-increasing pollution of our air and water threatens health in communities across the country. Preservation of our environment is of paramount concern in the Nation today. We must at the same time achieve a balance between the preservation of our environment and the need for progress.

For nearly a decade now, we have been painfully aware of the problems besetting our environment arising from our need to consume and our propensity to pollute. It has become apparent that if we do not take steps to correct the situation in a humane manner, we will find difficulty in meeting future demands for a clean, productive, and safe environment.

National Environmental Data System

At this time, as at no other time, there are numerous and diverse studies, programs, and projects generating data on the environment. That there is need for a system to collect, assimilate and disseminate environmental data and information to concerned Federal agencies, local and State governments, and private citizens, is obvious in light of the ever-growing commitment of Congress toward the goal of an enhanced environment. Not only should the data be readily available for analysis and evaluation, but there should be the means to insure that all available scientific and technical information affecting the environment be quickly located and evaluated by responsible parties.

In response to this vital need, the House passed legislation providing for the establishment within the executive branch of the National Environmental Data System. H.R. 56, passed May 17, authorizes $1 million for fiscal year 1972, $2 million for fiscal year 1973 and $3 million for fiscal year 1974, for a central facility to serve as a clearing house for new and existing information on environmental matters. The legislation specifies that this information be gathered from the Federal Government, State and local governments, private institutions, including educational institutions, and foreign sources. Information is to be made available to Congress and to Federal, State and local governments without charge and to private individuals and groups at a "reasonable" fee.

Each department and agency in the executive branch would be required to make available to the data system all information as soon as possible for incorporation into the system. The basic function of the legislation will be the hopeful elimination of waste, overlapping, and duplication is the programs of these departments and agencies.

Too often in the past we have been forced to cope with massive environmental problems on a crisis-by-crisis basis, despite our great technical know-how. In order to cope with the spiraling environmental problems with which we are daily confronted and to find long-range solution, it is imperative that we have a system for effectively monitoring environmental quality with accuracy. H.R. 56 will do this.

Joint Committee on the Environment

In the field of environmental protection we find that there is an incredibly broad range of topics and jurisdictions covered.

The House has taken a step to provide a long-range overview of this matter by passing H.J. Res. 3, creating a Joint Committee on the Environment. A joint committee offers a chance to stand back, to assimilate, organize and offer plans for the future in the whole environmental field.

Although the committee will not have legislative power, it will play a vital role in furnishing information to other committees to help insure effective action on short as well as long term environmental problems which come under their jurisdictions.

Select Committee to Investigate Energy Resources

Environmental concerns must be appreciated in searching for solutions to the energy problem. We cannot continue to have such a large proportion of the cost of energy borne by the environment as we have in the past. Aware of the energy consumption trends in the United States and other highly industrialized nations, and the threats of an energy crisis, the House passed H. Res. 155 providing for the creation of a Select Committee to Investigate Energy Resources.

The committee would be responsible for investigation of all aspects of energy resources in the United States, including availability of oil, gas, coal and nuclear energy reserves. It would be the purpose of the panel to identify the ownership of such reserves; the reasons and possible solutions for the delay in new starts of fossil-fueled powerplants; the effect of pricing practices by the owners of energy reserves; and the effect of the import of low sulfur fuels.

Further, it would be the mandate of this committee to investigate measures to increase the availability of pipelines, railways, barges and ships used in transport of fuel materials; to investigate measures to close the gap between the supply and demand for electric energy; and the identification of the environmental effects of the energy industry.

House Resolution 155 would enable us to anticipate our energy needs for the immediate and long-range future. The information and data collected by this body could give us the information so vitally needed to play the role that Congress must play in the establishment of any national energy policy.

National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere

For more than a decade there has been a growing concern among Members of Congress and among knowledgeable segments of the general public that the Nation has been deficient in addressing attention to the vast resources of the oceans and the development of inland water bodies. That concern culminated in the Marine Resources and Engineering Act of 1966, in which congressional intent was made clear that a coordinated and vigorous national ocean program was of major importance and that it should be developed promptly.

As a part of the act, a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources was established to develop the background information and to propose recommendations upon which the program could be based. One of the major recommendations to be made by that body was the creation of an advisory body to serve as a link between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and State and local governments, private industry, and the scientific and academic communities, on the other.

In May the House formalized this recommendation by approving the creation of the National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere. The Senate passed the measure August 2. H.R. 2587 provides for the creation of a 21-member body to be appointed by the President to primarily assist executive agencies in policy and program formulation. Each department and agency of the Federal Government concerned with marine and atmospheric matters is to designate a senior policy official to assist in the committee's work, and to serve as a point of liaison with their agencies.

The committee would be authorized to per-

form a continuing review of the progress of the marine and atmospheric science and service programs of the United States, and advise the Secretary of Commerce with respect to carrying out the purposes of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Finally, the committee is to submit an annual report which will hopefully reflect the broad experience of the members by the inclusion of specific recommendations which will insure the most practical approach to the thorough and expeditious implementation of a complete and coordinated national ocean program.

Saline water conversion

Both Houses of Congress have approved S. 991 authorizing a continuance of programs of research and development in the process of saline water conversion. The Secretary of Interior, under which the program is directed, is authorized not only to continue programs of saline conversion, but also programs directed toward the conversion of other chemically contaminated water and for treatment of contaminated waste water.

Water pollution control

In related action, Congress passed Public Law 92–50 extending through September 30, 1971 authorizations for expiring federal water pollution control programs. The major program authorized under the act provides for a program of grants to local governments for constructing water treatment facilities. Fiscal 1970 authorizations for that program were set at $1.25 billion, while new authorizations were proposed by the Administration at $2 billion annually for fiscal 1972–74. Final authorizations approved in Public Law 92–50 were set at $1,500,000. Subsequently, the fiscal 1972 agriculture-environmental and consumer appropriations bill approved by Congress in July contained appropriations for fiscal 1972 for construction grants at $2 billion.

Shooting animals from aircraft

The House in May approved H.R. 5060 amending the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 providing a criminal penalty for shooting at birds, fish and other animals from aircraft. In addition, it would be unlawful for anyone to knowingly participate in using an aircraft for such purposes. Violators would be subject to a fine of $5,000 or one year imprisonment, or both.

This prohibition, however, would not be applicable to any person carrying out duties to administer or aid in the administration and protection of land, water, wildlife, livestock, domesticated animals, human life, or crops, if such a person is an employee, authorized agent, or operating under license or permit of any State or the Federal government.

Many states have already tackled this problem by enacting legislation to regulate the use of hunting from aircraft. H.R. 5060 supplements these State laws, by establishing nationwide uniform regulations.

Land use programs

In July the Senate approved S.J. Res. 52 increasing fiscal 1972 authorizations for comprehensive land planning grants by $50 million and the open space land program by $100 million. The effect of the resolution was to provide adequate authorizations to match the Administration's fiscal 1972 budget request of $100 million for comprehensive planning and $200 million for open spaces. Funds for comprehensive planning are designed to support the managerial capacities of state and local governments, while monies for the open space land program are intended for acquisition and development of park lands in urban areas.

AGRICULTURE

International Wheat Agreement

Final approval has been given to two items affecting American Agriculture. The Senate on July 12 ratified the International Wheat Agreement of 1971, a treaty regulating the exchange of wheat among 23 participating nations. Before ratifying the treaty, however, the Senate passed a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should call an international conference to establish world price standards for wheat.

No price standards were included in the treaty, although they were part of a previous wheat agreement ratified in 1967. The conference that wrote the 1971 treaty failed to agree on prices. Opponents of the agreement argue that price agreements do not improve the position of U.S. wheat on the world market and that the treaty is better without them.

A major feature of the 1971 treaty is continuance of the International Wheat Council, first created by the International Wheat Agreement of 1949. The purpose of the council is to expand the international wheat trade, stabilize the world market and provide assistance in the resolution of international disputes among wheat-trading nations.

I feel that it is imperative that there be a maximum effort, through agreement, to protect the American wheat grower from uncertainties, particularly the lower prices that tend to dominate the world market. It is imperative that every effort be made to assure our wheat producers a fair price for their wheat. U.S. growers simply cannot sustain losses which result from a price war.

Acreage allotment transfer

Legislation has been passed by the Senate easing restrictions on farmers who transfer their acreage allotments when the Federal or State Government purchases part of their land. While the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided that a farmer, whose land was purchased by a government agency under eminent domain, could switch the acreage allotments on the land to other farms under his ownership, existing law requires that new allotments be comparable with those for other farms in the area. The newly passed legislation eliminates the comparability requirement for growers of cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat.

Just approved by the President was a $13.3 billion Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 containing funding for the Department of Agriculture and consumer protection programs. House and Senate conferees agreed on a $55,000 per crop ceiling on farm subsidy payments. On the same day that the Senate passed the Agriculture money bill, the body agreed to a resolution calling for a report to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture on his findings on the operation and administration of the $55,000 subsidy limit. This legislation also contains funding for the food stamp and school breakfast programs and funds for the support of State and local participation in the administration of the Clean Air Act.

Sugar quotas

Legislation extending the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 have been passed by both the House and Senate and is now in conference. H.R. 8866 would extend the Act's provisions for three years and revise quotas which foreign sugar producers are authorized to supply to the United States.

The Sugar Act, first passed in 1934, guarantees the United States an adequate supply of sugar, at stable prices, protects domestic producers, and sets import quota for other nations. Domestic producers are authorized by the bill to supply 62 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States. The remaining 38 percent is allocated by H.R. 8866 to various foreign countries depending on (1) their relations with us, (2) their reliableness as a source of sugar, (3) reciprocality in their trade policies, and/or (4) their dependency on sugar markets for economic survival.

The House Agriculture Committee reported an increased quota for domestic producers of an additional 300,000 tons for growers in Florida and Louisiana. The Secretary of Agriculture was granted permission to penalize nations which expropriated American property or discriminated against American citizens. Although criticism was directed in both the House and Senate toward the South African quota, both Houses voted down amendments designed to suspend the quota for that country.

An important objective of the Sugar Act is the promotion of foreign trade, and it is significant that our largest Western Hemisphere suppliers are also our most important purchasers of agricultural commodities. It is important that there markets be preserved for a sound trade foundation. The encouragement and continuation of such trading partnerships are vital to each country.

Rural Telephone Bank

In May final action came on S. 70 amending the Rural Telephone Electrification Act of 1936 by establishing a Rural Telephone Bank. Designed to provide capital for financing for telephone cooperatives and companies serving rural areas, the bank would be financed through the sale of stock and debentures, including stock purchases totaling $300 million by the Federal Government. An additional $30 million would be appropriated by Congress annually for deposit in the rural telephone account.

Meat inspection programs

To increase the quality of sanitation in the production and shipment of meat products, the Senate approved S. 1316 increasing the maximum Federal contribution to the cost of any State meat or poultry inspection system to 80 percent of the cost. Presently, the Federal contribution is limited to 50 percent.

S. 1316 amends Title III of the Federal Meat Inspection Act and section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act. Since 1967 when the Wholesome Meat Act amended the Federal Meat Inspection Act, some 44 states have developed meat inspection programs comparable to the Federal inspection program. An effective inspection, in cooperation with the Federal governemnt, has been developed thus far in a relatively short period of time. The Wholesome Meat Act, however, does not provide incentive for States to continue their meat inspection programs and in fact the States are faced with the burden of bearing 50 percent of the cost of carrying out their meat inspection programs.

To uphold the standards and insure that future needs are met, a better incentive must be provided so that the States can continue to meet the growing demand for quality inspection standards. The States are increasingly caught in the fiscal squeeze with the tighter economic situation. The Department of Agriculture is confident that an 80–20 funding basis will permit most of the States to continue their programs.

It is estimated by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the additional costs of the program at 80% financing in fiscal year 1972 for meat inspection would be $16 million. For poultry inspection the additional cost would be $1.3 million.

Farm credit act of 1971

The Senate has also passed S. 1483, the Farm Credit Act of 1971, providing for a farmer-owned cooperative farm credit system through which credit can be made available to farmers, ranchers, rural residents, and to associations and others upon which farming operations are dependent.

Recognizing that a prosperous, productive agriculture is essential to our Nation, it is the objective of the farmer-owned cooperative farm credit system to improve the income and production methods of farmers and ranchers by furnishing adequate and

constructive credit and closely related services to them, their cooperatives, and selective farm related business necessary to efficient farm operations.

The legislation contains many recommendations made by the Commission on Agricultural Credit authorized to ascertain the credit needs of agriculture and to recommend changes in the farm credit system to help meet those needs. These recommendations were submitted to owners of farm credit systems, among others. A vast majority of those affected have voiced their approval of these recommendations. They have also received the approval of the major farm organizations, cooperatives, and the Federal Farm Credit Board.

In short, through the enactment of this legislation, Congress can issue a new charter that will modernize the cooperative farm credit system so it can continue to do its share in filling the changing credit needs of agriculture.

HEALTH AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Health Professions Manpower Act

We have become increasingly aware of the growing crisis that surrounds our health delivery system. One of the major problems lies in the shortage of health personnel and teaching facilities. This is particularly true in our large urban centers. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that the country faces health manpower shortages totaling over 481,000 including 48,000 doctors and 17,000 dentists. By 1980, it is estimated that this health manpower shortage will reach 725,000.

Both Houses have approved, in differing forms, H.R. 8629 which seeks to meet this shortage. As passed by the House, H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, extends for three years a program of financial assistance to students in the health professions first authorized in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. For fiscal 1972, $755 million is authorized, while $914 million and $1.1 billion are authorized for fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974 respectively.

A new program of financial incentives to medical schools to produce more doctors who would go into family and general medical practices is also authorized. The measure also provides student grants to encourage medical schools to expand their facilities and curricula to graduate more students in the health professions.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to pay part of the loan if the student subsequently practiced in an area of shortage for at least three years.

In addition, the bill provides $94 million over the next three fiscal years in scholarship funds and $30 million to assist new schools of medicine, osteopathy and dentistry.

This Nation vitally needs an increase in the supply of health service personnel before medical costs can be reduced; the Health Manpower Training Act is a step in this direction. It addresses the manpower problems of our health care system in terms of at least four major areas: the need for increases in total numbers; the need for altering the distribution of types of medical skills; the need to alleviate the current geographical imbalance in medical services and personnel; and the need for a larger cross section of our population to obtain adequate health services.

Nurse Training Act of 1971

That the shortage of trained nurses is critical is indisputable. There are approximately 700,000 nurses in active practice, but 150,000 are needed now. By 1980, 1,100,000 nurses will be needed. More and more of them will be needed to fill jobs requiring higher levels of skill and responsibility as medical knowledge and technology expand.

At present, however, we simply do not have sufficient nurse manpower to provide even adequate nursing care in hospitals, schools, and community care centers. Many hospital wards in the country have never opened or have been forced to close down due to lack of nurses. Realizing that to meet our goals we must have Federal financial support that is reliable, the House and Senate have approved a measure to bring us nearer to meeting our health needs in the years to come.

The Nurse Training Act of 1971 extends for three years programs to train nurses, amending the Public Health Service Act of 1944. H.R. 8630 authorizes for nursing assistance $206 million in fiscal 1972, $237 million in fiscal 1973, and $267 million in fiscal 1974. Funds are provided for construction grants to nursing schools, and loan guarantees and interest subsidies to encourage nursing schools to expand present facilities.

Under the Act, nursing schools would also receive student grants to encourage them to increase their student enrollments and loans for advanced training by practicing nurses would be provided. Special programs would be established to identify and assist needy persons with a potential for training.

Conquest of Cancer Act

Congress is also acting upon proposals introduced to combat the disease of cancer. The Conquest of Cancer Act of 1971, passed by the Senate July 7, amends the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to establish an independent cancer research agency within the National Institutes of Health.

S. 1828 also establishes a National Cancer Advisory Board composed of the director of the National Institutes of Health and eighteen members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. Under the bill, the existing National Cancer Institute would be made a part of the cancer research agency.

The Conquest of Cancer Act embodies the recommendations of a national panel of consultants to the Congress. This body urged an immediate massive, systematic attack on cancer stating that the control of cancer is feasible and a matter of urgent priority. It was stated in the panel's report that over 300,000 Americans die each year of cancer and that nearly one-fourth of the population of the United States will develop some form of cancer.

We in the House have been considering in committee H.R. 3658, proposed legislation which would set up a National Cancer Authority. The House bill would authorize $400 million for research immediately and would increase this amount up to $1 billion a year as soon as possible.

Health scholarships

H.R. 7736 enacted into law, provides for student loans and scholarships for the health professions. Public Law 92–52 amends the Public Health Service Act of 1944 by extending for one year existing authorization for such loans under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and the Nurse Training Act of 1964. An authorization of $111.4 million for the various loan and scholarship programs has been provided.

TRANSPORTATION

Defeat of SST funding

In March the House decided to discontinue Federal funding of the supersonic transport aircraft. In voting down an additional $134 million for construction of two prototypes of the SST, the Senate agreed to the House decision.

In May, however, the House reversed its previous stance and approved $85.3 million to continue work on the controversial aircraft. The vote was taken on an amendment to H.R. 8190, the second general supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1971. The Senate, however, is unwilling to reverse itself.

In July the House and Senate voted what should be the final payment on the canceled supersonic transport by voting to repay $58.5 million to ten airlines who had financed the SST project. The votes came on the final version of the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1972.

High-speed ground transportation

In June the Senate passed S. 979 eliminating the authorization limit and the termination date now contained in the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 for research and development of high-speed ground transportation. The Senate bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to give highest priority to areas experiencing unusually high rates of unemployment in the awarding of contracts for these development and demonstration projects.

Removal of the termination provisions will enable the Department to engage in a more comprehensive long-range planning of the projects, while opening up new jobs and programs. Efforts are already underway to transfer the highly skilled unemployed manpower from aerospace industry.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The record of the 92d Congress reflects the concern we all share for those Americans who have served our country in the military forces. Four bills of major importance benefiting veterans and their survivors have been passed by the House so far this year.

Military drug treatment

Proposals have been submitted in the 92d Congress to treat drug addiction among veterans of the Vietnam era. In a report issued May 27 by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, it was estimated that 10 to 15 percent of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam are addicted to heroin in one form or another. Aware of the problems posed as these men return home, the House on July 10 voted to loosen eligibility standards for veterans for drug treatment programs operated by the Veterans Administration.

Under the provisions of H.R. 9625 all veterans would be eligible for VA drug treatment programs. Such facilities could also be used by active-duty servicemen with an addiction problem. U.S. district courts would be given the option of committing a veteran to the facility if he is judged an addict by the court. Once a person is committed to any program, he may not be released by the VA until his drug addiction condition had been determined to be stabilized, or upon written statement that the individual refused to continue the program.

Veterans' mortgage insurance

On March 1 the House passed two bills increasing benefits for disabled veterans. The first, H.R. 943, provides for government-supported mortgage life insurance for those veterans with service-connected disabilities, who receive grants for specially adapted housing. The main purpose of the legislation is to protect home mortgages of paraplegic and quadriplegic veterans in case of their deaths.

Subsidies for veteran care

The second, H.R. 460, extends government subsidies for disabled veterans in private nursing homes from six months to nine months. Estimated cost of bill for the first year is set at $6.9 million.

Direct home loan program

In an effort to revive the direct loan program for housing, we authorized the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans. Most veterans are eligible for a Government guarantee on a home loan under the GI loan guarantee law. However, in counties where commercial credit is tight, veterans are eligible for a direct loan from the Government if private financing is not available.

However, the program has been suspended by the VA. The fact remains that 20 percent

of the veterans in our country live in credit-tight areas and are therefore eligible for the direct loan but unable to get one. H.R. 3344 directs the VA Administrator to make direct loans available.

OTHER

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, Extension

Congress has cleared S. 1732 extending for one year the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. In so doing, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare has been authorized to make grants up to 75 percent of the cost of rehabilitation projects and programs for delinquents. This represents an increase of 15 percent over that provided in the 1968 Act. Nonprofit agencies and organizations have also been authorized to be funded for rehabilitation programs.

An Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency is to be established to coordinate all Federal delinquency programs with membership to include the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. A total of $75 million was authorized for fiscal 1972 for programs covered by this act.

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972

Congress as of August 3 completed action on eight regular annual appropriations acts providing funding for fiscal year 1972. These eight include the Office of Education Act (H.R. 7016); the Legislative Branch Act (H.R. 8825); the Department of the Treasury and U.S. Postal Service Act (H.R. 9271); State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary Departments Act (H.R. 9272); the Housing and Urban Development and Independent Offices Act (H.R. 9382); Department of Interior and Related Agencies Act (H.R. 9417); the Department of Agriculture (H.R. 9270); and the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Act (H.R. 9667).

Three of these measures have been approved by the President: Office of Education as Public Law 92–48; Legislative Branch as Public Law 92–51; and Treasury and Post Office as Public Law 92–49. Conference reports of the five other measures have been cleared by both Houses for the President.

Congress in addition has approved three measures during the First Session providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1971 including Public Law 92–4, Department of Labor Supplemental; Public Law 92–11, Urgent Supplemental; and Public Law 92–18, Second Supplemental. Two continuing appropriations for fiscal 1971 have been enacted: Public Law 92–7 and Public Law 92–38. A third continuing appropriation bill for fiscal 1972, H.J. Res. 829, was passed by the House August 2.

Office of Education appropriations

Public Law 92–48, signed July 9, appropriates $5,146,311,000 for the Office of Education and related agencies in fiscal 1972. The total provided is nearly $400 million more than the Administration budget request, while it represents an increase of $563 million over the fiscal 1971 education appropriations act.

Included in the funding of the Office of Education are programs of education of the handicapped, vocational education, higher education and elementary and secondary education services. Monies were appropriated for educational communications and libraries and research and development projects.

As cleared by Congress, the measure prohibits the use of funds for loans, loan guarantees or other pay for students, employees, teachers or researchers at institutions of higher education who have participated in activities interfering with the regular curriculum and activities of the institution. Congress specified that no funds could be used to force school districts already considered desegregated under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to bus students, abolish schools or set attendance zones either against the choice of student's parents or as a prerequisite for obtaining federal funds.

Legislative branch appropriations

Public Law 92–51, signed July 9, provides $529,309,749 for activities of the legislative branch for the present fiscal year. As cleared for the President, the bill contains appropriations of $73,496,544 for the Senate and $128,861,150 for the House of Representatives. Funds are also included for the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office and the Cost-Accounting Standards Board. A total of $71,090,000 was approved for construction of the James Madison Memorial Building for the Library of Congress.

Treasury Department, Postal Service, and Executive Office of the President appropriations

Public Law 92–49, signed by the President July 9, appropriates $4,528,986,690 for the Departments of the Treasury, U.S. Postal Service and certain independent agencies. The Act is $1 billion less than provided for the same departments and agencies in fiscal year 1971 and $223.8 million less than the Administration budget request.

Funds totaling $1,217,522,000 were approved for the Treasury and $140,657,000 for payment to the Postal Service Fund. For the eight agencies contained in the bill, $1,616,090,500 was appropriated. The agencies include the Civil Service Commission, the General Services Administration, Civil Defense, Emergency Health of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Commission on Government Procurement, the Administrative Conference of the United States and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Housing and Urban Development and independent offices

On August 2 both Houses cleared for the President H.R. 9382 providing for $18,115,203,000 for fiscal 1972 appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration and nine independent offices and commissions. Among the independence offices and commissions included in the measure are the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (established by the 91st Congress), the Federal Communications Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Administration.

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations

The House and Senate have passed varying versions of H.R. 9272, the appropriations bill for the State, Justice and Commerce Departments. As sent to conference, the bill provided for $4,098,083,000 as passed by the Senate, a difference of $413,900,000 more than the House-approved funding. The total amount approved by the Senate represents $118,719,000 less than the fiscal 1972 amended budget request.

As passed by the House on June 24, H.R. 9272 appropriated $3,684,183,000. A total of $352,715,000 in recommended fiscal 1972 funds were cut from the bill most of it from the Judiciary branch and Maritime Administration within the Commerce Department. Much of the debate concerned an amendment restoring $11.6 million for the U.S. assessment to the International Labor Organization. The amendment, however, was defeated.

Among the agencies funded by H.R. 9272 are the U.S. Information Agency, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, and the Federal Maritime Commission. Altogether four departments and twelve agencies in the executive branch are funded in this legislation.

In addition, both Houses approved a proviso barring the Federal government from paying salaries to federal employees convicted of rioting or inciting to riot, and the making of loans to college students or teachers who engaged in conduct after August 1, 1969, forcing curtailment of college programs.

In the final version, a total of $4,067,116,000 in new obligational authority was appropriated. An additional $240,544,000 is contained for liquidation of contract authorizations.

Department of Transportation and related agencies

On August 2 the House and Senate cleared for the President a conference report on H.R. 9667, Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. As cleared for the President, H.R. 9667 appropriated a total amount of $2,905,310,997 for the Coast Guard, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Secretary of the Transportation Department, Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Conferees accepted the Senate amendment, approved by the House in amended form, a contribution of $58,500,000 toward the partial reimbursement to airline companies who had contributed toward the development of SST.

The final amount approved represents an increase of $171,941,000 over the House-passed amount and $53,619,000 over the Senate-passed amount.

Agriculture appropriations

The House and Senate approved a total amount of $13,276,900,500 in appropriations for the agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Title I of H.R. 9270 provides funding for research, extension, and statistical work. One million dollars is included specifically for research and control of the South American horse disease that in July devastated much of the horse population in the south. The Secretary of Agriculture is using emergency funds in addition to enable us to do all that is necessary.

A sum of $4,213,331,000 was appropriated for full reimbursement of the net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The total funding for Title I was set at $654,299,500.0

Title II provides for funding for rural development totaling $943,943,000. This section included rural electrification and telephone loans totaling $669,100,000 with the stipulation that they be repaid with interest. Other loan programs include operating loans at $350 million, insured housing loans at $1.6 billion, and insured water and waste disposal loans of $300 million. Provisions have also been made for rural water and waste disposal grants at $100 million, providing for new authority above the proposed budget at $44 million. For the Rural Community Development Service recently established to coordinate rural development efforts, $20 million has been approved.

Programs for environmental protection have been funded in Title III at $3,490,477,500. Programs which are included in this section for appropriations are the environmental programs of the Soil Conservation Service, rural environmental assistance programs, and programs administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. Two billion has been approved for waste treatment facilities.

Finally, Title IV includes $2,974,849,000 for consumer protection programs. Such programs funded under this section include the special milk program, which has also been extended, the food stamp programs, the school breakfast program and also nonschool food programs. This level of funding we consider should be adequate to fully meet

the needs for fiscal year 1972 and provide some program expansion into additional counties who have made application to enter the school food programs. Specifically, $198,816,000 was appropriated for the food stamp program for fiscal year 1972.

Department of Interior and related agencies

The Senate and House cleared August 2 for the President H.R. 9417 appropriating $2,223,980,035 for the Department of Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1972. Title I of H.R. 9417 includes funds for the Department of the Interior, including the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Office of Territories, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Coal Research, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, National Park Service, and Office of Saline Water.

Title II provides monies for the Forest Service, Health Services and Mental Health Administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations

In July the House and Senate passed and sent to conference the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act which, when trust funds are included, would total over $77 billion. As passed by the House approximately $3.4 billion were designated for health, $11.4 billion for welfare, $5.1 billion for education and $53.3 billion from the trust funds. The last figure includes Social Security payments and health and hospital insurance.

Although the measure is $321 million higher than the Administration's request, the amount approved is larger than the defense budget. The House added $82.4 million in vocational rehabilitation funds to train handicapped persons for jobs and $14 million to keep open public health hospitals which the Administration had planned to close.

More than $3.5 billion in other spending requests were deferred until later this year since legislation authorizing the programs has not been enacted.

Included in this appropriation measure is $1.3 billion for the operation of the Department of Labor and nearly $5 billion in trust funds administered by various departments within the department.

The House yesterday adopted the conference report on this bill.

Fiscal year 1972 regular annual authorizations

Of the nine regular annual authorization bills, seven have been cleared by both Houses of Congress. H.R. 9388, the Atomic Energy Commission authorizations for fiscal 1972 provides for $2,325,187,000; H.R. 7109, National Aeronautical and Space Administration authorizations, $3,280,850,000; H.R. 4724, Maritime Administration authorizations, $507,820,000; H.R. 5208, Coast Guard Authorizations, $219,750,000; H.R. 7960, National Science Foundation Authorizations, $655,500,000; H.R. 9844, Military Construction authorizations, $2,138,337,000; and H.R. 8687, Military Procurement authorizations, $21.9 billion.

The Foreign Assistance Act authorizations bill for fiscal 1972, H.R. 9910, passed the House August 3 and is now pending in the Senate. S. 2260, the Senate Peace Corps authorization measure, was approved by the Senate August 2, and is now awaiting House consideration. As passed by the Senate, S. 2260 authorizes $72,200,000. The Foreign Aid authorizations total $3,444,350,000 as passed by the House. H.R. 9910 also authorizes $3,494,350,000 for fiscal 1973. On the final vote on H.R. 9910, the House went on record in opposition to going further on Aid-to-Greece. An attempt to delete the ban on a $118 million-aid request for Greece was defeated 122–57.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Extension of the draft

Criticism of the draft system led the President to request that Congress approve an all-volunteer armed forces by mid-1973. His proposals were based in part on the report of the Commission on an All-Volunteer Military, issued in February 1970, which stated that the draft could be abolished by mid-1971. The Senate and House, however, deferred judgment on that proposal and agreed only to extending the draft for another two years.

After three days of debate the House April 1 approved a two-year extension, in the process rejecting amendments (1) to reduce the length of the extension, (2) to restrict duty in Vietnam to men who are not draftees, (3) to continue the existing two-year term of alternate service for conscientious objectors, and (4) to make the statutory language for acquiring conscientious objector status conform to Supreme Court rulings.

As reported from conference, H.R. 6531 contains the two-year extension and also authorizes a total of $2.4 billion for increases in military pay and living allowances.

Concerning the war powers of the President and Congress

Hearings held in the 92d Congress have centered around the constitutional roles of the President and the Congress in foreign affairs. The House, August 2, approved H.J. Res. 1, reflecting this concern. The resolution provides that the President will report to Congress when, without specific prior authorization by Congress, he commits United States military forces to armed conflict.

This legislation would codify procedures for consultation and reporting in certain extraordinary and emergency circumstances. It would require not only that the President consult with Congress before committing troops, but that consultation should continue on a periodic basis for the duration of the conflict. It would further require that the President promptly submit a full and formal report to Congress setting forth the circumstances necessitating his action, and any other information he may deem useful to the Congress in the fulfillment of its constitutional responsibilities.

While the resolution recognizes the prerogative of the President to defend the Nation without prior congressional authorization, it also expresses congressional consensus that the Legislative Branch must reassert its constitutional role in the decisionmaking process as to whether the country should go to war.

Our foreign policy cannot be effectively and responsibly conducted if that relationship does not exist between the President and the Congress. H.J. Res. 1 is a step in the right direction.

Funding for military procurement and construction

Funding for military construction and related activities in fiscal year 1972 cleared the House July 22 and now awaits Senate action.

As passed, H.R. 9844 authorizes to be appropriated a sum of $2,138,337,000. Although the amount represents a larger sum than amounts authorized in the last two years, it is $121,107,000 less than the Administration budget request.

During the course of House debate, the only amendment adopted was an addition of $5.2 million to the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile construction program. Funds would be used mainly in assisting communities in adjusting to the changes caused by construction of the ABM sites.

Included in H.R. 9844 are authorizations of $80,326,000 for reserve components; $7,575,000 for homeowners assistance; $19,879,000 for defense agencies; $571,130,000 for the Army; $318,716,000 for the Navy; $222,299,000 for the Air Force; and $918,412,000 for family housing.

For military procurement the House approved $21.9 billion for authorizations in fiscal year 1972. H.R. 8687 passed by the House June 17 provides funds for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedos, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces. The measure also prescribes the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces.

During the course of debate on amendment to prohibit the expenditure of new funds, after January 1, 1972, to support U.S. military deployment or military operations in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, was rejected. The only amendment adopted by the House forbids funds to institutions of higher education that deny armed forces recruiting personnel access to facilities.

HON. CARL ALBERT BEGINS TO PICK UP POINTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, Mr. McFALL is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McFALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, as the House nears a well-deserved recess, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues to a recent article from the Los Angeles Times which gives an objective account of your able leadership during the first 6 months of the 92d Congress:

SIX MONTHS AS SPEAKER: CARL ALBERT BEGINS TO PICK UP POINTS

(By Thomas J. Foley)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Carl Albert (D-Okla.) started out as Speaker of the House in January with a series of setbacks and continued for some time under a cloud of uncertainty. But after six months he is exhibiting a firmer grip on his high office.

Albert's critics maintain his grip is not as firm as it should be. "The House is still in the backwash of the political process nationally," said Rep. Michael J. Harrington (D–Mass.).

Albert's supporters, including many who are impatient with the legislative process, challenge such statements. They say the problems Albert inherited and the power structure he must contend with require a cautious approach.

As evidence that Albert has begun to fill his role as one of the most powerful men in government, the highest elected Democrat and third in line for the presidency, supporters cite:

PERSONAL ISSUE

His belated but successful effort to derail a contempt of Congress citation for the Columbia Broadcasting System—an effort that was a defeat for one of the committee chairmen, who have been the principal power sources in the House for many years.

Chairman Harley O. Staggers (D-W. Va.) of the Interstate Commerce Committee had made the contempt issue a personal one. But despite the jealous guarding of their prerogatives by mutual support of each other, four of the House committee chairmen, including the most powerful of all, Ways and Means

Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D–Ark.), backed the speaker against Staggers.

Rules changes adopted by the House Democratic caucus this week which give Albert and the party leaders a stronger hold on the caucus and should lead to its revival as a party organ.

Albert's recent meeting with committee chairmen where the speaker set an Oct. 1 deadline for legislative actions by the powerful Rules Committee. Albert also declared that all important legislation now being processed must clear the House by Oct. 15, at which time he plans to recess the House until the Senate has caught up with it.

Appropriation measures which must originate in the House, are farther along this year than any time in the past decade, despite the record size of the federal budget and increased questioning by Congress of spending programs.

RAYBURN "STRONG"

Key to any success is a redressing of the balance of power between the speaker and the chairmen.

Under Albert's predecessor, John V. McCormack of Massachusetts, the chairmen were allowed to exercise their considerable power with almost no restraints. As a result McCormack was generally regarded as a weak speaker.

On the other hand, the late Sam Rayburn of Texas, speaker from 1940 until his death in 1961 and who brought Albert into the leadership team in 1955, was considered a strong leader. Rayburn was greatly respected by most committee chairmen and was able to have his way without serious confrontations.

While a 1970 legislative reorganization act trimmed some of the chairmen's sails, the chairmen nevertheless still control legislation and exercise influence in the House.

Albert felt their strength within minutes of being sworn in as speaker last January. He supported a liberal-sponsored move to take away some of the power of the rules committee to hold up legislation. He was defeated, largely because Rules Committee Chairman William Colmer (D-Miss.) won the help of his fellow chairmen.

Albert also lost an argument with his new majority leader, Rep. Hale Boggs (D-La.) over the method of choosing the party whip.

Albert wanted to let the Democratic caucus elect the whip, and Boggs wanted to continue the traditional method of having the majority leader choose him.

Boggs, who had just won a sharply contested race for majority leader without any help from Albert, also won the argument. Albert salvaged something by exercising a veto over Boggs' first choice for whip, Rep. Daniel Rostenkowski (D-Ill.). Boggs finally chose Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D-Mass.)

Both Albert and Boggs deny reports of a continuing schism between them. And there is little evidence of any differences except Albert's refusal to support Boggs last spring in his charge that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover had authorized tapping of some congressmen's telephones—a charge Boggs has failed to substantiate.

Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), a 23-year House veteran and author of two books on its structure and foibles, defends Albert for one move that was attacked by the liberals. This was his refusal to go along with a move to dump Rep. John McMillan (D-S.C.) as chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee.

"If McMillan had been dumped," Bolling said, "the other chairmen would have killed the speaker early."

Bolling said he believes Albert is "slowly readjusting the balance with the chairmen and he has the patience and stamina to stick with it."

Bolling noted that the speaker's task is complicated because he is presiding over a divided House and divided party. Depending on the issue, he said, conservatives from both parties can combine to defeat the liberal coalition.

Albert almost invariably has voted with the liberals on domestic issues, usually on the winning side. But his support of President Nixon's Vietnam policies has found him with a diminishing minority in his party.

DEFINITE DATE OPPOSED

The speaker acknowledged in a recent interview that his opposition to Congress' setting a date for withdrawal of troops is opposed by a majority of Democratic congressmen. But he indicated his patience may be wearing thin.

He said he believes that before the Dec. 31, 1971, or March 31, 1972, dates mentioned for withdrawal, "we're going to know whether the President is going to succeed or whether the Congress is going to have to move more aggressively." He added that if the President's withdrawal plan seemed about to fail or if Mr. Nixon stepped up U.S. involvement, he would change his mind.

Asked what kind of a presidential candidate he'd like to see the Democrats nominate next year, Albert said he hoped it would be someone with an eye to the future.

"Harry Truman saved the Western world with the containment policy which was essential when the Communists were knocking on the doors of Greece and Turkey . . . but the doctrine of containment has become a little outworn. We need new Harry Trumans with the initiatives to meet the issues of the day and the changing conditions of time."

The Albert critics, however, are impatient. Harrington, a second-term Massachusetts congressman, said Albert's opposition to the CBS contempt citation was a change for the better "but not to the point of allaying my overall concern."

"There are national Democratic party goals," he said, "and there should be more vigorous day-to-day leaning on the committee chairmen to see that these goals are reached and implemented."

Asked what he would do if he were in Albert's place, Harrington said he would "call Jess Unruh to find how to make legislative government more responsive to the last third of the 20th century. It's not so much the rules, or the structure as how they are implemented."

Unruh was speaker of the California Assembly during the 1960's and Democrats at least credit him with making it one of the most progressive state legislatures.

A different view of Albert comes from one of Unruh's closest allies in the Assembly. Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.), who himself was highly critical of McCormack's leadership last year and introduced a resolution of no-confidence in the former speaker.

"I personally believe he (Albert) is doing his best to be more responsive to the caucus and to take command of the committee chairmen," Waldie said.

Waldie, now in his fourth term, agreed with Albert supporters that the confrontation with Staggers on the contempt citation was a turning point.

PROBLEM CITED

"There isn't a member in the House who doesn't have legislation before Staggers' committee," Waldie said, in pointing up the problem facing members in making up their minds whether to oppose the committee chairman. But Albert, he said, found a way to block the contempt citation that would create the least dissension, namely to send it back to the committee for further study.

The veteran Bolling summed up his appraisal this way: "I am sure that Speaker Albert will be a good speaker, but it remains to be seen whether he will be one of the rare great speakers in history."

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair and will give at least 10 minutes' notice prior to reconvening.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNGATE, for 1 hour on September 20, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEATING) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'HARA, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DULSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOGGS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MCFALL (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEATING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in two instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. WYATT.
Mr. BELCHER in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.
Mr. WYMAN in six instances.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.
Mr. O'KONSKI.
Mr. ROUSSELOT in four instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD in five instances.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS in six instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in five instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI in three instances.
Mr. GRIFFIN in three instances.
Mr. GIAIMO.
Mr. HAGAN.
Mr. FOUNTAIN.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in six instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS in five instances.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.
Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of Iowa.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON in three instances.
Mr. CULVER.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in two instances.
Mrs. SULLIVAN in six instances.
Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.
Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York in three instances.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 291. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 996. An act relating to the transportation of mail by the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. An act to amend the Act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1989. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the renewal of certain star route contracts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2393. An act to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to make areas suffering from economic disasters eligible for emergency Federal aid, to improve the aid which would become available to economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had 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. 135. An act to provide for periodic pro rata distribution among the States and other jurisdictions of deposit of available amounts of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2587. An act to establish the National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere;

H.R. 2596. An act to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the United States Park Police force, and the Executive Protective Service, to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2600. An act to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability;

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;

H.R. 7718. An act to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America;

H.R. 8794. An act to provide for the payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services provided certain retired, disabled officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, and the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10061. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 581. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to eliminate certain export credit controls, and for other purposes; and

S. 2296. An act to amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 384 of the 92d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, September 8, 1971.

Whereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 384, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 8, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1043. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Inter-American Affairs), transmitting a report of implementation of section 507(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on advertising and small business (Rept. No. 92–467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3304. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (for himself and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 10479. A bill to protect environmental quality of the Nation's public lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and other Federal agencies through establishment of an accelerated program of research in advanced timber harvesting techniques, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 10480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on fuels containing sulfur and on certain emissions of sulfur oxides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 10481. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to further cultural activities by making unused railroad passenger depots available to communities for such activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 10482. A bill to extend to hawks, owls, and certain other raptors the protection now accorded to bald and golden eagles; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 10483. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for transportation to and from the place where an individual receives services covered under that program or under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. GROSS):

H.R. 10484. A bill to provide for payments by the Postal Service to the civil service retirement fund for increases in the unfunded liability of the fund due to increases in benefits for Postal Service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 10485. A bill to provide increased penalties for distribution of heroin by certain persons, and to provide for pretrial detention of such persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 10486. A bill to make the basic pay of the master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard comparable to the basic pay of the senior enlisted advisers of the other Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10487. A bill to amend chapter 48 of title 7 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin):

H.R.A 10488. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. MCCLURE):

H.R. 10489. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Soshone-Bannock Tribes of Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, as representatives of the Lemhi Tribe, in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 326–I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 10490. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the development of regional waste treatment plans and to authorize a demonstration waste water management program for Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 10491. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the railroad and airline transportation industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10493. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10494. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the maximum burial and funeral expense payment for a veteran to $400 and to provide an additional allowance of not to exceed $150 for the purchase of a burial plot; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCFALL:

H.R. 10495. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project (California); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 10496. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to require that persons eligible to register to vote in Federal elections shall be permitted to register as late as 30 days prior to the date of such an election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10497. A bill to restore the wartime recognition of Filipino veterans of World War II who fought as members of the Commonwealth Army but whose wartime service records were subsequently stricken from official U.S. Army records and to entitle them to those benefits, rights, and privileges which result from such recognition; and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to classify as special immigrants alien veterans who served honorably in the U.S. Armed Forces, together with their spouses and children, for purposes of lawful admission into the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. REES, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 10498. A bill to authorize members of the Armed Forces to be discharged from active military service by reason of physical disability when such members are suffering from drug dependency, to authorize the civil commitment of such members after their discharge, to provide for the review of less-than-honorable discharges granted to certain members and the issuance of new discharges in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 10499. A bill to ban oppressive child labor in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee):

H.R. 10500. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. KEE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. THONE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.R. 10501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MCKEVITT):

H.R. 10502. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of public officials and foreign officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10503. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to promote the public health by strengthening the national effort to conquer cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 10504. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of tuition, subsistence, and educational assistance allowances on behalf of or to certain eligible veterans pursuing programs of education under chapter 34 of such title; to apply automatic cost-of-living increases to subsistence allowances; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10505. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the review of certain veterans' benefits cases forfeited for fraud on or before September 1, 1959, and for remission of forfeitures; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution to declare a U.S. policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SIKES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. YATES, Mr. ROE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. REES):

H. Con. Res. 390. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MORSE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. GROVER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. KARTH):

H. Con. Res. 391. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. PEPPER):

H. Con. Res. 392. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. COTTER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FISH, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BYRON, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. KOCH):

H. Con. Res. 393. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. ANDERON of Illinois, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. SISK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. KYROS, Mr. DU PONT, Mr.

McCLORY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DOW, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. DWYER, and Mr. THONE):

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H. Res. 582. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that meetings of the Committee on House Administration for consideration of the fixing and adjusting of allowances of Members and committees be open to all Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 583. Resolution authorizing the Speaker, during the remainder of the 92d Congress, after agreement with the minority leader, to entertain motions to adjourn the House to a day and time certain; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10506. A bill for the relief of Josephine Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth G. Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10508. A bill for the relief of Sea Oil & General Corp., of New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10509. A bill for the relief of Juan Marcos Cordova-Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10510. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Telemachos Agoudemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H. Res. 584. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 10477) entitled "A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property situated in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Riverside County, California", to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Res. 585. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 10478) entitled "A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, California", to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Friday, August 6, 1971*

The Senate met at 8:15 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we commit to Thee the work of this body in the months just past, beseeching Thee to complete elsewhere what has begun here. If we have done those things which we ought not to have done and left undone those things we ought to have done, good Lord, forgive us. Confirm and complete all that has been right and good. Overrule all shortcomings and failures.

Give to the Republic a new sense of national purpose which arises out of faith in the invincibility of goodness and commitment to the spiritual verities which abide all change.

Be with Thy servants as they separate at the close of the day. Give journeying mercies to those who travel. Guard them in moments of peril. Bring them back to this place renewed in energy, enlarged in vision, and deepened in faith in Thee.

Now may the Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace now and evermore. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 5, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate turn to the consideration of the unobjected to items on the calendar, beginning wih Calendar No. 344 and concluding with Calendar No. 350.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR PROPERTY OF SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE SCOTTISH RITE OF FREE MASONRY

The bill (H.R. 7718) to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 343, S. 2387, be indefinitely postponed. It is the same bill, I understand, as Calendar No. 344, H.R. 7718, which the Senate has passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION IN THE METROPOLITAN POLICE BAND

The bill (H.R. 2596) to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the Executive Protective Service, to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUALIZATION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN

The bill (H.R. 2600) to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEALTH SERVICES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN

The bill (H.R. 8794) to provide for the payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services provided certain retired, disabled officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2592) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employ-