



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 26, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Dr. John Milton Sayre, First United Methodist Church, Valparaiso, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, in whose hands are held our lives and times; we give hearty thanks for the sense of Your presence in our lives and the affirmation of Your love.

We are not great men and women and we are sometimes awed by the responsibilities that are placed upon us and by the power that is entrusted to us. We are forced to set a course when there is no place to go. We are forced to say "yes" and "no" when "yes" and "no" is not enough. If we cannot attain perfection then comfort and strengthen us in our efforts to do our best.

If we seek to attain greatness then let it be the true greatness of humility, integrity, and truth. 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 agreed to the first House amendment to Senate amendment No. 2 with an amendment to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4590. An act relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the study entitled "International Cooperation in Outer Space: A Symposium" as a Senate document.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Armed Services:

CXVII—2356—Part 29

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 26, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the committee on Armed Services effective immediately.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES ON AGRICULTURE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committees on Agriculture and Government Operations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 26, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Sincerely yours,

J. KENNETH ROBINSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 660) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 660

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: J. Kenneth Robinson of Virginia;
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio;

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Carleton J. King, of New York and Floyd D. Spence, of South Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN WYOMING

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 137) to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 137

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the successors in interest of Ferne M. McNeil all right, title, and interest of the United States, except right, title, and interest in deposits of oil and gas, in lands in resurvey lots 38C, 38D, and 38F (original survey southeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter) section 25, township 52 north, range 103 west, sixth principal meridian, Park County, Wyoming, lying east and south of the Cody Canal. Such conveyance shall be made only upon application therefor within six months after the date of this Act, and upon payment of the fair market value of the land as of May 13, 1949, plus the administration costs of making the conveyance, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, within one year after modification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due. In determining the fair market value of the land, the Secretary of the Interior shall not include any values added to the land by Ferne M. McNeil or her successors in interest or their heirs. Any conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall reserve to the United States all deposits of oil and gas in the lands, together with the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Acceptance of Ferne M. McNeil or her successors in interest of any conveyance made hereunder shall constitute a waiver and release by them of any and all claims against the United States arising out of the operation, maintenance, or construction of the Buffalo Bill Reservoir as now or hereafter authorized, including, without limitation, by reason of enumeration, claims for seepage, wave action, blowing silt, or increase in ground water level.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday when the private calendar was called, the House inadvertently passed

37451

H.R. 2082, an identical bill to S. 137. The passage of S. 137 is necessary if this legislation is to be enacted.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

NEWSLETTER

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week I will be mailing to my constituents my third newsletter of this session of Congress. With the thought that it might interest my colleagues, I am submitting its full text for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

Dear Constituent and Fellow New Yorker: You know as well as I do that the Congress has continually abdicated its responsibility in bringing an end to the Vietnam War. This is especially true of the House of Representatives. It has ducked every occasion for a vote—up or down—on setting a date certain for total withdrawal from Vietnam.

The Senate has twice adopted the Mansfield Amendment which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the United States shall withdraw from Vietnam no later than six months from date of enactment subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

Fearing its passage, the House leadership, at the direction of the President, has used parliamentary chicanery on two occasions to prevent a direct vote on the Mansfield Amendment. On a procedural vote in June we failed by 44 votes in getting a record vote on ending the war. This month, on another procedural vote, we failed by 23 votes.

It is greatly distressing for me to see the House moving at a snail's pace while young men die everyday in Vietnam and we have no date certain as to when the killing will stop. In my mind "winding down the war" is an unacceptable agony that our country and fighting men should not have to endure. And the failure of Congress to force the President to speed up withdrawals shows contempt for the American people who have made it abundantly clear to their Representatives that they are sick of waiting for an end to this national disgrace and nightmare.

WELFARE

In March of this year I reported to you that the administration of welfare in New York City was in a shambles as illustrated by my investigation of "welfare hotels."

Since that earlier report there has been more evidence of the continuing mismanagement of the welfare program in New York City.

My office has been involved in two individual cases which highlight the welfare bureaucracy's confusion and inertia. The first case involved a woman with nine children

who for one full year lived in three unconnected rooms at a welfare hotel at a cost to the taxpayers of \$24,000 annually for food and rent. They had no cooking facilities and ate most of their meals in restaurants. In addition there were seven fires in the hotel during the past year, one of which destroyed all the family's clothing. After months of futile correspondence with the Department of Social Services in an attempt to relocate this family, I finally brought this case to the attention of the press and public. Only then did the Department act to relocate this family.

The second case related to a woman who says her husband earns \$32,000 per year, owns his own business, and lives in a luxury apartment in Riverdale. She and her six year old son have been on welfare for 2½ years despite the fact that a support order from Manhattan Family Court is in effect against her husband. When I asked the Department of Social Services to investigate this matter, pointing out that they would save public funds if the court order were enforced, they replied that the Department has no authority to enforce the support order. I checked the law and discovered that the Department of Social Services does, indeed, have enforcement authority. Their refusal to use it simply costs the taxpayer unnecessarily, and leads one to question how many such unenforced support orders involve individuals on welfare.

It is regrettable that the City's Welfare Administration does not respond to these problems until there is a crisis or after their own fumbling has been exposed in the press. A good example has been the problem of fraudulent cashing of welfare checks. Assemblyman Antonio Olivieri and I met with Welfare Administrator Jule Sugarman back in April to urge the establishment of a program for distributing relief checks through local banks to avoid the loss and theft of mailed checks. But the Department of Social Services procrastinated until the press revealed the tremendous loss involved whereupon the City finally proposed a pilot project based on our earlier proposals.

It is distressing that the Department of Social Services attempts to minimize the significance of the problems that are brought to light. Their standard response is that the waste resulting from welfare hotels or forged checks is marginal in light of their overall budget. The sum of all this ineptitude, however, is enormous bungling and enormous waste. The Department of Social Services here is simply not doing the job with which it is charged by law.

The price cannot be weighed in dollars alone. This continual mismanagement has eroded public confidence in the welfare program, which in turn threatens the survival of the very legitimate and necessary aspects of welfare. It also creates a difficult situation for Congressmen such as myself who believe in a full federal assumption of welfare and who must convince colleagues in the House that federal funds so spent will be well used.

BIKES

In cities all across the country, pedal power is gaining momentum. More and more people are taking up bicycling for both commuting and recreational purposes.

To encourage bicycling and to make this form of transportation safer, I have introduced H.R. 9369, the Bicycle Transportation Act of 1971. My bill would allow states and communities to use Highway Trust Fund monies for the development of bicycle lanes and paths. It also provides that such funds can be used for the construction of bicycle shelters and parking facilities and for bicycle traffic control devices. H.R. 9369 is now cosponsored by 51 Members of the House and 12 Senators. Senators Cranston and Tunney of California introduced my bill in the Senate.

I believe that bicycling offers us an important transportation resource that must be more fully utilized, particularly in our metropolitan areas. We have in the bicycle a vehicle that emits no pollution, makes no noise, takes up little space, and requires little maintenance.

However, safety requires that cyclists be given their own lane on the road or a special bike path. In New York City a lot of green signs have been put on streets to indicate recommended places for bicycling—but nothing has been done to separate the cyclists from the cars. My own view is that this is dangerous tokenism. For the City to encourage bike riding without providing the necessary safety precautions is foolhardy. In the meantime, Congress should also do its part by permitting existing Highway funds to be used to make bicycling more attractive and safe.

DRUGS

In the past few months the Congress has taken several steps to stem the flow of hard-drugs into this country and provide therapy for drug addicts.

Congressional action has been taken on two of my bills designed to provide treatment for two categories of easily identifiable addicts.

My first bill (H.R. 8390) requires that drug addicts on welfare undergo treatment for their addiction and periodically be tested to be certain that they are not reverting to their drug habit. It also provides that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will be responsible for determining that adequate facilities are available to treat these addicts. The provisions of this bill were included in H.R. 1, the Family Assistance Plan, approved by the House on June 22 and now awaiting Senate action.

My second bill (H.R. 8389) requires states and localities receiving federal "corrections" funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to provide treatment for drug addicts in prisons and on parole. Up till now little has been done in our prisons to treat addicts. Prisoners are detoxified, but are given no therapy so that most, when released from prison, resume their drug habits.

Since drug addiction accounts for 50% of the street crime in New York City, making us prisoners in our very homes, we must have treatment of drug addicts in prison while they are easily identified and isolated. My bill was unanimously approved and reported out by the House Judiciary Committee on October 21. It will be voted on by the full House soon.

Since coming to Congress I have co-sponsored legislation directing the President to cut off both economic and military aid to countries failing to take measures necessary to control the growth, production and traffic of dangerous drugs. Finally this year we managed to get the cut-off aid directive included in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 as passed by the House on August 3. Now Turkey has announced that it will terminate its legalization of opium production within one year. 80% of the heroin coming into the United States starts out in the opium fields of Turkey.

Another important foreign target is the heroin processing factories in the French port of Marseilles. It appears that the French government is beginning to cooperate with us in facing the problem but we must exert continued pressure if these factories are to be shut down once and for all.

SOVIET JEWS

In June I reported on my trip to the Soviet Union to learn firsthand about the plight of imprisoned Soviet Jews protesting against religious and cultural discrimination.

For many months, I and many others have been attempting to have the United States government make it absolutely clear that we are willing to accept any Soviet Jews allowed

to emigrate. Toward this end, I introduced H.R. 5606 last March to provide 30,000 special refugee visa for Soviet Jews in event they are allowed to leave the Soviet Union. H.R. 5606 gained the support of 123 House cosponsors, 34 Senate sponsors and hundreds of thousands of Jews and non-Jews in the country.

On September 30th in a major shift of Nixon Administration policy, Attorney General John Mitchell announced that he would use his parole authority, without regard to quota restrictions, to bring Soviet Jews into the United States should they be able to leave the Soviet Union. The Attorney General has done administratively what my bill would have done legislatively.

While our country's action does not, by itself, ease the plight of the Soviet Jews—it is a strong moral incentive for pressing the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate and be reunited with their families and relatives in Israel or wherever they may be.

STUYVESANT TOWN

On September 16th, Assemblyman Andrew Stein and I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury John Connally to protest the request by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company that tenants of Stuyvesant Town renew their leases and increase their security deposits during the 90 day wage-price freeze.

On September 30th, the Office of Emergency Preparedness wrote to me indicating that the request for additional security was, indeed, a violation of the freeze. The Stuyvesant Town Tenants Association was alerted to this fact and formally protested through the Internal Revenue Service. Subsequently, Met Life retracted its request for the additional security.

While the federal regulations do not specifically prohibit Met Life from seeking lease renewals during the freeze, I think it is extremely unfair to request such renewals before the tenants of Stuyvesant Town know what controls will affect rents after the official 90 day freeze. I have written to the Mayor, members of the Board of Estimate and the City Corporation Counsel asking that they stop Met Life from seeking lease renewals until such time as the Board of Estimate has approved Met Life's application for a rent increase.

NIXON'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM

The President's recent reversal of his past economic policies is in essence an acknowledgement of the failure of his Administration to deal with the now all-too-familiar problems of inflation, unemployment and balance-of-payments.

During the past 2½ years of Nixon's Presidency, unemployment climbed from 3.3 to 6.1 percent, prices rose at an annual rate of 8.4 percent, the GNP fell for the first time since 1958, and the United States suffered its first balance-of-trade deficit since 1893.

Clearly, it was high time for the Nixon Administration to give second thought to its optimistic claims about impending economic recovery and to yield to the long-standing recommendations of many economists and Congressmen.

Although I feel it is essential that the basic outlines of the President's new economic program be put into effect, I have supported changes in Nixon's original program so as to provide additional tax relief for low-income individuals. I have also supported the reduction of accelerated depreciation allowances and of the investment tax credit from the proposed 10 percent to 7 percent. However, I wholeheartedly supported the Nixon proposals to speed up increases in the standard deduction and personal exemption allowances for individual taxpayers.

I think more funds should be used to expand emergency public service and public works job programs; and the enactment of welfare reform and revenue sharing should not be postponed.

In the weeks to come you may have questions about President Nixon's post-freeze (Phase II) wage and price program. My New York staff probably won't have the answers but they will make every effort to get them for you or put you in touch with government officials who do. Please make any post-freeze inquiries by letter (26 Federal Plaza, Room 3139, New York 10007) instead of by phone. In that way the staff can more efficiently serve you.

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you need assistance, call my New York City office at 26 Federal Plaza on 264-1066 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

GOLDWATER HOSPITAL

During the past summer, I was notified by two social workers at Goldwater Hospital on Welfare Island that about 25 disabled and elderly patients were being denied the privilege of attending special summer camps outside the City because they could not get \$300 to obtain adequate clothing. I was told the Department of Social Services was not providing any clothing allowances whatsoever.

After checking that funds were unavailable from private charitable services, I sent a letter to HRA Administrator Jule Sugarman advising him there was a special fund for Medicaid clients (all the patients concerned were on Medicaid) which could be used for obtaining the needed clothing. The next day the Department of Social Services called saying that funds would be made available. This was very gratifying since the patients of Goldwater Hospital are rarely able to leave and the special camp offered a very important recreational opportunity to them.

Of the pictures included in the newsletter, one was captioned and its text read as follows:

During the Congressional Recess in August I visited Israel and, in particular, the Ashdod absorption center above where I spoke with Mrs. Rochel Shpungin and other newly arrived Russian immigrants.

While in Israel, I met with Prime Minister Golda Meir, Finance Minister Pinchas Sapir and former Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. I made trips to the Suez Canal, the Golan Heights, and Sharm el-Sheikh. I was enormously impressed by the pride of the Israelis in their country and their confidence that they can withstand any assault that may be launched by the Arab states.

PRAYER AMENDMENT: MISCONCEIVED MOVE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the prayer amendment to the Constitution will shortly be before this House. It is the matter of much discussion with emotions running high on both sides of this issue. I personally am religious and attend services of my faith not as often as I should but when I do I feel the better for it. But I believe in denominational prayer and I think that to be meaningful prayer must be conducted in conformity with one's own religion and therefore ought not to be conducted in the schools in an antiseptic manner intended to be acceptable to all but really not acceptable to any.

I recently have had the great pleasure of meeting with Father Donald R. Campion who is editor-in-chief of America, a magazine published by Jesuits of the United States and Canada. He provided me with a superb editorial which appeared in the magazine America of October 23, 1971, and expresses his own misgivings about the proposed amendment. I should like to bring it to the attention of our colleagues.

PRAYER AMENDMENT: MISCONCEIVED MOVE

Sometime before it adjourns, the House of Representatives is expected to vote on proposing a "prayer amendment" to the Constitution. The bill proposing the amendment had been locked up in the House Judiciary Committee, but a discharge petition was successful last month in forcing it out on the House floor. As a result, the House will consider the measure without having had the benefit of the kind of hearings that usually precede House debate on a constitutional amendment. For this the liberals on the House Judiciary Committee have only themselves to thank. If they had not blocked full and open discussion of the amendment under the usual procedures, they would not now be faced with the prospect of House adoption of an ill-written, mischievous and misconceived proposal.

The text of the proposed amendment reads as follows: "Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds to participate in non-denominational prayer." To be adopted as part of our Constitution, the amendment needs a two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate and ratification by three-fourths of the states.

The amendment looks innocuous but it is not. The word "nondenominational" is a serious flaw, certain to provoke extensive litigation and to involve the Supreme Court in theological disputes far beyond its competence and patience. Moreover, the implication from the amendment is that "denominational" prayers in public buildings are forbidden. This is not the law today, and never has been.

The Supreme Court's decisions banning official sponsorship of prayer in public schools do not forbid the renting of public buildings (including public schools) for religious services, the employment of chaplains by Congress and the state legislatures, or the celebration of Mass in the White House. Even the Supreme Court itself begins each public session with an invocation of God's help. Whether the prayer is "denominational" or not depends entirely upon your theological point of view.

Secondly, the proposed amendment does not include the important word "voluntarily" between "to participate" and "in prayer." Although this might seem like a quibble, since the proposal speaks of the "right" of persons to pray in public buildings, the word "voluntarily" should not have been omitted. It cannot be emphasized too much that the government must remain neutral in religious matters, and the right *not* to participate is just as important as the right to join one's heart and voice to the prayer being offered.

The most serious defect, however, of the proposed amendments is that it is sheer tokenism in an extremely important area. If passed, the amendment will be thought to have altered our Constitution with respect to religion in the public schools. The amendment, however, will do no such thing. It does not touch the question of government sponsorship of prayer, especially in the public schools during regular school hours. The amendment simply asserts what very few would deny, that there is no constitutional

interdict on truly "private" prayer in public buildings.

Reconciling the rights of all parents and students with respect to religion in the public schools is a serious, difficult problem. It should not be trifled with by passage of the "prayer amendment."

VETERAN ADDICTION: DO YOU PEOPLE KNOW WHAT REALLY IS GOING ON?

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Veterans Day, I went as I have every year since I have been in Congress, to the veterans hospital in my district located at 24th Street and First Avenue. The director, Mr. John V. Sheehan, conducted me through several wards in the hospital, newly opened, in response to the need to provide therapy for drug addicted veterans. It was in January of this year that the VA Hospital instituted several programs to deal with drug addiction. One is detoxification and the other is a methadone maintenance program. The total number of veterans in the program at the present time is 251. The total number having gone through the program since its inception is 172. The current number of patients in the detoxification ward is 31. The number in the methadone maintenance ward is 20 and those who by choice are seeking detoxification without the aid of methadone in other wards, cold turkey, is 5. The current number of out patients receiving continuing assistance in the methadone maintenance program is 150 and those who are receiving aid other than methadone to stay drug free is 45.

There is a waiting list of 85 veterans who wish to enter the program for which there are no beds available. However, Mr. Sheehan made a point of saying that any veteran who is an addict walking into the hospital at any time of the day or night requesting immediate admission is admitted notwithstanding the bed shortage.

I spoke with a number of these young veterans and they included some who were in the Korean war and others from the war in Vietnam. The youngest was 18 years of age and the oldest appeared to be in his late thirties. The stories they told me have become all too familiar to those of us who have visited the many drug programs operated by private agencies, as well as the city of New York, for drug addicts. Some were hooked on heroin before going into service; others became heroin addicts while in service and this was particularly true of the veterans who had served in Vietnam. One young veteran said to me and his question sums it all up, "Do you people know what really is going on?" It is hard to respond to his question. I like to think that we do know but if we do, then why is it we have been so ineffective in dealing with the problem. It was just this year that President Nixon announced his concern for the drug addicted veteran.

I do not know anymore who to believe insofar as the figures on drug addiction

are concerned. On one hand we are told by Members of Congress who have visited Vietnam that the figures of drug addicted servicemen in Vietnam average between 25,000 to 40,000. On the other hand we are told by the White House that the figure does not exceed 5,776. Whether the figure is the lowest or the highest it includes thousands of our young men who are returning to civilian life drug addicted.

The program in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Manhattan appears to be a good one although clearly inadequate. The young men who participate in the program find no jobs available for them when they leave. Due to the efforts of the hospital personnel, and obviously they are not equipped to do the job, 60 of the 172 men who have graduated have found jobs. But one need not be a genius to know how easy it will be for those who are unemployed to sink back to drug addiction for whatever solace that brings them by blocking out the disappointments of every day existence. Furthermore, when these young men leave the hospital setting, many of them, because they are without funds and jobs must apply for welfare. In the city of New York the Department of Social Services in finding accommodations for these men who are usually single and without families, is for the most part limited to placing them in what has come to be known as welfare hotels. These hotels are generally squalid and have become centers of drug pushing and addiction.

What we need to supplement the drug detoxification and methadone maintenance programs now provided in the Veterans' Administration hospital are job programs for these veterans, and halfway houses in which they can live for some reasonable time after their discharge from the hospital—the stay in the hospital is approximately 6 weeks in duration.

Prior to going to see this particular program in the Veterans' Administration hospital I had been contacted by constituents complaining that they, who were former drug addicts and now on methadone maintenance programs, were barred from jobs with government agencies. In looking into their complaints I found them to be valid and that indeed at least two agencies of government, one the U.S. Postal Service and the other, the Metropolitan Transit Authority in New York did indeed effectively bar from employment former drug addicts now on methadone maintenance. I think such an attitude is wrong. Would these agencies bar alcoholics who have reformed and who are now able to work and are well-motivated citizens? I am told that in fact these agencies do not bar reformed alcoholics. Why then should a reformed drug addict be barred? Furthermore, drug addicts have a problem in securing jobs which require that they be bonded and it is evidently the policy of bonding companies not to issue bonds for such individuals. If that is the case, then legislation, at least for veterans who were addicts and are now reformed, should be passed which would provide bonds, in appropriate cases where private insurance companies will not.

At the conclusion of my tour through the VA hospital I participated in the chapel service conducted by the three major faiths at the hospital, and as I sat meditating there I had only one thought and that was, no matter what our feelings may be about the war in Vietnam we must all be united in making certain that these young men who our country sent there and who have come back, physically or psychologically handicapped, be given every aid necessary to restore them to their rightful place as productive citizens in our society.

The correspondence which I have had with President Richard M. Nixon, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Metropolitan Transit Authority is appended.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1971.

Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want to bring to your attention a matter which I believe deserves your intercession.

Former drug addicts have a very difficult time obtaining employment. To indicate that, I have enclosed correspondence that I have had with the United States Post Office.

At the present time, there are an estimated 200,000 heroin addicts in the United States and at least 40,000 soldiers now in Viet Nam who are heroin addicts.

You recently announced that you will be providing programs to deal with the total problem and that will include: education, law-enforcement, treatment and rehabilitation. Shouldn't the program also include jobs for those who have been rehabilitated? Would it not make sense to begin with the Post Office in the instant case described in the enclosed correspondence?

I await your response. Please reply to my New York office.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 22, 1971.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many thanks for your letter of June 15 regarding the need to formulate a program for the employment of rehabilitated drug addicts. I know the President will be most interested in your comments which will be presented for his early consideration.

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1971.

WINTON M. BLOUNT,
Postmaster, U.S. Post Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLOUNT: I am writing to you concerning the case of Charles Katznelson, about which I learned from reading James Wechsler's column in the April 1st *New York Post*. In the even you may not have seen it, I am enclosing a copy of the article.

I would very much appreciate your advising me, subject to your regular rules and regulations regarding matters such as these, of the reasons for which Mr. Katznelson was denied employment with the Post Office. It may be that the Post Office was justified and acting within its authority in refusing this particular man's application, and the purpose of my letter is not to question the Post

Office's judgment in this particular case. However, Mr. Wechsler's column does raise the significant question of what employment opportunities exist for people with drug histories who are trying to live without drugs.

Could you tell me if the Post Office is considering the removal of restrictions on the employment of individuals who are on a qualified Methadone Maintenance program? If not, could you then tell me why the Post Office would not consider such a policy?

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is in further reply to your letter of April 12 addressed to the Postmaster General, enclosing a copy of an article which appeared in the New York Post concerning Charles Katznelson.

In February 1971, Mr. Katznelson's name appeared on a list of eligibles, furnished by the Civil Service Commission to the New York Post Office, to be considered for employment. All applicants, who notified the Personnel Office that they were available for duty, were interviewed. This did not guarantee appointment. The postmaster or selected official may choose any one of the top 3 eligibles certified to him (rule of three requirement) as long as he does not pass over a veteran to select a non-veteran.

Each postmaster had the authority to select employees upon whom he must depend for proper performance, judging each applicant on his own merits. In the instant case, the postmaster appointed the applicant whom he considered the best qualified of the top 3 eligibles.

Until a policy is established on drug misuse, each applicant who has undergone methadone treatment, must be judged on his own merits. Such factors as treatment received, rehabilitative efforts in the community, and past employment history as related to job requirements would be considered.

Due to budget limitations and employment restrictions, we have not implemented a formal program on drug misuse. When guidelines are developed and published, we will be glad to furnish this information.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN W. POWELL,
Congressional Liaison Officer.

JAMES A. WECHSLER—ONE CASE HISTORY

He might be mistaken for the chairman of the department of philosophy if one saw him walking across a college campus. He is 46, quiet in tone as well as demeanor, with a few streaks of gray in his hair. He is a veteran of World War II who enlisted at the age of 17 and served for more than three years in the Marine Air Corps in the Pacific.

For 23 years after his discharge from the service, he was a drug addict who supported his habit by shoplifting, at which he was caught innumerable times because of his ineptitude. In his own words, "I amassed an extensive record of misdemeanors, larceny and drug convictions—but no felonies."

On Feb. 15, 1968, he gained admission to the Methadone Maintenance Renewal Program at the Beth Israel Medical Center and has faithfully pursued that program for more than 37 months.

He had high hopes that he could obtain secure employment as a postal clerk after he achieved an 83.5-plus score in his test and was placed on the eligible list last December. His doctor and counselor at Beth Israel both backed his application. But on March 5 he received a cryptic message informing him that

"favorable consideration cannot be given for this appointment."

So he is back on welfare, where he had been for many months after his temporary job in the census count ran out. He is haunted by the question of whether a man who finally licked hard drugs in middle age is nevertheless deemed unfit for employment by the Post Office—and many other institutions—because of his past record and his present reliance on methadone.

Recently I wrote a column suggesting that the "welfare case load" included many human beings who defied the prevailing Reaganesque stereotype. Those remarks evoked a letter from Charles Katznelson outlining the facts recorded above and ending:

"I really would like to work in the Post Office because it would give me a sense of security, which at the age of 46 I doubt I could find anywhere else. Can you please help so I can get off welfare?"

We talked at length in my office yesterday. One was struck at once by the apparent miracle of methadone. Here was a man who, by his own confession, had been a prisoner of hard drugs for more than 20 years—almost from the time when he was honorably discharged by the Marines in 1945—and who still had sufficient resources of spirit to begin fighting for escape when he was over 40.

"When I came out I was just 21," he recalls, "I finished up at high school in Chicago—I hadn't graduated when I enlisted—and I started going to music school. I wanted to be the White Charley Parker but I just couldn't get myself organized. I started smoking pot, like a lot of the musicians, and then I tried the hard stuff and got addicted immediately.

"At first I was a very bad shoplifter, I got caught all the time, but gradually I became a professional—with the advice of some experts."

He drifted from place to place—Texas, California, finally New York. Eventually he married, but that ended more than ten years ago. Then, in 1967, he met a woman who was in the methadone program at Beth Israel's Morris J. Bornstein Institute. She persuaded him to apply for admission and, after about a year's interim, he entered the hospital. Within eight weeks he was released as an outpatient. Twice a week since that time he has diligently returned to obtain his medication; there are also sessions with his counselor.

Early last year he had six months of employment during the census operation and he was recalled for another month in December. But he knew that would be transitory and began his quest for Post Office employment. In his personal interviews he did not conceal any of his personal history. But he clung to the hope that his three-year "drug-free" record, confirmed in a letter signed by hospital officials, along with his passing of the eligibility test, would enable him to break through.

The negative response contained no reason for his rejection. It simply concluded: "Another eligible was appointed to this vacancy in accordance with Civil Service regulations."

Currently Katznelson is seeking employment as a counselor in a neighborhood addiction program; that application is still pending. Meanwhile he receives \$204 a month in welfare.

It's enough to pay the rent and survive if you don't really do anything except read and watch the tube—but you have a feeling that you can get deeper into a rut," he says. And the unemployment figures shadow his landscape.

Charles Katznelson, age 46. One methadone success story—and one "welfare case"; literate, articulate, yet deemed unacceptable for the routine chores of a postal clerk. A man salvaged from the drug-heap—but where does he go from here?

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1971.

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Chairman, Metropolitan Transit Authority,
New York City.

DEAR BILL: I am writing to you concerning the hiring policies of the MTA with regard to former addicts.

The enclosed letter from Ronald Brayer of the Greenwich House Counseling Center deals with a patient who is on Methadone Maintenance and whose application for a position with the MTA was turned down.

It may be true, as Mr. Brayer points out, that the MTA is justified and acting within its authority in refusing this particular man's application, and the purpose of my letter is not to question the MTA's judgment in this particular case. However, the letter does raise the significant question of what employment opportunities exist for people with drug histories who are trying to live without drugs.

Could you tell me if the MTA has, or is considering a policy of hiring patients who are on a qualified Methadone Maintenance Program? If not, could you then tell me why, then, the MTA would not consider such a policy?

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

NEW YORK CITY
TRANSIT AUTHORITY,
April 16, 1971.

Representative EDWARD I. KOCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: I note in Mr. Bayer's letter that Mr. O'Connor had applied for a position at the Transit Authority; therefore, I will confine my remarks to Transit policy rather than attempt to cover an operation as varied as the MTA.

In regards to your first question, the TA has considered the policy of hiring patients who are under treatment for addiction. In the course of this consideration various clinics were visited and many opinions were solicited. After an extensive investigation it was decided that the TA's longstanding policy of not appointing applicants with an addiction history would continue.

There are several reasons for arriving at this conclusion:

1. There are approximately 1500-2000 limited service employees who must be assigned to special jobs because of physical disabilities. The size of this group is not expected to decrease as medical standards will remain high and when employees are disqualified from critical jobs by the Medical Department transfers must be made to less demanding assignments. Although these special jobs are the ones that new appointees with medical limitations such as Mr. O'Connor's might be assigned to, I think you would agree the policy of giving preference to employees is desirable.

2. Transit Authority employees are responsible for passenger safety. I am sure you would agree that any experiments that might endanger the riding public cannot be justified.

3. There is general agreement that present narcotic rehabilitation programs are in the experimental stages. In the interest of passenger safety and passenger peace of mind, it would be untimely to initiate such an experimental program in Transit facilities.

Kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. RONAN.

A PREDICTION: MORTGAGE RATES ARE STILL GOING UP DESPITE ADMINISTRATION CLAIMS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the interest on home mortgages is still going up despite freezes on prices and wages.

Telephone calls, letters, and other information reaching my office indicate that there has been a great deal of price-gouging on the part of lenders since the August 15 freeze. These increases on mortgage lending have come at a time when the wages of all workers—everyone from the schoolteacher to the assembly line worker—have been frozen. The home buyer has not received a single dime in wages to pay the higher interest rates and the additional discount points.

Yet, the administration continues to talk about "voluntary" approaches to the interest rate problem. Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles Walker, went to the White House last Tuesday to brief the national press on the phase II legislative package and once again indicate that this administration has no plans to invoke credit controls.

Mr. Walker indicated that the controls were not needed because "interest rates were coming down." Once more, the administration was clinging to various changes in the money market rates to support its claims. The administration has been very silent on the rates paid by actual people on mortgages and consumer loans.

All of us welcome the improvements in the bond markets, but in a wage-price freeze, it is essential that we have equity at the consumer level. Even the changes in the money market rates are being greatly exaggerated by the administration and, today, key corporate issues are still bearing interest rates of 7½ percent and higher. The prime rate went down but there is no indication that this reduction is being passed on to the consumers.

These changes in the money market rates are temporary. In the long run, we are going to see even greater pressure on interest rates, particularly, if we have the heavy investment in plant equipment predicted by the administration. The time to impose controls on interest rates is now and not after they start going up again.

The time for controls is now if the administration is truly interested in having an equitable wage-price program under phase II. It is disgraceful that the administration continues to put its economic spokesmen on national television to claim that interest rates are coming down when homebuyers are being forced to pay higher rates and higher under-the-table charges. It is shameful that the administration continues to spread this propaganda when millions of Americans are being gouged by small loan sharks, second mortgage manipulators and are being forced to pay 18 and 24 percent on revolving retail credit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the news media—which has been so willing to repeat the administration's claims about interest rates—will start asking the Charlie Walkers tougher questions about consumer credit—about mortgage credit. I hope the television networks which have given Mr. Walker and others time to make their claims about lower interest

rates will start talking about the increases in the mortgage rates.

The problem of rising mortgage rates in a wage-price and rent freeze is very serious. In recent years, the Congress and many groups across the Nation have done everything possible to help maintain housing in the inner cities of our urban areas. The rents in these buildings are now frozen, but the lenders are seeking substantial increases in interest rates as the mortgages come due.

The New York Times of October 12 noted this problem and I quote from this article:

Interest rates and mortgage terms have also caused hardship, according to Sanford Sirulnick, a vice president of the Ditmas Management Corporation, which owns 20 apartment houses in Brooklyn and Queens.

In the next three months, Mr. Sirulnick said, "four of our mortgages are coming due." This means they must be renegotiated with the banks at current interest rates or paid off entirely.

The interest on the four is currently 5.5 to 6 percent, Mr. Sirulnick said, but the banks are raising it now to 8 percent.

This type of situation has been called to my attention by several people. It is an impossible situation where the rents are frozen on one side and the interest charges—the single biggest cost—are going up on the other. What may happen is that many of these buildings will simply be abandoned and the space converted into other uses further worsening an already severe housing shortage.

In addition, uncontrolled mortgage rates will probably discourage many owners from seeking financing to rehabilitate and repair existing homes and apartment buildings. Unless interest rates are controlled, we are going to greatly increase the already-horrendous housing problems.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has been very silent about mortgage rates and few in the news media have pressed them on this point. It is nearly the end of October and the administration has yet to release the figures on the September mortgage rates.

Last week, the White House issued a statement commending the banks for reducing the rate to their affluent "prime" customers. I will be interested in seeing the White House statement after it is confirmed that the homebuyers—most of whom do not fit into the affluent "prime" class—are actually paying higher rates.

Mr. Speaker, in coming weeks, we will continue to see fluctuations in the money market rates. There is a strong possibility that there will be a reduction in the Federal Reserve discount rate—the rate which banks pay on their borrowings from the System. There will be other similar announcements, but we cannot base policy on temporary changes in broad market rates. The important thing—in a wage-price freeze—is what the consumer is paying.

CORPORATION MERGERS SHOULD BE FROZEN DURING PHASE II

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, corporate mergers should be frozen for the duration of the current wage-price controls.

Many of our price problems stem directly from the concentration of economic power in certain industries and the situation has worsened in recent years through the boardhouse reaches of the giant conglomerates. It would be foolhardy to allow a further concentration at a time when the entire machinery of the Federal Government is being enlisted in a stabilization effort.

In addition to an outright ban on all corporate mergers, the antitrust division of the Justice Department should greatly step up its efforts to prosecute existing anticompetitive mergers and to break up concentrations which are leading to administered prices.

The current concern over the economy gives the Justice Department the kind of public backing needed for vigorous enforcement of all antitrust laws. The American public will support such a stepped-up law enforcement campaign and I feel certain the Congress would readily provide what additional funding was needed to finance the effort.

The new Price Commission should be required to certify to the Justice Department any questionable concentrations of economic power it discovers in the process of administering price controls.

The Price Commission will be in an ideal position to spot these monopoly situations and to identify areas where inflation and price distortions are being caused by administered prices. The Price Commission should work hand-in-glove with the Justice Department in these cases.

The Nation will have no long-range benefit from the current economic restrictions unless we take steps to increase competition.

Unless we have a strong antimonopoly program, we will find ourselves back in the same economic mess shortly after the controls are removed. The same dreary cycle will return again unless we instill and maintain real competition in key industries.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD EXAMINE ITS CONTINUED MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N.

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, action last night by the General Assembly of the United Nations, in approving Communist Albania's resolution to admit Red China and expel the Republic of China, must be treated as a major victory for Communist forces at the U.N. level. Yesterday was a day of rejoicing for the Communist bloc and for the Peking regime. It was indeed a black day in the history of the United Nations.

The U.N. now becomes a weak, vacillating, and ineffective agency. In view of this action, and this precedent, the future use of the United Nations as an instrumentality for promotion of peace and

prevention of war, is but a meaningless gesture.

It is time the United States now seriously reexamine the matter of its continued membership in that body. And, in any event, financial support by the Congress to the U.N. budget must be drastically reduced. Now that the Communist influence has become dominant in the U.N. let the Communist nations pay in accordance with the number of people they claim to represent.

Another thing: The United Nations headquarters should be moved out of this country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, because of an unavoidable conflict in my schedule which necessitated that I be in my district on the afternoon and evening of October 14, I was not present to vote on the Moorhead amendment to H.R. 10835 and the bill itself.

If present, I would have voted "nay" on roll No. 299, the Moorhead amendment, and "yea" on roll No. 300, the vote for final passage of H.R. 10835.

FLAG OF MANKIND FLIES AT HALF MAST

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, if the world had a flag, it should fly at half mast today.

Peace and freedom, justice for all men, has suffered a blow which will peril peace for our children and our children's children. The United Nations has voted to expel Taiwan from its membership.

We have here an example of stupidity which is beyond comprehension. A nation that has abided by the principles of the United Nations—a charter member of an organization formed with a fervent prayer for peace for all mankind—has been thrown out.

It is not just the United States that will inevitably suffer from this foolhardy act. It will come back to plague the Soviet Union and the other nations around the world.

We have seen example after example of the foolhardiness of man in traveling the seemingly impassable road for a world at peace. The one today should stand as a landmark.

There are 14 million humans living on Taiwan. There are many nations in the United Nations with populations far less.

The policy of the U.N., it would seem, has been to admit every tiny state on the pretext that all nations should have a voice in this international forum. But, when it came to Nationalist China, that tenet went out the window.

As I listened to the final act of tragedy, I could not help but think of how many of those delegates were actually voting

against the retention of Nationalist China just to slap the United States in the face.

This is the De Gaulle syndrome where a nation can take our generosity in rebuilding a ravaged land—after having been liberated from enslavement in two world wars—and immediately making every effort to destroy their friend.

This is no tirade.

This is said on a note of sadness.

It is a dark day for international peace.

The American people are going to have to stand mighty tall in the decade ahead. We are going to have to suffer many indignities, it would seem, because the American people genuinely seek world peace.

Here at home, it seems there are those forces that continually rave at the failings of our society and turn their backs on much worse conditions in other lands.

How long can our Nation continue to fight against such heartbreaking incidents for our goal of world peace?

Just as long as we endure—so long as we have life and breath.

But, this does not mean that we are not heartsick at the ignorance expressed by little minds at the U.N. Monday. That folly, just as the folly of the League of Nations will come back to haunt mankind.

It was a dark day for those who genuinely want world peace and freedom for all men everywhere.

A NEW ERA OPENED FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the seating of representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations will open a new era full of opportunities and challenges for the United Nations and for the United States. With a positive American response to these opportunities and challenges, it could be an era of more effective cooperation among the great powers of the world. On the other hand, an American backlash at this point could aggravate cold-war tensions which have been steadily receding for several years.

Yesterday's vote at the General Assembly will be interpreted from many points of view. But it should be noted that the vote did not expel a member nation of the U.N. China was a member before yesterday's vote and remains a member today so far as the U.N. is concerned. The General Assembly's decision was to replace a government controlling 14 million people on Taiwan with one controlling 800 million Chinese as representatives of China.

If yesterday's General Assembly action had been decided by a handful of votes, there might be some doubt as to world opinion on the subject. But the so-called Albanian resolution received over a two-thirds majority—a clear expression of world opinion. And although the United States worked diligently for a solution which would allow both Chinese Governments to be represented, it is ob-

vious that our recent initiatives to improve relations with Peking had the effect of releasing inhibitions our friends and allies may have had about supporting Peking's claim to exclusive representation of China in the United Nations.

A look at yesterday's rollcall shows clearly that without the support of governments very friendly to the United States, the Albanian resolution would not have passed. Probably these friends had been waiting hopefully for some sign of a thaw in Sino-American relations, and when the thaw came, they merely acted to facilitate it.

The great opportunity in the United Nations now is to bring the Chinese People's Republic into a system of international cooperation, to demonstrate to that government that decisions arrived at jointly by nations of different ideologies can be beneficial to the Chinese people and to the world at large. Americans need not fear a Chinese "takeover" of the United Nations, for China will learn, as the United States has learned, that no single nation can dictate policy to the other 130 members of the world organization.

American interests will certainly be confronted with great challenges in the United Nations, perhaps greater than ever before. We will find ourselves at odds with Peking more frequently than we were with Taipei, and this problem will be particularly acute in the Security Council. But a Security Council which more nearly reflects the real power configuration in the world today will be better equipped to grapple with worldwide problems of peace and war.

The United States could ignore both the opportunities and challenges of the U.N.'s new era by shirking its responsibilities there. Some have proposed an illegal reduction of our financial contributions to the U.N. It is ironic that among those urging that we blackmail the U.N. in this way are persons who were loudest in demanding that the Soviet Union and France pay their withheld contributions to the United Nations during the financial crisis of the last decade. A reduction of American contributions now would be not only hypocritical but entirely inconsistent with this country's longstanding position as a world leader.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of which I am chairman has arranged for Ambassador Bush to testify at a hearing next week. This will provide an opportunity for interested members of the House to discuss this new situation in the United Nations with our permanent representative there.

It is my hope that the Congress of the United States will support new and continuing American efforts to make the United Nations an effective force for international peaceful cooperation in this new era.

BEVILL PRAISES PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the basis of American prosperity and American progress is clearly the success of our public education system, and as a Member of Congress, I am proud of the achievements we have made through the close cooperation of Congress and our educational institutions.

I would like at this time, on the occasion of American Education Week, to express my admiration for our public schools, our teachers and administrators; for what they have accomplished to date, and what they currently are striving to achieve.

There is no professional group of people on earth who works harder and more conscientiously than our teachers, and no other group who has more daily problems with which to cope than teachers in the public schools.

During this special week of recognition, I encourage all parents and interested citizens to reexamine their attitudes toward our public schools. Education is the most important area of concentration to all mankind. Our teachers need and deserve the full support and cooperation of every citizen.

From the beginning of our country, Congress has been in the forefront of the struggle for a well-informed America, providing land grants to newly formed States for use in the interest of public education.

The 1940's witnessed a dramatic, different kind of commitment of the Congress to education. Through the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the "GI bill of rights," and again through the "Korean GI bill," Congress assured the education of thousands of veterans who had interrupted or forgone theirs in order to defend their country.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was a comprehensive effort to improve educational quality and educational opportunity in the Nation's grade and high schools.

It is the intent of Congress that the local and State education agencies draw up their own programs designed to meet their problems. In this way we hope to assist the States in maintaining leadership in the field of education.

Congress also responded to public demands for higher quality and increased accessibility in higher education throughout the country. The Higher Education Act of 1965 contains a number of provisions which offer our institutions of higher learning both opportunity and challenge. Funds are authorized to the schools to improve their library facilities and to train greatly needed librarians. Funds are also authorized for the improvement of undergraduate instruction in our colleges.

During American Education Week, it is, I believe, most appropriate for us to take a moment to reflect on what has been done and to establish firm, reachable goals for what we wish to accomplish in the future.

In any case, we are deeply indebted to our teachers for their contributions to the progress of the American system of education.

SEVEN YEARS AND 214 DAYS AGO THE FIRST AMERICAN PRISONER OF WAR

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, 7 years and 214 days ago the first American prisoner of war was captured by Communist forces in Southeast Asia. During all that time our country has used every conceivable approach to obtain the release of Americans now in Communist hands and to insure better treatment for them during their captivity. All this has been unavailing. No one knows how many of the approximately 1,500 men who are missing are alive in Communist hands. No one knows their exact condition. We do know that the Communists have heaped infamy upon themselves by their inhuman disregard for the rights of these prisoners and for the feelings of the wives and families who maintain lonely vigil in the United States.

There is little to be said that has not been said in this long and continuing effort, but we shall not cease in that effort, and I hope that we shall never forget what has transpired. We now have learned in full measure of the perfidy of the Communists; of their callous disregard for the rights and feelings of human beings. We should constantly be reminded that any action now or henceforth which glorifies any Communist nation is an insult to those unfortunate Americans who are in Communist hands and a disgrace to our own country.

TIME TO LEAVE A SINKING SHIP

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the current debacle in the United Nations shows it is now time for the United States to get out of that organization and to get the U.N. out of the United States. We have been deserted by our friends and the Communists have taken over its operations. It can serve no further useful purpose toward a better world.

The expulsion of Nationalist China is an inexcusable act and should not be accepted by the United States. No nation has been expelled before nor has there been a motion for expulsion. The United Nations has started to disintegrate and it is time for the United States to leave a sinking ship.

Whether or not the United States remains in the United Nations, I do not believe the American people will tolerate continued payments of over \$300,000,000 a year of the taxpayers' money to the United Nations. The State Department's estimate on the amount for fiscal year 1971 was \$335.4 million. The taxpayers have never been fully apprised of the gargantuan contributions which they are called upon to make. They do not realize the United States is paying half of the total operating costs of the United Nations. It is time to call a halt to this and

I am one of the introducers of legislation to accomplish it. We should not pay a penny more than our own pro rata share according to the population of United Nations countries. Such a formula will cut our contributions to \$59 million per year and Russia which now pays \$42 million would have to pay \$74 million. Newly admitted Red China would be billed for \$228 million.

For more than 25 years, the taxpayers of the United States have been carrying the major burden for United Nations operations. It should be noted in 1970, for example, it cost every American—man, woman, and child—\$1.33 for United Nations operations while it cost every Russian only 17 cents.

This means the average American has been paying almost eight times the amount paid by each Russian. The American pays 2½ times as much as the Frenchman and 1½ times that of the citizen of the United Kingdom.

This is grossly unfair and it must be stopped. The time has come for the Congress to reassess the U.S. position and to take steps to bring our contributions to the United Nations in line with reality.

At present, the United States has 7.6 percent of the total United Nations population, yet we are paying half of the United Nations cost. If our payments were established on the population ratio formula, the United States would pay \$76 million a year for the United Nations instead of the \$335.4 million it is estimated we will pay in 1971. This would be a saving of almost \$260 million in 1971. With Communist China admitted and Nationalist China expelled, the U.S. population percentage will drop to 5.9 percent and our payment would be only \$59 million a year—a saving to the American taxpayer of more than \$275 million a year.

At a time when we are struggling with an economic crisis, and there are increasing demands for better health care, education, and programs for the elderly and the needy, I believe we can begin in no better place than the United Nations to set our own house in order.

THE REPUBLIC OF 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, I was shocked and saddened to see the Republic of China, a devoted and dedicated member of the United Nations for 25 years, voted out of any representation in the United Nations Assembly, a free government of 14 million people who served the United Nations in the cause of freedom almost without parallel. Really, Mr. Speaker, it was a "day of infamy." Countries created and sustained largely by U.S. aid going down the line against any representation whatsoever for Taiwan in a representative body, thus making a mockery of justice, gratitude, and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, has done as much

for the cause of freedom and to oppose aggression as any government in the modern history of the world. Chiang fought with courage and determination the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. He received no help from the League of Nations at that time, although the American Secretary of War Henry Stimson urged that action be taken against this stark-naked aggression or the world would have to later face the consequences. Subsequently, following the example of Japan, Hitler invaded the Rhineland and Mussolini invaded Ethiopia. Again, virtually nothing was done by the League and the free nations of the world.

In 1937 the warlords of Japan struck China again with aggression, a full-scale naval, land, and air attack. Chiang held out valiantly for more than 4 years till Pearl Harbor. China absorbed unprecedented punishment and provided the time necessary for the forces of freedom to mobilize. Chiang continued to absorb the pressure of hundreds of thousands of crack Japanese troops and air squadrons while we concentrated in the South Pacific and on Europe. Chiang by his unbelievable tenacity occupied Japan to the extent that Red Russia could turn back the Nazi onslaught at Moscow. Had there been no Chiang, Japan could have attacked Russia simultaneously with the Nazis and Russia would have been crushed and the war lost to the Allies. After World War II Chiang fought the Communists who were equipped with Russian and Japanese materials of war during the critical days of the Berlin airlift and the Communist threat to Greece and Turkey. After the mainland was overrun the Republic of China continued its resistance on Taiwan. The Republic of China offered its troops to the United Nations effort to repel the sinister, diabolical Communist invasion of the little free nation of South Korea. Again, Taiwan offered its troops to the allied cause in South Vietnam.

Taiwan has been a strong bastion of freedom. Taiwan is a model of the prudent use of American foreign aid. Her standard of living has become a model for the Far East. Her agricultural and industrial production is truly phenomenal. Taiwan has been a model member of the United Nations—a classic example of the principles and ideals as originally envisioned by the United Nations. To be voted out of the United Nations largely by former colonies and nations whose freedom was made possible by the United States and, yes, by the long struggle of the Republic of China against aggression, is a tragedy beyond comprehension. It is a step away from peace, justice, and fairness. The time has come for the United States to reevaluate its foreign aid program, its stupendous financial support of the United Nations and yes, to even exercise its veto in the Security Council in the cause of our own national interest and the self-determination of free people throughout the world.

EXPULSION OF NATIONALIST CHINA AND ADMISSION OF RED CHINA A BLOW TO FREE WORLD

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that a great number of our fellow Americans are distressed and deeply concerned over the action taken last night by the United Nations General Assembly. The admission of Red China and the expulsion of Nationalist China, a charter member of 26 years, is a blow to the free world.

It is not an understatement to say that the United States has carried the United Nations on its back for too long now. The load grows heavier with each irresponsible action.

I feel that the time has come to reassess our country's moral and financial support of an ineffective and irresponsible body. Why should America continue to furnish more than one-third of the UN's money? If the Communists and their lackey nations, which continue to spring forth like dandelions, want all the privileges of membership, let them pay an equal share and bear equal responsibility with the United States.

I also feel that the Nixon administration must shoulder the responsibility for the U.N. action. When the President announced that the United States would vote to admit Communist China, he opened the floodgates. The resulting action could be foreseen as a natural course of events.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is highly appropriate for each Member of Congress to ask himself this question: "Can we continue to give our full support to an organization which not only acts against the national interests of the United States but also fails to live up to its obligations?"

The administration should ask, "How can we undo what has been done?"

AMERICANS FAVOR PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Claud Logan Asbury, pastor of the Gibson Avenue Baptist Church in Wilmington, N.C., is a dedicated and distinguished constituent of mine. His church is one of 52 Baptist churches in the Wilmington Baptist Association which includes New Hanover County and five adjoining counties.

On July 21, 1970, Reverend Asbury offered a resolution to the association calling for a constitutional amendment authorizing voluntary prayer in the public schools of our Nation which was unanimously adopted.

The same resolution was adopted by the North Carolina Baptist State Convention representing 3,200 churches with approximately 1 million members. This

action was taken in Greensboro, N.C., in November 1970.

Some misunderstanding and perhaps even confusion has developed among Baptists as the result of what appears to be a reversal of position on the part of the president of the Southern Baptist Convention. By letter of July 27, 1970, Rev. Claud Asbury advised Dr. Carl E. Bates, president of the Southern Baptist Convention of the action taken by the Wilmington Baptist Association. On August 17, 1970, Dr. Bates acknowledged this letter, and I quote from same:

Thank you for your thoughtful letter of July 27 and for the enclosed news story. I am always pleased to know of such action. May our Lord continue to richly bless and use you is my earnest prayer.

So it came as quite a shock to learn later that Dr. Bates had changed his position and is now writing Members of Congress urging them to vote against the resolution that is presently scheduled for consideration on November 8.

I cannot bring myself to believe that we should as Members of Congress take any legislative position except what is in our total national interest. While some Members have advised me that prayer is still continued in some of our public schools, the fact remains that many of our State school officials and many of our local school boards are rigidly adhering to what they have been advised is the intent of the Supreme Court in outlawing prayer in our public school system.

Why not settle this perplexing question by the adoption of the resolution authorizing a constitutional amendment. Then, after action by both branches of the Congress, the people of our Nation, through the general assemblies of our 50 sovereign States, can make what is rightfully their decision on this question.

ANOTHER COMMUNIST VICTORY IN THE U.N.

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are reeling in shock and disbelief over the announcement of the latest betrayal of another free world government, the Nationalist Chinese, a charter member of the United Nations.

Expulsion of Nationalist China by the United Nations, the result of the President's personal diplomacy, has furthered the cause of international communism. Many are wondering if this explains Herr Kissinger's delayed departure from Peiping—to celebrate the admission of the Red Chinese Communist Party to the "U.N. peacemaking organization" and to offer his personal assistance in arranging diplomatic quarters for another army of Communist U.N. bureaucrats in New York City.

The United Nations and Red China merit one another. I only regret that the same U.N. bureaucrats did not vote to move their shouting headquarters to Peiping so that they would benefit by the experience of living and operating within the confines of a Communist nation.

Transferral of the United Nations to Red China would help solve the New York housing problem, reduce the crime rate, and even help Red China increase its per capita income. Certainly the American people can use their money more advantageously in their own domestic programs than by squandering it in continuing to support the United Nations.

I include the list of voting nations and the arrearages, by nation, on their U.N. accounts follow:

U.N. ROLL-CALLS ON CHINA

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., OCT. 25.—Following are two roll-call votes taken in the General Assembly tonight on seating Communist China and expelling Nationalist China.

ON TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT

Resolution declaring the expulsion of Nationalist China an "important matter" and thus requiring a two-thirds vote rather than a simple majority passage.

In favor—55

Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Central Africa Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Kinsh.), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Li-

beria, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico.

New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Opposed—59

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhulan, Britain, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Congo (Brazza), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea.

Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria.

Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, So. Yemen, Soviet Union, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad/Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstentions—15

Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Cyprus, Iran, Italy, Laos, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey. Absent, Maldives, Oman.

ON SEATING PEKING

Resolution to seat Communist China and expel Nationalist China.

In favor—76

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bhulan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma,

Burundi, Byelorussia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eq. Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea.

Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Congo (Brazza), Peru.

Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Soviet Union, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Trinidad-Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Britain, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Opposed—35

Australia, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cent. Afr. Republic, Congo (Kinsh.), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Rep., El Salvador, Gabon.

Gambia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, New Zealand.

Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstentions—17

Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Colombia, Cyprus, Fiji, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Spain, Thailand.

Absent—3

China, Maldives, Oman.

SUMMARY AS OF JUNE 30, 1971—COLLECTIONS AND ARREARAGES FOR 1970 AND PRIOR YEARS OF UNITED NATIONS ACCOUNTS FOR THE REGULAR BUDGET, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, EMERGENCY FORCE AND THE CONGO: BALANCE DUE, 1970 AND PRIOR YEARS, JUNE 30, 1971

Members (126) ^a	Regular budget	UNEF	UNOC	Balance due 1970 and prior years	Members (126) ^a	Regular budget	UNEF	UNOC	Balance due 1970 and prior years
Afghanistan		\$29,499	\$37,603	\$67,102	Japan				
Albania	\$61,343	45,299	43,602	150,244	Jordan		\$45,299	\$43,602	\$88,901
Algeria		8,932		8,932	Kenya				
Argentina	145,756			145,756	Kuwait				
Australia		63,227		63,227	Laos				
Austria					Lebanon		19,850	12,108	31,958
Barbados					Lesotho				
Belgium		144,583		144,583	Liberia				
Bolivia	148,259	41,905	34,833	224,997	Libya		1,689		1,689
Botswana					Luxembourg				
Brazil	751,705		248,838	1,000,534	Madagascar				
Bulgaria	339,890	181,155	190,746	711,791	Malawi				
Burma					Malaysia				
Burundi	109,570	11,278	10,471	131,319	Maldives				
Byelorussian S.S.R.	696,113	911,964	1,357,881	2,965,958	Mali	\$42,706	5,469	24,259	72,434
Cambodia	49,996	1,689		51,685	Malta				
Cameroon		1,689		1,689	Mauritania	55,059		17,215	72,274
Canada					Mauritius				
Central African Republic	48,817	2,256	6,589	57,662	Mexico	136,352	679,491	786,193	1,602,036
Ceylon					Mongolia		12,387	17,215	29,602
Chad	59,547	8,385	9,832	77,764	Morocco				
Chile	123,475	165,903	224,847	514,225	Nepal				
China, Republic of	11,934,547	5,274,569	6,687,207	23,896,323	Netherlands				
Colombia	433,361			433,361	New Zealand				
Congo (Brazzaville)	8,519	9,249	9,938	27,706	Nicaragua	117,666	1,288	33,915	152,869
Congo (Kinshasa)					Niger		1,906		1,906
Costa Rica	18,746			18,746	Nigeria				
Cuba	488,816	249,811	260,259	998,886	Norway				
Cyprus					Pakistan				
Czechoslovakia	825,927	1,814,845	2,759,408	5,400,180	Panama	6,256	15,648	33,915	55,819
Dahomey	73,949	5,530	6,994	86,473	Paraguay	151,205	31,661	24,229	207,095
Denmark					Peru	287,825	77,441	89,184	454,450
Dominican Republic	165,495	22,898	54,503	242,896	Philippines		15,632		15,632
Ecuador	102,585	10,129	4,120	116,834	Poland	977,581	2,528,364	2,466,010	5,971,955
El Salvador	106,243	7,411	3,349	117,003	Portugal	101,478		201,673	303,515
Equatorial Guinea					Romania	390,402	682,212	641,015	1,713,629
Ethiopia					Rwanda	5,510	11,278	10,471	27,259
Finland					Saudi Arabia		74,890	69,487	144,377
France		765,655	17,031,152	17,796,807	Senegal	39,936	9,814	20,418	70,168
Gabon					Sierra Leone	34,849	5,469		40,318
Gambia	5,612			5,612	Singapore				
Ghana	6,736			6,736	Somalia		11,191	17,445	28,636
Greece					South Africa	352,402	80,862	1,503,337	1,936,601
Guatemala			38,209	38,209	Southern Yemen	46,256			46,256
Guinea	84,693	19,410	9,938	114,041	Spain		1,089,981	985,159	2,075,140
Guyana					Sudan	132,805	89,332	5,860	227,997
Haiti	165,469	25,661	33,916	225,046	Swaziland				
Honduras	32,073		5,677	37,750	Sweden				
Hungary	1,147,451	898,298	995,024	3,040,773	Syria	56,256	46,654	20,379	123,289
Iceland					Tanzania				
India					Thailand		9,026		9,026
Indonesia					Togo		16,174	25,324	41,498
Iran					Trinidad and Tobago				
Iraq		100,407	22,362	122,769	Tunisia				
Ireland					Turkey				
Israel					Uganda	97	9,589	10,471	20,157
Italy	219,418			219,418	Ukrainian S.S.R.	1,759,080	3,476,580	5,185,697	10,421,357
Ivory Coast		1,689		1,689	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	19,976,184	27,665,631	39,223,085	86,864,900
Jamaica					United Arab Republic		351,946	48,387	400,333

Members (126) ²	Regular budget	UNEF	UNOC	Balance due 1970 and prior years	Members (126) ²	Regular budget	UNEF	UNOC	Balance due 1970 and prior years
United Kingdom		\$383,300		\$283,300	Yugoslavia		\$7,598	\$333,269	\$340,867
United States	\$949,743	1,189,096		2,136,839	Zambia				
Upper Volta	92,258	19,936	\$14,145	126,339	Total	\$45,086,950	49,520,995	82,092,029	176,699,974
Uruguay	223,298	54,388	97,662	375,348	Members in arrears	53	65	56	76
Venezuela	632,885	32,298		665,183					
Yemen	165,750	45,299	43,602	254,651					

¹ Source: Information as of June 30, 1971, supplied by the United Nations.
² The number of members (126) excludes Fiji, admitted to membership by the 25th General Assembly, October 13, 1970.

³ China deficit includes assessment on mainland China.
⁴ This amount is the difference between the original apportionment for 1967 and the amount paid by the United States toward its share of revised estimates of 1967 costs.

U.N. ACTION ON THE TWO CHINAS

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to be popular in my congressional district temporarily, I know what I should say, but I am not necessarily interested in popularity at this time. I am interested in doing what is right and that is what I shall do whether it pleases or displeases my friends and colleagues.

We have only one peacekeeping organization in the world, as bad as it may be, and that is the U.N. I do not like many of the things that are happening in the U.N. I am just as disappointed as many of my colleagues about the fact that our solid and dependable ally, the government of Chiang Kai-shek, has been expelled from the U.N., but I do not believe we should advocate abolishing the U.N. simply because of this one disappointment. Rather, I believe we should limit our contribution to the U.N. to the percentage of the previously agreed upon formula, and not a nickel more. I do not believe we should ever again make a contribution greater than the amount agreed upon originally, and if the other nations do not put up their share to pay for the U.N.'s operation, then close it down.

But, to stand here in the well of the House and advocate pulling out of the U.N. and kicking the U.N. out of the country would only be yielding to a temporary impulse and to our enemies' desire. It is time to stop, look, and listen, and I am not going to be one of those to condemn the President. I believe our President is working to bring about world peace, and that is what we all want. We should wait for the results of his efforts and not criticize prematurely because of our shock and disappointment over the events of last evening.

I could not be more pro-Nationalist China if I were made an honorary citizen of that country. I am shocked and disappointed because of last night's events which establish the fact that I have long pointed out, that you cannot buy friends. Those we helped the most, voted against us the loudest. They have betrayed our trust after squandering our wealth.

Before advocating the abolishment of the U.N., we should first try to make a real peacekeeping organization out of it. We should subsequently insist that Nationalist China be returned to the U.N. and, failing in our honest efforts, then it would be time to wind down an unwieldy, political, anti-American organization.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, there has been more real progress in the direction of a sound economy and freedom made in Nationalist China than in any other country in the face of the earth during the same period of time. It is indeed regrettable that this terrible thing has happened to this great and dependable ally, but criticism alone will not undo the wrong. That will require cool deliberation and wise counsel. Short of this, all nations sooner or later will be doomed.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ACTION TO RESTORE EQUITY TO U.N.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the action taken by the United Nations over the weekend, I believe that this Congress now should take some action to restore equity to that world body. We recognize that many are disappointed by the voting on the China question. But, beyond that action, the United Nations as a body is itself in a questionable status. It is nearly bankrupt. Despite this, it is asking the United States for a \$20 million donation to expand its operations in New York. I believe it is time we faced the facts on the U.N. and its fiscal shambles.

There are 76 nations in debt to the U.N.—well over two-thirds of its membership. Why are they allowed to vote? How can a body call itself a world organization when its member nations renege on their dues and assessments for the peacekeeping operations that the U.N. conducts.

The United Nations is in hock to the tune of \$176,699,974. The Soviet Union owes nearly half of that sum.

I believe that before we authorize one more penny of U.S. taxpayers money to the U.N., we in Congress have the obligation to demand a full accounting, and to demand that the U.N. collect its dues, or conduct some more voting and expel members who are delinquent in paying those dues.

If the U.N. is going to determine the status of Nations in the world by its votes, it should be a fiscally sound, credible organization. Until the Communist bloc, which owes a grand total of \$118,753,898 and other delinquents pay up, the United States has no business socking our taxpayers for another penny. Let us face reality, as those who sought the one-China solution like to say, let us not continue

to subsidize "deadbeat democracy" in the U.N.

TOCKS ISLAND DAM SUSPENSION OF CONSTRUCTION

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn on Friday of the decision of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Army Corps of Engineers to suspend construction of the Tocks Island Dam pending further study.

On July 27, I stood before this House and asked for the withholding of allocation of funds to build a dam that could turn out to be detrimental to our environment. I was not then and am not now against the construction of the Tocks Island Dam, per se.

I only felt we would do well to study all information that could be made available to us regarding the dam's possible effect on the Delaware River, its pollution and its marine life. We were told that evening that this project had been studied to death. Indeed it has, but we still do not have the answers. Unfortunately, we have followed the policy of "spend now; study later."

I stood pretty much alone that night, and the funding passed the House before the environment impact statements had even been filed. I still feel the same way about the Tocks Island project, and fortunately the Council on Environmental Quality shares my concern. They have requested more studies, and have requested that they be completed before we do something to Delaware and other States that we cannot undo or correct with a recorded teller vote on the floor of the House.

On Friday I learned that the Council on Environmental Quality had requested an immediate halt in construction of the \$260 million Tocks Island Dam on the upper Delaware near Stroudsburg, Pa. I also learned that the Army Corps of Engineers acceded to this request. I strongly support CEQ's stand.

Just prior to learning of CEQ's action, I had sent a letter to Russell Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, to recommend an immediate halt to the project. I pointed out that the environmental impact statement recently filed by the Army Corps of Engineers confirms the probability of serious environment consequences should the dam be constructed as presently

planned. It would contradict national environmental policy to proceed knowing that serious problems exist.

In a special report prepared by Jack McCormick Associates of Devon, Pa., for the Corps of Engineers it was revealed that the probability of cultural eutrophication of the impounded waters behind the dam could seriously endanger many of the uses of the proposed multipurpose dam. According to the report—

Without positive and immediate action, the potential for the onset of accelerated cultural eutrophication during the early stage of reservoir operation is a real and serious threat to the full use of the impoundment for the multiple purposes cited for its justification.

"Cultural eutrophication" is a term used to describe the growth of algae and other plant life in nutrient-rich water, especially when stagnant. The report cites upstream pollution, especially of poultry waste, as a prime cause of this phenomenon.

I previously questioned the congressional funding of the proposed dam in July before the environmental impact statements were filed as required by law. At that time I said:

I am opposed to setting up a comprehensive program for studying possible harmful environmental consequences of major Federal projects, as now required by law, and then going ahead and appropriating the construction money before we even see the reports. That's really saying, "You go ahead and study it, but we're going to build it anyway." That just doesn't make sense.

The report was a perfect example of what happens with this type of approach. We went ahead and appropriated the money, and now we find out a major problem exists. I have already introduced legislation which would require Congress to have these reports before appropriating the money, not after.

The corps had recommended proceeding with construction, in spite of the dangers cited in the report—hoping answers could be found as construction proceeds. That is an outrageous recommendation; it is repeating the same error: build now, study later. The Army Corps of Engineers seem to have been going hell-bent for leather to build this dam, regardless of the consequences. Why did not the corps discover these problems before? The dam has been authorized since 1962. The Delaware River Basin Commission is responsible for finding the answer to water quality problems in the Delaware River Basin. Where have they been? I am deeply disturbed that we have come so far down the road toward construction, and now we find out a major problem exists affecting the viability of the entire project. We must have answers, and we must have answers before another dollar of taxpayers' money is spent on a \$260 million project which strong evidence suggests may not work. I have asked for an immediate halt to the project to get these answers, and I am glad the Corps of Engineers has acceded to CEQ's request.

This project emphasizes the need for the legislation I introduced in Congress a week ago. It emphasizes the need for strengthened procedures for studying the

environmental impact of Federal projects. The Congress must have the benefit of impact studies before it appropriates millions of taxpayers' dollars. My legislation would insure that all environmental data available on a project would be brought to the attention of the Congress early in the legislative process, not after the fact.

A DAY IN INFAMY

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's U.N. vote to oust Taiwan and seat Communist China is living proof of the ridiculousness of U.N. voting which gives the same vote to tiny countries such as the Congo, or Guyana or Kuwait, as it does to the United States of America. It is reasonable to predict that future United Nations voting patterns will be increasingly adverse to U.S. interests.

But more is involved in the ouster of Taiwan by the U.N. than an unsound voting structure. While admission of Red China has been urged by steadily increasing numbers of nations for some years now, it does not follow that the U.N. should have voted to oust Taiwan, or more particularly that the United States should go along with this. Taiwan has been loyal to the United States for more than a quarter of a century. It has stood with us through thick and thin. It built itself up and took itself off our foreign aid. It has looked always to America as its ally.

The Communist regime of mainland China has committed untold crimes against the Chinese people. It was conceived in slaughter and pillage. It thrives on anti-Americanism from constant propaganda to presently aiding in the killing of Americans defending the independence of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how the United States can tolerate the deliberate expulsion of an ally and its replacement by an enemy. For this country to accept this is to proclaim to all the world the worthlessness of any country remaining loyal to the United States of America.

Many of my colleagues in the Congress are now questioning our continued participation in the United Nations. It seems to me that our integrity as a Nation is at stake before all the world.

THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world, of course, today are focused on the decision of the United Nations. It should come as no great surprise to us that the Communist-dominated organ known as the United Nations has finally supported the flag that formerly flew on their flag pole with banner displaying the Hammer and Sickle.

To admit Red China is a travesty of justice. They were condemned as aggressors in 1952 in the Korean conflict, and

to my knowledge have never been removed. How soon we forget Red China as hordes in that conflict and the American lives they took.

They never made application for admission to the U.N. They have been forced into it by default not by their own request, by somebody holding a shotgun to our heads.

We are deserting our allies right and left. We have made a mockery of the entire democratic process for smaller nations who have been our friends. We have dropped one of our great friends, the Taiwanese. We should now abolish the entire sham or at least make the Commies pay their way.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOHN M. SAYRE

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend a word of greeting to our visiting Chaplain for today, Rev. John Milton Sayre, who has retired after 26 years with the U.S. Army, with the rank of colonel, and who has now settled down in my hometown and is the minister of the United Methodist Church, Valparaiso, Ind. He has taken a very active role in community and church affairs. He is a very fine gentleman, and I am particularly happy to welcome him here today; also, I wish to thank Dr. Latch for his cooperation.

WHEN THE BATTLE WAS LOST AT THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, my reaction to the United Nations action of last night was about the same as after I witnessed a professional wrestling match. What we saw was a show. The decision which determined the outcome of last night's gala was made long ago.

As a matter of fact, we lost the battle, so far as I am concerned, when Kissinger came to Washington.

As a military officer I will say this: When one fights a battle on the wrong battleground, one should not be too surprised when he loses.

If we are going to pull out all of the stops, to pull all of the strings to keep Taiwan in the United Nations, why not do the same thing to keep Red China out?

How can the small nations of the world take us seriously as friends of free China when Kissinger is in Peking and when the President is planning a trip to China? How can they take us seriously on a "two China" policy when on the one hand we are smiling at the Communist overlords who have 700 million people held under bondage and at the same time are asking the small nations to rub them the wrong way just once for us, to keep Taiwan in? I do not believe anyone took our position too seriously.

We should not be too surprised when we lose under these conditions. As I say,

the battle was not lost last night but was lost when we started on this insane policy.

OUSTER OF REPUBLIC OF CHINA FROM U.N.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Republic of China was ousted from membership in the United Nations. I submit to you that that action not only flouted the spirit of the world body, but was in fact contrary to the provisions of its own charter. I am sad to report that in my opinion, the question is now open as to whether or not that organization should be permitted to survive, or at least, should this Nation continue to be a party to its deliberations?

The Republic of China is a member in good standing of the U.N., and has never violated any of the conditions of membership. Can the same be said for others? Was it not a charter member, the Soviet Union that invaded Hungary and later Czechoslovakia? Was it not the charter members, Great Britain and France who invaded Egypt in 1963? Was it not the same U.N. that branded Communist China as an aggressor during the Korean war? What acts of aggression has the Republic of China committed upon their neighbors? The answer is none.

The Republic of China is a charter member of the United Nations, its representatives have sat continuously since its founding. The U.N. Charter provides that all expulsions and admissions must be initiated by the Security Council before action can be taken by the General Assembly. In the Council, the permanent members hold a veto over such actions, and we can be certain that the Republic of China would certainly have used it.

The leadership of Communist China has never sought membership in the United Nations, why then has it been offered?

What must be the thoughts of the new and emerging nations whose only international debating forum is the General Assembly, can their seats so easily be taken away by whim or design? I fear that the precedent has been set.

Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, I served as a representative of the Congress to the World Health Organization. I have watched since that time the United States provide the bulk of the funding for the WHO. I have also watched the Republic of China do its part. Will the leadership of Red China be so benevolent?

In view of the actions of the United Nations General Assembly last night, I feel it is time that this Nation reviewed once again its commitment to world peace and determine if in fact the United Nations, on the basis of last night's vote, is still an instrument dedicated to that goal.

CHIEFS COME, GO, NOTHING CHANGES IN BUREAUCRACY

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 16, 1971, Daily Oklahoman written by Mr. Allan Cromley entitled "Chiefs Come, Go, Nothing Changes in Bureaucracy," points out the ineptitude, lack of initiative, and lack of imagination in our Federal bureaucracy. The article points out how our colleague, the Honorable H. R. Gross of Iowa, is consistently fighting to protect the U.S. interests abroad when many in the Federal bureaucracy stand piously by with hands folded refusing to look out for these interests. Congressman Gross is to be commended for his stand and for his continual struggle to protect and to look out for the interests of the American taxpayers. The article follows:

CHIEFS COME, GO, NOTHING CHANGES IN BUREAUCRACY

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—It was 1971, the Nixon era, but what took place in a small congressional committee room Friday seemed more like something out of the days of John F. Kennedy or Lyndon B. Johnson.

The antagonists were a "striped pants" State Department official and a conservative Republican congressman.

The issue was U.S. policy toward countries unfriendly toward the United States—in this particular case, Chile.

And the moral of it all, if any, was that presidents come and go, but nothing ever really changes in the U.S. bureaucracy.

The administration witness, defending the department's placid acceptance of Chilean expropriation of American copper companies, was Charles A. Meyer, 53-year-old, Harvard-educated assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs.

In a Boston accent, he coolly and imperviously parried the angry questions of Rep. H. R. Gross, Republican veteran from Iowa, the premier congressional watchdog of the taxpayers' dollars.

Their forum was a meeting of a House foreign affairs subcommittee, which was examining recent Chilean expropriation of American copper mines and other interests.

Gross listened to Meyer's defense of a statement by Secretary of State William P. Rogers that the action by the government of Marxist Socialist Salvador Allende was "disquieting" and might "erode the base of support for foreign assistance" in the United States.

Meyer termed Rogers' reaction a "moderate" statement.

"Gross stormed that it was "more on the order of skim milk—an awfully weak statement."

Meyer said comments he has heard "vary from too soft to too hard."

He emphasized that the State Department particularly wanted to avoid a "ripple effect," which he defined as "the growth of public and congressional opinion adverse to authorizing or appropriating or allocating sufficient funds . . . for development assistance" to Chile and other countries.

"It's about time for a 'ripple effect' in this country," declared Gross, glaring down from his subcommittee post.

Chile is in the process of eliminating all American companies' holdings, which have a book value of \$629 million. The Chilean government says there'll be no compensation to American companies.

In fact, says Allende's controller general, Hector Humeres, the companies owe the Chilean government an unclear sum—possibly in the hundreds of millions—because of their receipt of \$774 million in "excess profits."

To make matters worse, and raise Gross'

blood pressure higher, the U.S. government-backed Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) has insured American holdings in Chile to the tune of \$313 million.

Claims will overshadow assets of OPIC, and it will probably ask Congress to make up the difference, possibly in excess of \$100 million.

Further infuriating Gross and other critics is the fact that the United States extended \$5 million in military credits to Chile last June. They were used to purchase one C-L30 airplane and small arms ammunition.

Gross asked, "The situation was pretty well established in Chile by then, wasn't it? We knew what the Allende government would do . . . that we would get slapped in the face . . . so we went ahead and sweetened the pot."

Meyer said, "We thought we would be compensated."

Gross said, "It's time for the State Department boys in Foggy Bottom to get hard nosed."

He wanted to know why the Inter-American Development Bank loaned \$11.5 million to two Chilean universities recently.

"They are institutions whose merits have long been established," said Meyer.

"It was nothing but a lolly-pop sweetener," contended Gross. "A glorified bribe to the Chileans not to go ahead and do what we knew they were going to do anyway."

"We recognize their right to nationalize foreign holdings . . . but we thought there would be compensation," said Meyer.

He said there is no contemplated change in U.S. policy.

Gross noted sarcastically that OPIC, created in 1969 by Congress, has 130 persons in the payroll whose average salary is \$25,902.

"It makes you sick what's going on in government," said Gross, who conceded that he made similar remarks in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

"We never left those days," he said after the hearing. "Nothing ever changes—except that it gets worse."

THE LATE JAY G. HAYDEN

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, death has taken from us a grand old man of journalism, Jay G. Hayden.

Jay was a Washington correspondent for 50 years. The possessor of a keen and agile mind, Jay wrote a highly perceptive political column for the North American Newspaper Alliance until 1965, when he retired.

Jay began covering the Washington scene in 1916 and was a longtime Washington Bureau chief for the Detroit News. During his long service in the Detroit News' Washington Bureau, Jay covered nine Presidents beginning with Woodrow Wilson. In 1945, George Washington University awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree. He also served as president of the Gridiron Club.

There are few Washington correspondents of Jay Hayden's caliber. He was made of stern stuff. He had an instinct for political news that pierced through all the fluff and went straight to the substance of the matter.

For years the reader who wanted to know what was really happening in Washington read Jay Hayden's thrice-weekly column. His was interpretive writing that was worthy of the appellation.

Jay was a hard-working newspaper-

man who truly loved his job. He lived for journalism. He kept tapping out his outstanding columns until he reached the age of 80.

And Jay was eminently fair. It was for this reason that he could count untold numbers of politicians among his close friends.

My wife and I considered Jay Hayden one of our closest and dearest friends. When we first came to Washington in 1949, Jay Hayden bent over backward to be friendly and helpful. It was a great help for a freshman congressman to have the benefit of the kindness and knowledge of one of the Nation's outstanding newsmen. For this friendship I will forever be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, Washington and the Nation have lost a truly outstanding individual with the death of Jay Hayden. I extend my condolences to his wonderful wife, Ruth, his fine son, Martin, others in his family and his host of friends.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD U.N. AND WORLD SHOULD CHANGE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday must have been a red-letter day for all the ardent, red-faced supporters of the United Nations.

After spending hundreds of millions through the years in support of the United Nations, they not only got their faces roundly slapped but all their front teeth kicked in at the Tower of Babel.

The United States, if it now has an inch of backbone left, should withdraw from the United Nations, lift its economic boycott of Rhodesia and do what it should have done long ago—assist only those few countries around the world that have demonstrated evidence of fair play and friendship.

COMMENDATION FOR AMBASSADOR BUSH

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I read this morning in the Washington Post the comments of our former colleague, the Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, in which he was quoted as saying: "Obviously, I did not do a good job."

As one Member of the House of Representatives sharing the disappointment of many that Taiwan was expelled from the United Nations, I want to assure George Bush that I believe no man could have done more in the effort to save Taiwan from expulsion.

The decision of the United Nations is a sad one, but I think the decision by the President and our Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, to carry on an effective campaign to maintain Taiwan in the United Nations did not fail because George Bush did not do a good job.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Ambassador Bush performed a yeoman service to this country in the United Nations, and I would like to compliment him on his efforts to support Taiwan in its membership in the United Nations.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I share the view of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think it is regrettable that the Chinese Nationalist Republic was expelled from the United Nations. It will harm rather than help the United Nations in the long run. But certainly our Ambassador, George Bush, a former colleague, did an outstanding job in pleading the case for the continued membership of Taiwan in the United Nations.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished minority leader and the gentleman from New York for their contribution.

AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH OF THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) and the distinguished minority leader in expressing my sentiments as to the extremely efficient work that Ambassador George Bush has been doing in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the action of last evening was one setback in the United Nations but one which I know should not be looked upon as representing a lack of effort on behalf of Ambassador Bush.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who served with Ambassador Bush when he was in the House of Representatives know him as a hard-working and effective man and are extremely proud of his energetic representation of the United States in that forum.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the sentiments which have just been expressed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. de la GARZA) regarding the efforts that George Bush made in the United Nations during this struggle to keep Taiwan in that body last night. I am convinced that he was sincere and that he did everything on earth he could do on behalf of the cause that meant a lot to him, to the United States and to the whole free world.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my colleague from Texas.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD VETO ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO SECURITY COUNCIL

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the General Assembly of the United Nations yesterday helped to write its own obituary.

By starting this business of throwing nations out, we do not know where it is going to begin or end. But, it would be my hope that the President would try to save some of the pieces by exercising the U.S. veto in the Security Council on the question of seating Red China on that Council.

Mr. Speaker, the vote yesterday was for seating Communist China in the General Assembly. There is no veto in the General Assembly, however, we have a veto in the Security Council.

I do not think it would be asking too much to have Red China show some good faith; to see what she is going to do and in what manner she is going to behave before being seated on the Security Council.

You know, we never did exercise that veto power and it is my hope that we will exercise that power in the Security Council because the Communists have been using it for a number of years.

So, it seems to me that in the name of humanity and decency and if there is any honor left among nations, the United States ought to exercise a veto power with reference to seating Red China on the Security Council until we have an opportunity to see what she is going to do.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some talk here today about the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. I think it is obvious that the United Nations has been an utter failure in its basic purpose. It causes me to wonder about the consistency of these people who believe in the one man, one vote concept because that is the only major forum in the world that does not follow that rule. Here they expel a nation of 14 million people for no good reason, when in the last year they have admitted four insignificant nations with a population of less than 4 million people.

The United States should no longer pay the lion's share of the U.N. expenses, and not a cent more than our proportionate share, if that.

It seems to me that we should adopt a practice which all nations understand and that is that the United States should cut off all foreign aid to those nations which voted in opposition to our position in the action which was taken yesterday. When you hit these pip-squeak countries in the pocketbook, that is one thing they understand.

CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, regardless of how one may feel about the action taken in the United Nations yesterday, it is essential that this country maintain its firm and unequivocal support of the United Nations.

It is most disturbing to hear suggestions that aid be cut off to those countries which did not vote as we might have wanted them to vote. It is also most disturbing to hear threats of retaliation by the withholding of funds from the United Nations because the position which was vigorously advocated by our Ambassador to the United Nations did not prevail.

Our efforts must be directed toward strengthening the U.N., recognizing that, however imperfect it may be, it remains still the most hopeful vehicle for seeking world peace. Our commitment to the U.N. should be firm and unequivocal, whether votes go for or against us in that body.

For years the United States has opposed the efforts of other United Nations members to exercise a financial veto over its activities by withholding funds. What was right then is right now. The United Nations must be strengthened—not simply for its own sake but because the attainment of an international community of nations at peace should be the foundation of our foreign policy.

I believe that we all must be united in one overriding effort: the creation of a just and peaceful world. The United Nations remains an important element in that quest.

CHANGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for today and the schedule for the remainder of the week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we had scheduled originally for today general debate only on the higher education bill. The rule on that bill was not filed until a few minutes ago, so we are unable to call it up. We will call it up tomorrow immediately following the military construction appropriation bill.

We also plan to call up the other legislation as scheduled on the whip's notice, and also the bills originally scheduled for last week, including the Guam bill which went over Thursday.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, then I take it that we will be adjourning today out of sympathy for Nationalist China, or out of sympathy for the now dead and defunct United Nations, one or the other—which way should it be?

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Iowa can view that subject any way he likes, but we will be adjourning before very long, and unfortunately we have to adjourn because we did not have the rule filed on the higher education bill. That is the real reason.

WE MUST CONTINUE OUR SUPPORT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, this Member had the privilege of visiting Taiwan as a member of a delegation that was led by our distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT). As a result of that visit and the conversations and the briefings that we had there, I must confess my deep disappointment in the action taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations last night in ejecting the Taiwan Government from the United Nations. I had hoped it would have been otherwise.

However, I think in measuring our reaction we should take note that many if not most of our NATO partners were on the opposite side of that question, and that many of the leading developed and underdeveloped countries of the world were on the opposite side of that question.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would not take retaliatory action, either in the form of reducing our contributions to the United Nations or in the form of bilateral action against the nations involved. For example, we are trying very hard to get contributions to the U.N. Special Fund on Narcotics Control, which was established about a year ago, and some of the very highly developed countries whose cooperation we need, England, France, and Denmark, and all the other countries in Western Europe to whom we can hopefully look for contributions, are countries who disagreed with our position in the U.N. last night. Any form of U.S. retaliation against these countries for their vote yesterday would only lead to diminished support for the special fund.

I would hope, therefore, that we will carefully consider any action that we might be tempted to take to "punish" those who voted against our resolution. We must not respond in haste and anger.

BILL HARRELL: OUTSTANDING OFFICER AND GENTLEMAN

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a young boy would look up from his mule-pulled plow and standing in the furrow, see pre-World War II planes in the blue Florida skies. He dreamed of someday becoming a pilot.

That dream became a reality and more. Today, Bill Harrell has retired after a distinguished record of 30 years of military service in the Air Force, followed by outstanding service to his Nation as the senior adviser to the Secretary of the day America.

And might I add, a man who has been a warm personal friend and one who counseled with me as a relatively new Congressman and never failed to advise me in many areas pertaining to the armed services and their needs in modern day America.

Those who know Bill Harrell from his days as a high school student testify that there was always something that set him apart. Here was a young farm lad from a family that worked hard in an era when there was plenty of food on the table, but very little money.

From that background came a man who was to fly 52 different types of aircraft in 24 years as a pilot, graduate from college and law school, and advise in the purchase and procurement of billions of dollars of military supplies.

I met Bill Harrell when he first came to Washington, as I asked him down to the Capitol to have lunch with me. He was from Live Oak, Fla., a fine city in my district, and I knew many of his close friends and family.

From that first meeting, there came a warm friendship and today, upon his having retired from a second career, I thought it fitting and proper to pay tribute to a fine officer and gentleman.

He typifies those who gave so much, so many their lives, in the fighting of World War II and then a great contribution to national security in the years that followed. His story could be repeated hundreds of times among those now serving in a very difficult period in the life of our Nation.

For all of those who serve—and to a very close friend—might I offer this tribute in the journal of the Congress.

William Hasel Harrell was born near Mayo, Fla., November 26, 1914, son of the late Steve and Alberta Harrell. The family moved to a farm near Live Oak where Bill grew up.

His sister, Mrs. Eumera Taylor, lives in the Luraville section where the farm of some 300 acres was located, and his surviving brother, Moray, is an agronomist with the Corps of Engineers in Jacksonville.

His wife is a lovely lady, the former Elizabeth Phillips, whose father was a member of the State Senate from her hometown of Lake City, Fla. She has been his mainstay and helpmate since their marriage in 1941 at Barksdale Field at Shreveport, La.

To this union came three children—and like their father, they are very much interested in the study and practice of law.

The oldest daughter, Mrs. Susan Black, is an assistant state attorney in Jacksonville, Fla. Bill, Jr., is married and a law

student at his father's alma mater, the University of Florida.

The youngest daughter is Diana Silberborn of Cincinnati, Ohio—her husband is in law school.

Bill Harrell graduated from the University of Florida and enlisted in the Air Force. He never lost that dream of a boy who wanted to fly.

The story of his class at flight school is so typical of that day and time. Of the 99 who graduated out of his class of 200, only 13 are alive today. Many were lost in Europe, many gave their lives in fighting in the Pacific.

A nation at war, and ill prepared, had to train pilots rapidly to fight on two fronts, and pushed its productive force to the limit to produce the planes to fly.

Harrell was sent to England as he advanced rapidly from second lieutenant to serve as a squadron commander flying out of England. There were to be 14 combat missions and seven weather missions. His squadron was composed of 36 aircraft, with an 11-man crew to operate the B-17 bombers.

Weather missions were hazardous, flying over Europe to check out the weather to advise the planes coming on a bombing mission of the conditions to expect.

Sometimes 1,000 aircraft would assemble in the skies over England for strikes on Germany.

He began his service flying the B-10 and B-12 bombers, the first this Nation had. With these planes, the oil gage and gasoline gages were on the outside of the cockpit on the wings. A pilot hoped they were accurate—there was a constant realization that the landing gear might not go down.

Harrell was shot down twice. The first time he lost most of a wing, forcing the bomber to land in a very small field in Belgium. He was rescued.

But the second time, antiaircraft riddled his plane. The nose was blown off, two engines shot out and the bomb bay jammed shut with a full load of bombs.

The bombardier had lost a leg, the navigator was severely wounded, and the waist gunner's arm was shot off. Flying out of the flak, the bomb-heavy ship could only make it to the North Sea as Harrell tried to fly to Holland so that those able might attempt to escape and the wounded receive medical treatment.

The weather at that altitude dropped to 50° below zero, with the plane facing a gale of 50 knots before being ditched near an island in the North Sea. The wind blew the plane up on the shoreline.

Germans shouted for them to bring the wounded ashore. Later the crew found they were in heavily mined territory and that the German soldiers expected the plane to be blown to bits at any moment.

Thus, like so many others, Bill Harrell was a prisoner of war. There are many stories of brutality as he dropped down to a skeleton and today he calmly recounts that experience as part of war—horrible, as he said, but part of war.

Upon gaining freedom, he asked for an opportunity to receive further training and was sent to law school at the University of Denver where he graduated in 1950.

This enabled him to be assigned to the Strategic Air Command in the Judge Advocate General's office for 2 years.

But when the Korean war started, a new career began. He was sent to the Air Materiel Command as chief of contract settlements. Contract law fascinated Harrell and he became an expert in a field where someone was needed with legal knowledge, the problems of flying aircraft, and understood the requirements of the Air Force contracts.

In 1954, he was transferred to Europe in another advancement as chief of procurement for the Air Force in some 12 to 14 nations from Norway to Africa.

After 5 years, he was assigned to Wright Patterson as director of procurement policy for that command and stayed there until being moved to Brookley Air Force Base in Alabama in 1960. From that position he retired as a colonel after 30 years of distinguished military service.

On his chest he proudly wore his wings, the Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal with cluster, Legion of Merit, and Commendation Medal.

It was in the fall of 1965 that he was offered and accepted the position of small business adviser to the Secretary of the Air Force and his staff. The Air Force needed a man with experience in contracts, a knowledge of the needs of the service, legal training and a good administrator.

In Bill Harrell, they found the right man.

The purpose of this position is to make certain that small business in America receives a fair share of the dollars spent for procurement—and for the past 5 years this has been running at a volume of \$1 billion annually. The Air Force currently spends \$10 billion of the \$45 billion spent by the Department of Defense.

The Small Business Act of the Congress was passed to preserve small business as an entity in this country, having learned from the experience of other nations that giant concerns can monopolize this area and the Nation loses the vitality which small business creates.

Harrell's job was to see that the Air Force complied with that act along with covering the 50 States with his people in 176 installations and training those individuals in carrying out the program. A part of that responsibility is to counsel small business in doing business with the Government.

It is important to point out in talking about small business that some 30 percent of large contract awards are sub-contracted to small business.

Every purchase of \$2,500 or more is reviewed to see if it can be placed with small business. If it can, then that item is set aside for small business companies to compete for the award.

Of course, all business in this Nation was small. In 1871 there were 300,000 businesses for a nation of 30 million people with hardly any of these large by today's standards.

Harrell told me that there are several criteria for establishing whether a firm is small business or not. In some cases it is by the number of employees. In construction, it is by dollar volume, and in oil it is measured by barrels produced.

The Small Business Administration has the authority to review the actions of the services in making certain that they comply with the law in this area—and

men like Harrell perform a service that is vital to the business community of America.

He has now retired from that position with the best wishes and admiration of a great many men and women at the Pentagon who knew him.

It is significant that the Small Business Administration and the Air Force have just presented him with their highest civilian medals in recognition of his service.

In his well deserved retirement, he can look back on a most successful career, a fine family, a host of friends—and I am proud of the fact that he considers me and my office in that number.

DISASTER TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the monumental disaster to American foreign policy suffered in the General Assembly of the United Nations yesterday should be of extreme concern to all of us both in the Congress and out of the Congress, for we see here an alinement of nations which are rearranging and re-directing the balance of power in the United Nations.

I said earlier it is my hope the President will exercise America's veto power in denying Communist China a seat on the United Nations Security Council even though she has been admitted to membership in the General Assembly.

I have discussed this matter with a number of international experts and they assure me that the United States being one of the five charter members of the Security Council does have the veto power over any changes in that Council including membership changes.

I have made a number of inquiries in the State Department and, as usual, got a fuzzy answer. The State Department begged off giving a concrete answer on the ground that there has never been any such precedent.

I submit that the time has come to initiate that kind of precedent and I hope the President will indeed exercise that veto power. I do not see any great damage being done to anyone if we require Red China to serve an apprenticeship in the General Assembly to see what her conduct will be like, particularly when we have already been forewarned by Peking that it has no intentions of adopting or accepting the rules and charter provisions of the United Nations.

I submit that a careful study of the United Nations Charter and precedence established under that charter—including memoranda adopted by the Security Council in the absence of specific language in the charter—leads one to conclude that not only the United States can veto the admission of Red China into the Security Council, but such action can also be taken by the Republic of China itself as a charter member of the Security Council with full veto powers.

The Security Council consists of 15 members. They are: Argentina, Belgium,

Burundi, China,* France,* Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, U.S.S.R.,* United Kingdom,* United States.*

The above is the Security Council membership in 1971. The five permanent members, which have veto powers on votes on questions of substance, are asterisked. The Presidency of the Council rotates monthly, in the alphabetical ordering of the above list. In August the representative of Italy was President of the Council. On 31 December, five nations will complete their terms of membership: Burundi, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, and Syria.

U.N. Charter—article 27(2) states:

Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members. (3) Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members. . . .

Under the second part of article 27(3) obligatory abstention from voting as a member to a dispute applies only when the Council is voting on proposals for pacific settlement.

Please note that the five permanent members of the Security Council have veto power on votes involving questions of a substantive matter. I submit that the replacement of one of the five Charter members is a substantive matter and if there is any question about it being a substantive matter, by use of the "double veto," either the Republic of China or the United States can make it a substantive matter.

I call attention again to the United Nations Charter article 27(2) which clearly states that decisions of the Security Council on all matters—and this includes the decision whether a question is one of substance or one of procedure—must have the concurring votes of the permanent members. This means that any one of the five permanent members can alter a decision by merely not concurring in the findings.

It is important to draw a distinction between procedure and substance.

The confusion which reigns relative to the definition of these two terms and thus what proposals and draft resolutions of the Security Council are subject to the veto, is traced to the silence of the Charter—see article 27, above—and of the Council's rules of procedure on the subject. But a statement at San Francisco by the permanent members of the Council, on June 8, 1945, on voting procedures in the Security Council, does specify matters which they regarded as procedural, and thus passable by an affirmative vote of any seven—now nine—members.

First, adopt or alter its rules of procedure; second, determine the method of selecting its President; third, organize itself in such a way as to be able to function continuously; fourth, select the times and places of its regular and special meetings; fifth, establish such bodies or agencies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions; sixth, invite a member not represented on the

Council to participate in its discussions when that member's interests are specifically affected; and seventh, invite any state, when it is a party to a dispute being considered by the Council, to participate in the discussion relating to that dispute.*

The statement also indicated that—

The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not . . . a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of seven (nine) members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of the permanent members.

Thus subject to veto. The rules of procedure of the Council are of little help in determining what is procedural and what is substantive; in fact, they are still "provisional" primarily because no agreement could be reached on the mechanics of voting and "on the majority by which various decisions of the Council should be taken"—Bailey, page 16. Mr. Bailey observes that practice has identified the following matters as procedural:

Inclusion of items in the agenda;
Order of items on the agenda;
Invitations to participate in the proceedings;
Challenges to ruling of the President;
Postponement of consideration of items on the agenda;
Suspension or adjournment of a meeting;
Order of voting on proposals;
Retention or removal of items from the list of matters of which the Council is seized;
Convocation of emergency special sessions of the General Assembly. (Bailey, page 17.)

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is patently clear that a decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not a matter is procedural must first be concurred in by the votes of the permanent members. I stress this because failure by a permanent member to concur that a question is procedural automatically constitutes a veto.

Thus, if a question is not procedural and cannot be resolved by a simple vote of nine members, the only alternative is that the question is one of substance, and when it is one of substance, either the United States or the Republic of China can veto any proposal to change the membership of the Security Council.

It is absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, that within the present legal framework of the Security Council there appears no way for the Republic of China to be driven out of the Security Council unless it chooses to do so voluntarily. An affirmative statement by the United States that it will veto, at least for the time being, any effort to replace the Republic of China with Communist China would only strengthen the Republic of China's position in the Security Council.

I believe it should be made very clear that the action by the General Assembly in ousting the Republic of China from the General Assembly has no legal bearing on the Security Council. It is an established legal fact that a permanent nation member does not have to be a member of the General Assembly in order to serve on the Security Council if it is one of the five Charter member nations with veto power.

The General Assembly's resolutions are only recommendations and have no bearing or binding on the Security Council,

nor does the Security Council have any legal obligation to carry out recommendations by the General Assembly.

I am convinced that a firm position by the United States at this time will at least give all of us time to pause and reflect on this issue while a formal request is made to the World Court in the Hague to resolve whatever legal problems may arise out of America's decision to exercise its veto, or the Republic of China's decision to exercise its veto, and block the intrusion of Communist China into the Security Council.

It seems to me that we are not making an extraordinary or unusual request.

I am mindful that the President is planning his trip to Peking and after that to Moscow, and I know that there will be those in the State Department who will argue that a veto of seating Red China in the Security Council at this time would jeopardize or destroy that trip. But I would not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, now that Red China appears to have gotten everything she wants in the United Nations, if, indeed, Red China initiates the action to wreck Mr. Nixon's visit to Peking. When we see the turmoil in Red China; the confusion; and we see the fact that no one seems to know what really is going on in China, there is reason to believe that perhaps Peking has some second thoughts about Mr. Nixon's visit to Red China.

It occurs to me that we are at a crossroads of destiny, and either the United States will provide leadership to manifest to the members of the United Nations General Assembly and to the world that we have an abiding interest in human dignity, or we will see this the sellout of Nationalist China placed by historians right next to the sellout of human dignity at Yalta.

If the President fails to exercise his responsibilities, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Nixon will have to sit next to President Roosevelt on history's special bench reserved for American Presidents who have been duped by the Communists. As we look at the 180 million people in Communist-dominated nations behind the Iron Curtain; as we witness the Communist takeover of mainland China after World War II, we can draw no other conclusion but that a great President was tragically duped at Yalta into agreements that took on entirely new significance after the war.

So, it seems to me, we had better look at the two monuments out there on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the National Archives Building, the one that says, "What is past is prologue," and the other one, "Study the past." From the immediate part we can see the scope of Communist treachery.

All we have to look at is the relationship we have had with the Communists in the last 25 years. They have kept this world in constant turmoil. They have plunged our Nation into two disastrous wars, one in Korea and one in Vietnam. Are those the kind of people we are being asked to trust in the United Nations today?

The irony of yesterday's action of expelling Nationalist China is that there are 92 nations in that world organization, which have populations substan-

* Bailey, Sidney D. *Voting in the Security Council*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969. Page 14.

tially below the 14 million people living in Formosa.

The great tragedy of yesterday's action will be seen in many ways. One, in that it will afford Red China a field for extreme mischief and turmoil in the Security Council.

I have asked the President to use our American veto power in the Security Council at least temporarily, at least until we have had an opportunity to let the air clear, at least until we have had an opportunity to see what sort of a member Red China will be in the General Assembly before we admit her into the United Nations Security Council, where she will have a veto power from now into perpetuity, or at least as long as the United Nations continues to exist.

I can tell you this. There is a reluctance in our American State Department to use the American veto power. But the Communists have never hesitated to use it. They have used it time and again in the United Nations whenever their own interests were jeopardized.

By admitting Communist China to the Security Council, the American interest is most seriously jeopardized for the balance of power will now shift. Out of the five charter members, Russia, Red China, and France will constitute one bloc, and we will be stuck with a very flimsy ally in Britain on the other side. This is the Britain that, incidentally, voted with Albania against the American interest yesterday.

The perfidy of yesterday's action is reflected in the fact that some of those we helped most turned their back on the United States yesterday. It is a monument to ingratitude by these nations we have been helping at great expense to the American people that these same nations would not even give us a vote on a procedural matter. I can appreciate why some of the nations voted the way they did on the final question, but what kind of fair-weather allies do we have in the United Nations who would not give the United States a vote to declare this an "important question" requiring a two-thirds vote? They would not even give us a vote on a purely procedural matter on something as important as driving a member nation out of the United Nations.

This is what leads me so strongly to believe that yesterday's action has led the General Assembly to write its own obituary. I think it is reasonable to predict today that it will not be very long before the United Nations will go the way of the League of Nations.

This is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker. I have been among the strongest defenders of the United Nations from the inception of that organization. I have advocated that we bring all nations into the United Nations. I have advocated that we bring in North Korea and South Korea, and North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and East Germany and West Germany—all these countries—to try to resolve their difficulties in the United Nations, making the United Nations an umbrella of peace throughout the world. And we have been doing that. At the opening of this General Assembly session, we admitted three new nations to membership to the General Assembly. They were three nations whose names I cannot even

recall. I could not even tell you where they are.

One of those nations has 100,000 people, another has 100,000 people, and a third one has 150,000 people. These are three nations with three votes, each vote as big as the U.S. vote in the General Assembly, and yet these three new nations combined have a total population amounting to only two-thirds of the population of my one congressional district.

These are countries that made the decision yesterday and altered the future of the world and the relationships in the world.

So it is my firm judgment that the President has a great responsibility and that if the United States is, indeed, to restore its leadership in the world, if we are to give meaning to American leadership, if we are to restore any confidence in American leadership, the President must act decisively. To do otherwise will reduce the United States to a second-rate world power, and we will see the turning point of world history recorded last night on this tragic vote against Nationalist China.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also believe we ought to give careful consideration to our future relationship with the United Nations. I had hoped the United Nations could become an instrumentality of bringing peace to the world. I do not think its prospects are very promising today. So it seems to me it is perfectly proper for the Congress of the United States to reevaluate our whole role and relationship with the United Nations.

This morning in the Chicago Tribune there was an excellent editorial which points out that quite properly the United States is carrying 31.52 percent of the U.N. administrative budget of almost \$208 million for 1972. Our Nation is carrying 31 percent, a third of the cost, while all the other nations bear the rest but because they don't pay even their reduced rates, the U.N. is in serious trouble.

The Tribune quite properly points out that Albania, the country that started the resolution against Nationalist China, pays only 0.04 percent into this general fund.

I think the time has come when we in Congress ought to make good on the pledge we made before this tragic vote. Many of us had signed a telegram and many of us had signed a resolution addressed to our Ambassador in the United Nations that if, indeed, Nationalist China was driven out of the United Nations General Assembly, we would move forcefully here to reduce substantially our contribution to that world organization.

I shall place the Tribune editorial in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Tribune editorial makes an excellent case for reducing our contribution to the United Nations with or without yesterday's vote. But it occurs to me that the tragic vote yesterday only fortifies the argument that the honeymoon is over.

The United States ought to serve notice on all in the United Nations that they will either carry their fair share of the load or else the United Nations will go the way of all other efforts at world peace.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the statement he is making.

I know the gentleman from Illinois is not one of them, but many people seem to forget that had it not been for Red China many thousands of Americans would still be living who fought in Korea.

It was the Red Chinese who furnished the warm bodies, the combat troops as well as supplies, in Korea; and it was certainly the Red Chinese who provided most of the sinews of war in North Vietnam, where more than 45,000 Americans have died and many, many thousands more have been wounded.

So it is incomprehensible to me that a nation which has not so far shown any disposition to expiate its crimes toward the United States should now be seated at the United Nations, and a nation which has been friendly kicked out in order to make a seat at the United Nations for this country that has been an enemy and so far as I know still is an enemy of the United States.

I will say to the gentleman that I was surprised and somewhat shocked by the fact that the President of the United States would make a trip to Red China in the absence of diplomatic relations between the United States and that country. It seems to me that the first requisite ought to have been the establishment of diplomatic relations. I cannot recall when a President of the United States made a trip to a foreign nation with which this country did not have diplomatic relations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank my colleague for his contribution. I believe he raises a very good point.

One cannot absolve this administration from the tragedy which occurred last night at the United Nations. As has been previously here, and properly so, how could we expect some of these countries in the United Nations to vote otherwise, when we see the President's top personal adviser in Peking for 4 days and, because the voting had not been completed, he extended his tour in Peking for 2 additional days, going out to look at the great China Wall and also some other sight-seeing ventures, in order to be in Peking to the tragic end of the voting.

So today the outrage we hear emanating from the administration would be much more convincing indeed if the President would now serve notice that the United States will exercise its veto power in the Security Council. We want to see what Red China is going to be like as a member of the General Assembly before we admit her to the Security Council. We have done that with every other nation admitted to the Security Council on a rotation basis. Why should we have a different standard for a nation that has not given us one iota of evidence that it will behave like a civilized partner in the United Nations?

If there is anyone in the Congress who can show me one iota of evidence that Red China intends to abide by the rules and regulations of the United Nations Charter, I want to see that evidence. We

have not the slightest idea what role China will be playing in the United Nations, yet they are going to go ahead, after they have paved the way in the General Assembly.

When we ponder the fact that the United States has been dragged into three costly wars, with a deficit of almost \$400 billion, and we have shelled out \$150 billion of direct aid, as Orro PASSMAN quite properly points out, when we count the cost of those loans and the interest, we discover we have helped those countries to the tune of about \$225 billion to get on their feet.

For them not to give us a vote on a procedural question yesterday is an indictment of their loyalty and of their value as allies.

I think perhaps the time has come, Mr. Speaker, to take a hard look at the entire NATO structure, because with allies like that we do not need enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this administration can voice outrage against what happened in the United Nations yesterday. To set the groundwork and to set the stage for this, we have the announcement of the President's visit to Peking and to Moscow. All of these things created enough doubt and confusion in the United Nations. Then the final coup de grace was when they sent Kissinger off to Peking to be there apparently in order to hold Mr. Chou En-lai's hand when the voting was going on.

I am afraid that the American people will look at this and say that there is nothing we can do about it. There is a kind of desperation setting in amongst American people because they feel that all of these things have to be and that they cannot be changed. The only thing that we can do here in this Chamber to show our outrage is, as the Chicago Tribune quite properly proposes today, take a hard look at the financing and the share of America's contribution in the U.N.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks I may be permitted to include the editorial from the Chicago Tribune and also a list which I would like to call a list of infamy which I want to appear in the permanent RECORD for time eternal stating the nations that voted last night for the beginning of the end of the United Nations.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I hope there is some way by which this could be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 10-point type at least.

I note that the morning newspaper in Washington printed it in the smallest type that is available. I am talking about the list of the countries voting on this issue.

Mr. PUCINSKI. When you look at the number of countries that have been to the public trough in the United States for the last 25 years and who abandoned us on this vital issue, the one time that we asked them to stand up with us and

be counted and who went their own way, I am not surprised that they appear in small print because they are going to have to carry their heads bowed in shame for a lot longer than I will.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. In the printing of this list, is the size of type going to reflect the size of the nations that the gentleman addressed himself to who voted on this problem, and will it indicate how ridiculous it is that the United Nations should give the Republic of the Congo and Kuwait the same vote, one vote, that the United States has on these questions? Has the gentleman considered that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. As I said a little while ago, before my colleague entered the Chamber, as an immediate measure toward trying to save some of the pieces of this at least, I would like to have us veto the admission of Red China in the Security Council at least for the time being, because I believe that we should take an entirely new look at the structure of the United Nations. We will never have a better opportunity to do it. If we keep Red China out of a voting position for the time being at least, it will give us an opportunity to review the whole structure of the United Nations Charter and see what changes are necessary. Obviously, neither the Soviet Union nor Red China will vote for any changes now that they have everything they want. You are absolutely right. You have a group of nations here which, as has been said earlier, the average American would not have the slightest idea as to where they are on the map.

I do not think many of them even appear on a map because they are so tiny, and you are right. However, they have a vote that is as big as the vote of the United States in that General Assembly. That is why I say we must preserve the Security Council while we still can because once Red China is seated on the Security Council, the ball game is over.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Would not the gentleman agree that the United States, nevertheless, ought to stay in an international organization such as the United Nations if there is going to be a viable and effective working relationship, but based upon a proper vote formula, rather than not participating at all?

Does not the gentleman recall the League of Nations after World War I and the background of it? Is the gentleman urging that we withdraw from the United Nations?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, I am not suggesting that we withdraw from the United Nations, but on the contrary. I said that I propose that we exercise our rights. For once let us have the State Department have the guts and understanding to know that they are dealing with the most vicious force that has ever confronted free men, let them have the guts to stand up and veto the seating of Red China on the Security Council until the air has cleared and until we know where

we are going. Let us look at the financing of that institution. As the gentleman knows, the United States is carrying about 33 percent of the cost of the load of that organization. However, the action of last night convinced me that we are really supporting a bunch of dead heads whose minds were made up. They did not want to be convinced by the facts. I say to you that when we have a chance later to do so, the United States ought to exercise every resource at its command. However, I am not suggesting that we leave the United Nations. We should strive to make it a more workable and viable United Nations and that will be accomplished only when we serve notice that Uncle Sam is not "Uncle Sap."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman not agree that what was demonstrated in the U.N. yesterday will progressively deteriorate insofar as the interest of the United States is concerned and so long as this one nation, one vote formula is concerned in the United Nations?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that we should review the entire basis of voting in the U.N. My colleague asked me if I advocated withdrawing from the United Nations. I will say to the gentleman that I am convinced that the vote of last night began the obituary for the United Nations. It will sink itself. It will not need the United States to provide the impetus for its demise. I think all we want to do is be there for the wake, because the United Nations demonstrated yesterday that it is insensitive when it drove Nationalist China out. It barred a solution to the Pakistan question, it barred solution in North Vietnam and North Korea. It closed the door. It established a precedent yesterday that the General Assembly of the United Nations hereafter will be the sole judge of what group constitutes the sovereign government of a divided country. They are going to take on that task. History will not need to say but very little to decide what a horrible example they set yesterday. It is going to come back to haunt them over and over again.

Mr. WYMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. If there is, as the gentleman from Illinois has suggested, probably going to be a wake, does the gentleman have any suggestion as to the form in which the reincarnation should take place?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, it could take place if the President of the United States would serve notice that while we have lost the battle in the General Assembly for human dignity, a battle to which we are pledged, we may have lost that battle but we still have a great deal of strength and muscle and vigor left on the Security Council and if the President will have the courage to stand up and use that muscle and courage in the Security Council I think he will have served notice on all of these nations that despite what happened on yesterday, America is still a leader in this great world struggle for human dignity and respect for the individual. But for us to roll over and accept this defeat without any kind of

effort to preserve human dignity would be a signal to these nations that their future lies with the Communist nations and not with the United States and, thus, the beacon of hope which has been held out by the United States is going to go down the drain. Thus, we have to have the courage to stand up and be counted.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that for 1 minute our President or any Member of Congress has any intention of rolling over and playing dead on this particular issue? I think most of us recognized what the facts were in the situation and I look upon this as nothing more than the revelation of the facts of life. I have not voted for the foreign aid bill for the reasons which the gentleman has stated. We will have to have a movement in the direction of new alliances on an international scale.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe you can reconstitute the U.N. I think once our country reviews its resources and the tools under its command that we can give the United Nations some meaning and some leadership. But I tell you again that if we just roll over and do nothing then we are through.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. We will not do that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You say we will not do that, but the fact of the matter is that last night in the General Assembly you have lost all your options. The United States has no options in the General Assembly, but I submit to you that we do have options in the Security Council, and all I am pleading for here today is that we exercise those options. I do not mean we should leave Red China out of the Security Council indefinitely, not at all. There will be ample time to make that decision, but it does seem to me that logic and decency and everything else in the name of human dignity requires us to proceed cautiously in that body where we do have options. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. Speaker, the material that I requested permission to insert in the Record is as follows:

SQUEEZE ON U.N.

The United Nations General Assembly has voted Red China in and Nationalist China out. The United States last night lost the crucial vote on the "important question" issue requiring a two-thirds vote for the expulsion of Taiwan and later lost on an Albanian resolution, now requiring only a simple majority, to seat the mainland Chinese and to oust the Nationalist Chinese delegation.

A considerable group in Congress has contended that with Taiwan out, after 25 years as a loyal, dues-paying member, the United States should retaliate by sharply reducing its assessed contribution of 31.52 per cent to the U.N. administrative budget of almost \$208 million for 1972. This budget doesn't include any of the U.N. specialized agencies, such as the Children's Fund, World Health Organization and International Labor Organization.

The I.L.O. provides a precedent for the kind of financial sanctions members of Congress are suggesting. For the last year Congress has refused to pay the United States membership assessment to the I.L.O. This amounts to 25 per cent of the organization's

operational budget, as compared to 10 per cent by the Soviet Union and 9 per cent for Britain.

This action was taken at the urging of George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, after the director general of the I.L.O., Wilfred Jenks, a Briton, had appointed a Russian, Dr. Pavel Astapenko, as one of his five assistant directors general. Meany said the I.L.O. had become a transmission belt for Communist propaganda and collectivist schemes, and Congress agreed with him.

Red China's ball in the U.N. debate has been carried by such nations as Albania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Alice Widener, publisher of U.S.A. Magazine and a syndicated columnist, has looked into the respective financial stakes of the contending camps over the China issue and has found that the Communist mouthpieces are getting in the door at bargain prices.

The Soviet Union, for example, is paying 14.18 per cent of the U.N. regular budget, and the fictitiously independent Ukraine and Byelorussia, which are integral parts of the Soviet Union, respectively pay 1.87 per cent and .50 per cent of U.N. upkeep. Thus for three votes in the General Assembly the Soviet members pay a combined 16.55 per cent, or about half as much as the United States.

The Poland and Cuba have millions and millions of words to say in U.N., their respective contributions are 1.41 per cent and .16 per cent, while Czechoslovakia pays .90 per cent and Yugoslavia .38 per cent. As for Albania, the nation which proposed expulsion of Nationalist China, its assessment is .04 per cent, while the Republic of China [Taiwan] was assessed 4 per cent, or 100 times more than the expeller. Taiwan, in fact, paid more than one-fourth more for U.N. upkeep than all five of these Red governments which clamored for her ouster.

"It might be said," remarks Mrs. Widener, "that never in all history was so much said by diplomats and propagandists at such little cost to themselves as by the Socialist nations in the U.N. As things stand now, the 31.52 per cent United States share of U.N. regular upkeep is extremely excessive. Congress ought to reduce our share, no matter what happens at the U.N."

U.N. ROLLCALLS ON CHINA

(Special to The New York Times)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Oct. 25.—Following are two roll-call votes taken in the General Assembly tonight on seating Communist China and expelling Nationalist China.

ON TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT

Resolution declaring the expulsion of Nationalist China an "important matter" and thus requiring a two-thirds vote rather than a simple majority for passage.

In favor—55

Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cent. Afr. Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Kinsh.), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia.

Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico.

New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Opposed—59

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Britain, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Congo (Brazza), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial

Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ire-

land, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria.

Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, So. Yemen, Soviet Union, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad/Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstentions—15

Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Cyprus, Iran, Italy, Laos, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey.

Absent—Maldives, Oman.

ON SEATING PEKING

Resolution to seat Communist China and expel Nationalist China.

In favor—76

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eq. Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea.

Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Congo (Brazza), Peru.

Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Soviet Union, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Trinidad/Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Britain, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Opposed—35

Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cent. Afr. Republic, Congo (Kinsh.), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Rep., El Salvador, Gabon.

Gambia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand.

Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstentions—17

Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Colombia, Cyprus, Fiji, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Spain, Thailand.

Absent—3

China, Maldives, Oman.

INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL FISSIONABLE MATERIALS SAFEGUARDS SYMPOSIUM

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting symposium is taking place at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., on the subject of safeguards against the illicit diversion of fissionable material. These are the special ingredients of nuclear weapons as well as the fuel for nuclear reactors.

The symposium is international in scope and financed by a grant from the National Science Foundation. Experts from all over the world are contributing their knowledge and experience toward raising the barriers against misuse of atomic science and nuclear materials. I was pleased to keynote this meeting yesterday. My remarks follow:

KEYNOTE REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER, REPUBLICAN OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SYMPOSIUM ON IMPLEMENTING NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, OCTOBER 25, 1971

With the discovery of nuclear processes over three decades ago there came as a twin

the need for precautions to keep the special materials and knowledge involved out of the wrong hands. At that time these were constructed by the Manhattan District to be "anybody else's." However, this simplicity was not for long to be.

Over the years holding the ever-expanding applications of atomic energy inside peaceful channels has become a matter of world-wide concern. Almost a hundred countries have signed the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and numerous other precautions have been instituted to guard against misuse of the atom. So many, in fact, that in the overall effort to prevent the perversion of nuclear science, some confusion exists as to who is policing whom, which agencies are guarding what, and by whose authority.

The confusion results because the overall antiproliferation problem is several-sided and complex. Possible proliferators might be desperately imperiled countries or even some evil conspiracy of ruthless or irrational individuals. Many separate endeavors are required to meet such challenges. The need to protect society and its members from nuclear proliferation spans the entire spectrum of human interest. And, in the countereffort to contain nuclear dangers there are a large number of possible controls which can be imposed selectively, separately, or simultaneously at international regional, national, or industrial levels.

ANTIPROLIFERATION—A MANY-SIDED EFFORT

Despite the focus of attention on nuclear safeguards envisioned at the international level by the Nonproliferation Treaty, this category of restraints constitute a response to but one of the several facets of the antiproliferation problems. Similarly, on a national level the disappearance of special fissionable material from peaceful channels at some particular point in the nuclear fuel cycle may constitute but one of several nonproliferation concerns. Therefore, in order to pinpoint specific deficiencies in the total structure being erected to prevent the multiplication of nuclear weapons states and to inhibit the proliferation of like dangers, we must first examine the individual building blocks from which it has been fashioned.

The Nonproliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency's guidelines for the structure and content of safeguards agreements fully recognize this basic multiplicity of the anti-proliferation challenge and the wisdom of the division of effort in meeting it. These documents begin by acknowledging the large technical and political gulf between weapons states and non-weapons states. They impose IAEA safeguards and mandatory inspections upon the latter, but make these burdens discretionary with the former.

As it has worked out, the United States and the United Kingdom have voluntarily submitted to some inspections, but the Soviet Union to none. The other nuclear weapons states, France and Mainland China, refuse even to sign the NPT, but insist that their nuclear hearts are pure and that their atomic arsenals are pacific.

Meanwhile, non-nuclear weapons states must comply fully with IAEA requirements in order (a) to obtain special nuclear materials for strictly peaceful purposes, and, (b) to be spared the embarrassment of being reported to the UN should they carelessly lose them.

This separate but unequal treatment of nations based on nuclear club membership stems from the obvious fact that the two categories of countries necessarily function with different effectiveness in different antiproliferation roles.

For instance, Articles I and II of the Nonproliferation Treaty prohibit the transfer between nuclear states and non-nuclear states of "nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices." These articles also ban the

"manufacture, or assistance with the manufacture or other acquisition whatsoever" of these troublesome items. Yet the safeguards provisions of Article III are cast exclusively in terms of monitoring diversions from peaceful channels of "source or special fissionable material." Article III does not even mention safeguard monitoring of A-bombs or H-bombs as such.

International safeguards thus focus almost exclusively upon that one facet of the total anti-proliferation problem having to do with accounting for fissionable isotopes legitimately in the possession of non-nuclear weapons states. This, of course, is a form of atomic bomb birth control. It can be quite helpful in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. It is a logical responsibility to be assigned to non-nuclear countries. But, no matter who does it, materials accounting is by no means the only anti-proliferation precaution which must be taken. It is but one of many.

WEAPONS PHYSICAL SECURITY

Very special efforts are required to insure that existing nuclear weapon stockpiles are maintained physically secure in the hands of their rightful owners. Yet the NPT contains not a word about procedures to enforce Articles I and II bans upon trafficking in nuclear weapons, and, properly so. Implementation of this distinct facet of the anti-proliferation effort is correctly remanded to the conspicuous self-interest of Nuclear Club members. It is backstopped by their respective civilian and military police organizations and networks of spies, counterspies and informers.

This is not to say, however, that pressure for top notch performance should not constantly be kept upon these organizations. Speaking as one who has been active in the military, worked in the weapons labs, ridden storage site perimeters, and over a decade ago took part in a review of nuclear weapons storage, handling, shipping safety and security practices which result in a series of major reforms, I will state flatly that no matter how good a physical security job is being done, it can always be done better, and ought to be done better. Frankly, I think members of the Nuclear Cartel ought to keep under constant review their procedures to prevent the theft or misuse of their bombs. They also ought to pass around tips to each other on improving such procedures whenever that can be done with a net gain for the common security.

WEAPONS DESIGN SECURITY

It is interesting to note that the related subject of security of nuclear weapons design data, which to the uninitiated might seem to be highly important in preventing nuclear spread, is actually of little or no concern from strictly a non-proliferation standpoint. Nuclear weapons designs are only an incidental facet of the general anti-proliferation effort. This is because the laws of physics from which nuclear weapons are designed have become so universally understood that any effort now to suppress the data would be absurd. This cat has been out of the bag for a long, long time.

A potential proliferator enterprising enough to lay hands on illicit supplies of fissionable material is certain to be smart enough to know how to weaponize them. Refined and sophisticated designs are unnecessary. Whether such proliferator be one country seeking to overpower another or a criminal organization bent on cruder forms of nuclear blackmail, its need is not to become an instant superpower. It requires only primitive explosive devices.

Insofar as nuclear powers are concerned, their weapon designs are top security items not primarily due to proliferation fears, but simply because compromising them will reveal to a rival the characteristics and vulnerabilities of one's own arsenal.

EVOLUTION, EXPANSION AND FORMALIZATION OF CONTROLS

If at this point you are starting to pick up a theme in these rather simplistic remarks, it is that preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons requires the integrated efforts of several separate national forces and multinational institutions. It is the same theme which runs through the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the United States Atoms-for-Peace program announced in 1956 which established the legitimacy of peaceful uses of atomic energy and encouraged their application on a global scale.

The many bilateral and multilateral agreements for cooperation which followed these historic landmarks frequently required practical judgments as to the identity of critical weapons proliferation danger points and the means best to deal with them. As anti-proliferation efforts have expanded and become formalized with only minor changes, these earlier judgments gradually have been incorporated into treaties, international law and various regional and national statutes.

Now, both formally and as a practical matter the physical security of nuclear weapons is recognized as a national responsibility of the nuclear weapons states. So also is fissionable material in the hands of the weapons states, except to the extent that they themselves submit it to international safeguards. In clear contrast safeguards against diversion of fissionable material from peaceful channels are made both international and national responsibilities of the signatory non-nuclear weapons states.

The IAEA safeguards systems thereupon functions to engage the non-weapons nuclear community in a parallel effort with the nuclear weapons powers aimed at deterring illicit diversions of fissionable material by means of an established capability to detect and report diversions should they occur. These international safeguards depend heavily upon the functioning of regional or national safeguards systems, which in turn rely upon strict materials accounting and other security measures at the individual plant level. Great resources and manpower are devoted to these efforts and their improvement.

International safeguards have become the glamour segment of the overall anti-proliferation effort. Safeguards people, their systems and analyses, methodologies, black boxes, game theories, non-destructive test paraphernalia preventing this diversion. This may be a very dangerous assumption in the real world, populated by very fallible people, some of whom are very certain to be just no damn good.

ANTIPROLIFERATION PUBLIC OPINION

In any event, the world political community probably ought to be doing a lot more than it is now under IAEA leadership to foster a climate of public opinion exceedingly hostile to the idea of nuclear spread. Trafficking in the ingredients of mass destruction is equitable to the heinous war crime of genocide, and its penalty should be fixed accordingly. An international norm boosting the intensity of disapprobation accorded anyone who might participate in nuclear black marketing would certainly do no harm and it might provide additional insurance against a day when incentives to divert may be on the rise.

COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL POLICE SYSTEMS

Deterrence also can be made more certain by boosting the illicit diverter's risk of getting caught, thereby both incurring punishment and losing the profits of his crime.

If, under our safeguards systems of international public opinion, when a diversion is discovered, the alarm sounds, whistles blow, sirens scream, the United Nations is notified, and it all strikes fear and terror in the hearts of the general public, that is one thing. Quite another and far better thing is if it scares

hell out of the criminal because he knows that the jig is up.

Every increase in the likelihood of a quick and positive identification and apprehension of a nuclear criminal plays a key role in fortifying the deterrent equation. So also does every increase in the degree of certainty with which the stolen item can be recovered.

Yet, neither apprehension nor recovery are functions of the current nuclear safeguards structure. These are the responsibility of independent and relatively uncoordinated national, and even local, police systems. Undoubtedly the IAEA and other nuclear authorities can do far more than they do now to prepare these police authorities to move rapidly and effectively in nuclear cases.

This is a facet of the overall antiproliferation problem that is relatively neglected. It is not a glamorous facet, like systems analyzing the five components of MUF to estimate the confidence level with which a material balance can be closed in some hypothetical nuclear fuel factory. But effective international police coordination will be of utmost importance when and if the world ever faces a real life criminal threat of nuclear blackmail and we ought to be promoting it.

Inspector General Rometsch, who follows me today, reiterated during Geneva IV that the IAEA policy is only to render advice to national police authorities when requested. However, my feeling is that both IAEA and the police authorities ought to do more than wait for each other's ideas to get on with the serious business of improving and sharing the capabilities of over one hundred national police systems to cope with possible nuclear crimes.

The IAEA could serve a particularly useful function by setting guidelines for police training, indoctrination, and equipment for this specialized work. The principal nuclear nations of the world could actively assist other countries in developing a worldwide network of nuclear competent police systems. When the need comes for such systems, it will be a sudden and critical one. It will then be too late to start putting things in shape. Therefore, the more concern in advance to this subject, the better.

REWARDS AND BOUNTIES

The practice of rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of offenders and the return of specific stolen goods has been an historic companion of efficient police work since the beginning of mankind. Informants are the backbone of any security apparatus. Today there is no particular assurances by the IAEA or any of the major nations that persons cooperating with the authorities on nuclear cases will even get a pleasant "thank you" for their troubles. Establishment of standing nuclear theft rewards and a "no questions asked" bounty system for return of unaccounted for materials should be put on the agenda at Vienna and elsewhere.

PROLIFERATION PROFILES

Along similar lines, IAEA and national authorities ought to be encouraged to arm themselves with psychological and other data useful in forestalling nuclear thefts. The airlines have developed fairly comprehensive profiles for potential hijackers. Potential proliferators also could be profiled. Is such a man more likely to be a three-time loser in the criminal courts, or an underpaid, under-promoted worker in a reprocessing facility with a large debt and a nagging wife, or some other type? What people in what positions for how long deserve special observation? These questions, too, are facets of anti-proliferation to which attention must be given if the total effort is to succeed.

RELAX ACCOUNTING FOR LOW ENRICHMENT U-235

And, if more attention is to be devoted to some things, it is likely that less can be paid

to others. To me it seems unwarranted for the safeguards systems to spend a lot of time and effort accounting for low enrichment U-235. This material is little more useful from a diversionary standpoint than source material. Notice of shipments and receipts are about all that are required for the latter and all that seem reasonably necessary for 5 percent or less U-235. This product is totally dissimilar to plutonium and U-233 which are explosively fissionable as soon as a critical mass is accumulated.

DECLASSIFYING DIFFUSION TECHNOLOGY

For this same reason a relaxation of the zealous classification of diffusion enrichment technology has for long seemed warranted. Anybody wanting to go about making an atomic bomb by enriching U-235 in a diffusion plant could hardly be secretive about it. At Geneva IV, Wataru Hirazumi, the President of the Japanese Atomic Energy Commission, recommended diffusion declassification and advised the owners of these secrets to get themselves some good patents, start licensing them and stop worrying about proliferation via the diffusion route, because it isn't in the cards.

So long as we make sure that no high enrichment cascades are built into these plants, I agree with the gentleman. We can better spend our safeguards, time and money checking on alternate enrichment processes which can be carried on in secrecy because they do not require large physical installations. We can safely take our eyes off the diffusion plants and concentrate them on the ultra-centrifuge, the Becker Nozzle, laser and thermal diffusion techniques and possibly whatever unique enrichment process the South Africans claim to have invented.

"BOMBS FOR ALL"

Since one unusual thought breeds another, I am now emboldened to mention the fantastic proposal that we contain the dangers from nuclear weapons not by limiting their ownership but by deliberately and rapidly accelerating proliferation on a worldwide basis.

This is the "bombs for all" idea that proliferation is inevitable, efforts to slow it down only unevenly delay the deadly day of reckoning and that mutual deterrence should work as well for ordinary powers as it has for the super-powers for over a quarter of a century. Therefore, every non-nuclear country is to be given four atomic bombs and made a nuclear power. It then can deter its enemies and in turn be deterred by them. The bombs are rigged with permissive action links which keep them from being turned against the supplier members of the Nuclear Club.

The kicker in this one is that any country which uses its bombs doesn't get any more. That will leave it a very, very lowly non-nuclear weapons state in a hostile world of nuclear powers. Such a possibility, it is argued, blanks out the proliferation problem and permanently guarantees a super-secured worldwide nuclear truce. That, of course, is a fallacy and the idea of "bombs for all" as the answer to proliferation is an absurdity or an obscenity, depending on your own preference for adjectives.

INCREASING NEED FOR TIGHT PHYSICAL SECURITY

Almost everyone but the astute chairman of our session this morning, Dr. Theodore B. Taylor, has neglected one very promising means to effectuate society's containment of the nuclear dangers. His ideas for enhanced physical security of the devices and materials concerned make a lot of sense and should receive serious attention. Taylor points out that nuclear material safeguards emphasis has been and continues to be concerned primarily with detection of losses after they have occurred. Physical security measures to prevent thefts in the first place are accorded only a secondary role.

The intrinsic value of special nuclear mate-

rials is high. At \$10,000 per kilogram the value of plutonium by weight is about ten times that of gold. Yet the physical security levels provided for plutonium are considerably lower than those generally obtaining for the protection of bank vaults or large shipments of money and other valuables. And, here is another pertinent statistic: during the last decade successful million dollar robberies have averaged one a year and \$100,000 and over robberies or thefts have occurred at a rate of around five per year.

Within about two years, plutonium recycle will commence on a large-scale and the flow of this product through the civilian power reactor fuel cycle will increase rapidly. The quantity, price and value of plutonium for illicit use could easily rise to a point where deterrence of theft, in the sense we have been talking about it, becomes much too weak a reed to rely upon. Dr. Taylor believes this will happen and contends that improved physical security is absolutely essential to reduce the vulnerability of these materials to large-scale felonious taking not only during shipment, which already is recognized as a serious hazard, but also during storage and handling. He points out that:

"Stolen special nuclear materials could supply an illegal national or international market, be incorporated into crude but highly destructive nuclear explosives for use by domestic or foreign extremist organizations, or sold to countries that want to make nuclear explosives but that do not have direct access to special nuclear materials."

Recently, the U.S. AEC somewhat tightened up its 10 CFR Part 73 physical security regulations, but they still fall short of constituting major barriers to special nuclear materials thefts or robberies by highly motivated professional criminals. Regardless of monetary costs, Taylor recommends that the United States Government vigorously press for action by appropriate foreign governments and the International Atomic Energy Agency to set up dependable SNM physical security systems on a worldwide basis. These should be designed to lock up SNM at least as tight as conventional valuables, and possibly tighter.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me say that this is a very distinguished audience of noted experts gathered together from many parts of the world. As this symposium begins, I am proud and pleased to have been given this opportunity to focus its attention upon the sea of problems associated with keeping vital atomic ingredients in the right hands and securely out of the way of mischief. My remarks have only skimmed the surface of that sea. During these few days here on the campus of Kansas State University, you will probe its depths for answers which may contribute significantly to the peace of the planet and the safety of its citizens.

I wish you well. All of civilization wishes you Godspeed.

TO ACHIEVE A FAIR APPORTIONMENT OF REVENUES FROM OFFSHORE MINERAL PRODUCTIONS

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, vast quantities of minerals lie in the submerged lands off the shores of our coastal States.

The State of Louisiana has been a leader in the technology of offshore mineral production. Techniques and equipment devised in Louisiana are being used in other coastal States and countries around the world.

In the past 16 years, total Federal income from the sale of mineral rights in the federally controlled Outer Continental Shelf has multiplied more than 30 to 1. With our country facing a growing energy shortage, there is reason to believe that this trend will continue.

To date, all revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf have gone to the Federal Government. Federal revenues from submerged lands off the coast of Louisiana alone now amount to well over \$3 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the revenues accruing to the Federal Government from the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Louisiana are possible only because of the many services rendered by the State of Louisiana, Louisiana and other coastal States build the schools, pave the roads, provide the health care, fire and police protection and other governmental services, without which there could be no offshore mineral production.

For similar reasons, it is present national policy for the Federal Government to share revenues from public lands on the mainland with the State within whose borders those lands lie. Thus, a mainland State is given 37½ percent of the revenues from mineral production from Federal lands within its borders.

Reason and equity require that the same formula be applied to Federal revenues from mineral production off the coasts of the States. For this reason, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4343, intended to achieve the same fair apportionment of revenues from offshore min-

eral production as is now afforded States with public lands within their borders.

On past occasions I have inserted editorials and articles on this subject by the distinguished executive editor of the New Orleans Times Picayune, George W. Healy, Jr. Mr. Healy has just completed an outstanding, six-part series of articles on this subject. I am inserting these articles in the RECORD and calling them to the attention of my colleagues:

SHELF OIL INCOME ZOOMS
(George W. Healy, Jr.)

In 16 years total federal income from sale of mineral rights in the Outer Continental Shelf has multiplied more than 30 to 1.

This income has been from bonuses and first-year rentals, and is exclusive of continuing royalties of one-sixth of the value of minerals produced under federal leases.

Lease sales made in 1954, shortly after the start of deep water exploration and production, brought a total of \$142,404,630.48.

Sixteen years later, on Dec. 15, 1970, federal income from bonuses and first-year rentals had mounted to a total of \$4,398,902,411.74.

In 1968, before the Santa Barbara oil spill, several fires and expansion of demands for protection of the environment led to suspension of offshore drilling rights sales, more than a billion and a quarter dollars went into the treasury at Washington from Outer Continental Shelf sales. The exact amount for the year was \$1,349,497,375.25.

After dropping off in 1969, the Outer Continental Shelf revenue collected from bonuses and rentals resumed the rise which has been increasing in proportion to the number of leases offered for sale by the Bureau of Land Management.

Now, with the new national energy policy calling for increased offshore production of

fuel, there is good prospect that income from Outer Continental Shelf minerals will double within the next few years.

To date, the greatest federal income has come from submerged lands adjacent to Louisiana.

Revenue produced by bonuses and rentals from minerals rights sales for operations off coastal states up to Dec. 15, 1970, was:

Louisiana	\$3,021,740,545.86
Texas	699,022,081.96
California	638,754,209.23
Oregon	29,045,074.24
Washington	8,281,188.40
Florida	2,109,312.00

Although activity in the Gulf of Mexico has been more productive than offshore activity in other United States areas, government experts and private oil men predict that other offshore areas of this nation soon will yield increasing volumes of valuable minerals.

Potentially rich oil deposits running the full length of the United States Atlantic Coast have been discovered by scientists for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an agency of the Department of Commerce. Exploration has indicated rich oil and gas reserves off the Pacific Coast and the coasts of Hawaii and Alaska.

To date, all revenue from the Outer Continental Shelf has gone to the federal government. None of it has been shared with a state off whose shores the revenue was produced.

In the case of Louisiana, a single year's "take" by the federal government (in 1970) amounted to more than 55% of the amount of the state's entire budget for fiscal year 1970-71. Although the state provided many services which made the offshore production possible, none of the 1970 bonus and rental income received by the federal government (all of which came from oil, gas and mineral leases off this state) was shared with Louisiana.

FEDERAL REVENUES FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—MINERAL LEASE SALES, INCLUDING BONUSES AND RENTALS

Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	1st year rental	Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	1st year rental
1954:					1965:				
Louisiana—oil and gas	90	394,721.16	\$116,378,476.00	\$1,184,175	Texas—sulfur	50	72,000.00	\$33,740,308.80	\$216,000
Louisiana—sulfur	5	25,000.00	1,233,500.00	50,000					
Texas—oil and gas	19	67,148.70	23,357,029.48	201,450	1966:				
Total	114	486,869.86	140,969,005.48	1,435,625	Louisiana—oil and gas	17	35,056.00	88,845,963.00	350,570
1955:					Louisiana—oil and gas	24	104,717.19	99,164,930.42	523,600
Louisiana—oil and gas	94	252,806.92	100,091,262.93	758,442	California—oil and gas	1	1,995.48	21,189,000.00	9,980
Texas—oil and gas	27	149,760.00	8,437,461.60	449,280	Total	42	141,768.67	209,199,893.42	884,150
Total	121	402,566.92	108,528,724.53	1,207,722	1967:				
1959:					Louisiana—oil and gas	158	744,456.13	510,079,177.76	2,233,458
Florida—oil and gas	23	132,480.00	1,711,872.00	397,440	Louisiana—salt	1	2,495.00	30,563.75	7,485
Louisiana—oil and gas	19	38,819.90	88,035,121.27	388,200	Total	159	746,951.13	510,109,741.51	2,240,943
Total	42	171,299.90	89,746,993.27	785,640	1968:				
1960:					California—oil and gas	71	363,181.00	602,719,261.60	1,089,543
Louisiana—oil and gas	99	464,046.23	246,909,783.59	1,392,159	Texas—oil and gas	110	541,304.41	593,899,046.38	1,623,915
Texas—oil and gas	48	240,480.00	35,732,031.20	721,440	Louisiana—oil and gas	16	29,682.00	149,868,789.27	296,820
Louisiana—salt	1	2,500.00	75,250.00	7,500	Total	197	934,167.41	1,346,487,097.25	3,010,278
Total	148	707,026.23	282,717,064.79	2,121,099	1969:				
1962:					Louisiana—oil and gas	20	48,505.00	44,037,338.65	485,050
Louisiana—oil and gas	401	1,879,526.71	445,036,031.81	5,638,671	Louisiana—sulfur	4	5,625.00	715,150.00	16,875
Texas—oil and gas	10	28,800.00	557,719.50	86,400	Louisiana—oil and gas	16	60,153.06	66,908,195.60	601,550
Louisiana—oil and gas	9	16,177.95	43,887,358.75	161,780	Total	40	114,283.06	111,660,684.25	1,103,475
Total	420	1,924,504.66	489,481,110.06	5,886,851	1970:				
1963:					Louisiana—oil and gas	19	44,642.00	97,769,013.00	446,420
California—oil and gas	57	312,944.85	12,807,586.68	938,838	Louisiana—oil and gas	116	543,897.70	845,832,785.06	1,631,694
1964:					Total	135	588,539.70	948,601,798.06	2,078,114
Louisiana—oil and gas	23	32,673.34	60,340,626.00	326,780	Grand total to Dec. 15,				
Oregon—oil and gas	74	425,433.05	27,768,722.24	1,276,302	1970	1,649	7,216,448.78	4,374,924,334.74	23,978,077
Washington—oil and gas	27	155,420.00	7,764,928.40	466,260					
Total	124	613,526.39	95,874,326.64	2,069,342					

Source: U.S. Bureau of Land Management.

OUR "LOST" OIL REVENUES

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

For all intents and purposes, the billions of barrels of oil and condensate and the trillions of cubic feet of gas being produced from the Gulf of Mexico outside Louisiana's boundary are tax free.

The State of Louisiana collects no severance tax on this production. Nor does it collect any sales tax on the materials and supplies used to effect the production. These taxes are paid to no one.

Since 1898 the state Constitution has authorized a severance tax on natural resources severed from the soil of Louisiana. The greater part of the severance tax on oil, gas, salt, coal, ores, marble, stone, gravel, sand and shells is dedicated to support public education. Different severance tax rates apply to different products.

Since 1936 Louisiana has collected a sales or use tax on goods consumed or used in the state. Since 1970 the rate of this state tax has been 3 per cent. Various parishes and parish school boards also collect local sales taxes. In Orleans Parish the sales tax amounts to 6 per cent—divided equally between the state government and local agencies.

If the state had collected its severance tax on oil, condensate, casinghead gas and natural gas on which no severance tax was collected, its income from this source in the 11-year period, 1955-68, would have been increased by more than one-third of a billion dollars—\$397,356,668.42.

Most of this tax income would have gone to pay the cost of educating Louisiana children—many of whom were the children of workers who made the federal offshore lands productive by manning drilling platforms and rigs.

These estimates are conservative. The severance tax on oil was based on an average of 25 cents per barrel. The severance tax rate varies as the quality, or gravity, of oil varies. Offshore oil generally is high-gravity crude. The tax on condensate was based on an average rate of 35 cents per barrel, and the tax on gas was based on an average of 2 cents per thousand cubic feet. The state recently increased its gas severance tax rate to 2.5 cents per thousand.

Here's the minimum severance tax that would have been collected by Louisiana, were this tax collectible on offshore production from federal lands:

Oil	\$250,233,711.75
Condensate	26,933,276.65
Casinghead Gas.....	23,503,190.66
Natural Gas.....	96,686,489.36
Total	397,356,668.42

Final production figures for 1969 and 1970 have not been tabulated, but preliminary tabulations show large increases. The 1968 offshore production from federal lands was more than 10 times as great as the 1958 production. This trend continues.

The figures showing uncollected or "lost"

severance tax in this report take into consideration that the Federal Government receives one-sixth of the minerals produced from federal lands, or the revenue from one-sixth of the production. No severance tax was figured as due by the United States from its share of the oil, condensate and gas.

In addition to collecting this one-sixth royalty, the federal government collects bonuses and first-year rentals which amounted to \$3,021,740,545.86 from sales of drilling rights off Louisiana between 1954 and Dec. 15, 1970. A report on the billions of dollars that are being received by the federal government from bonuses, rentals and royalties will be included in a later part of this weekly series.

Louisiana receives nothing to compensate it for the many services this state performs to make possible production of riches from submerged federal lands off its coast.

It is the editorial position of this newspaper that the U.S. Congress should pass legislation to correct inequity by having the federal government share with coastal states revenues which it receives from minerals production from offshore federal lands adjacent to those states.

This revenue sharing should be on the same formula as that now applied in sharing with inland states of revenues from federal lands within those states.

(Explanation: Casinghead gas is a by-product of production from oil wells, just as condensate is a by-product of production from natural gas wells.)

PRODUCTION BEYOND LOUISIANA BOUNDARY

Year and zone	By barrel—		By 1,000 cubic feet—		Year and zone	By barrel—		By 1,000 cubic feet—	
	Crude oil	Condensate	Casinghead gas	Natural gas		Crude oil	Condensate	Casinghead gas	Natural gas
1958:					1964:				
II.....	11,824,115	397,619	8,574,052	59,209,986	II.....	74,726,608	4,516,573	88,326,198	232,284,572
III.....	8,236,430	420,211	9,559,134	46,178,404	III.....	27,258,250	2,336,316	35,256,301	203,610,639
IV.....	2,116,053	70,831	1,403,349	8,965,911	IV.....	11,150,490	1,433,225	10,224,764	82,690,389
Total.....	22,176,598	888,661	19,536,535	114,354,301	Total.....	113,135,348	8,286,114	133,807,263	521,585,600
1959:					1965:				
II.....	18,481,271	1,263,051	16,720,958	82,646,268	II.....	84,097,491	6,181,166	94,613,780	303,113,750
III.....	10,154,709	486,311	11,582,520	90,861,207	III.....	39,805,366	2,290,262	48,650,958	205,070,069
IV.....	3,655,240	220,158	2,811,337	22,778,920	IV.....	13,796,080	1,327,869	14,448,216	84,852,808
Total.....	32,291,220	1,969,520	31,114,815	196,286,395	Total.....	137,698,937	9,799,297	157,712,954	593,036,627
1960:					1966:				
II.....	28,021,749	1,679,780	27,964,244	99,705,794	II.....	96,175,703	8,920,782	105,397,046	492,098,002
III.....	10,739,292	572,130	15,293,896	101,042,699	III.....	39,765,675	5,527,327	52,294,773	208,811,392
IV.....	4,310,620	464,226	3,333,312	40,102,495	IV.....	37,424,736	2,407,916	44,850,116	153,505,404
Total.....	43,071,661	2,716,136	46,591,452	240,850,988	Total.....	173,366,114	13,886,025	202,541,935	854,414,998
1961:					1967:				
II.....	39,123,538	2,817,295	40,451,812	135,401,283	II.....	105,920,098	9,747,299	122,564,074	520,019,962
III.....	12,930,168	734,063	17,301,042	93,318,857	III.....	44,015,777	1,933,144	60,299,866	181,618,075
IV.....	5,984,666	544,963	4,811,869	44,360,234	IV.....	56,633,701	4,731,699	71,547,476	271,526,484
Total.....	58,038,372	4,096,321	62,564,723	276,080,374	Total.....	206,569,576	16,412,142	254,411,416	973,164,521
1962:					1968:				
II.....	53,598,165	3,808,807	59,902,255	172,145,655	II.....	115,435,557	9,439,258	124,710,821	589,879,359
III.....	16,179,899	1,574,325	22,918,036	137,608,002	III.....	53,402,073	2,083,550	73,651,480	197,044,324
IV.....	6,790,407	761,738	5,016,425	53,223,694	IV.....	75,101,095	8,008,485	104,135,535	436,341,013
Total.....	76,568,471	6,144,870	87,836,716	362,977,351	Total.....	243,938,725	19,531,293	302,497,836	1,223,264,696
1963:					Grand total for				
II.....	64,633,811	4,947,881	74,294,639	198,414,452	11 years.....	1,201,121,861	92,342,683	1,410,191,439	5,801,189,361
III.....	21,327,573	2,531,098	31,016,477	180,181,967					
IV.....	8,305,410	1,133,305	6,264,678	66,577,091					
Total.....	94,266,794	8,612,284	111,575,794	445,173,510					

Source: The American Petroleum Institute.

"BURIED TREASURE" SPLIT
(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Desolate mountains of northwest Colorado and adjoining areas in Utah and Wyoming are being described as covering "one of the greatest deposits of potential energy on the face of the globe."

Under these mountains, according to the September issue of Reader's Digest, lies "Biggest Buried Treasure on Earth." Source of the

Digest Article is the Kansas City Star of Aug. 15, 1971.

Oil shale in the three states, the Star reported, via the Digest, is regarded as a potential source of riches for the United States Treasury. It could yield the federal government, the article reports, "according to one conjecture," royalties amounting to \$275 million a year.

If and when a way is found to produce oil economically from this rich shale deposit,

Colorado, Utah and Wyoming will receive 37½ per cent of the federal government's revenue from its share in the deposit. That is, if existing law continues in effect.

Now, to face reality and present facts rather than conjecture.

The United States Treasury during fiscal year 1971 (the year which ended June 30) received more than \$159 million in royalties from oil and gas produced from the Outer Continental Shelf. Submerged lands in the

Gulf of Mexico off Louisiana produced more than 90 per cent of this revenue.

There is a possibility that the Outer Continental Shelf royalty yield to the federal government for the single year may exceed \$380 million. More than \$221 million of 1971 offshore revenue is held in an escrow fund pending final settlement of hearings by courts and masters to establish the exact contour of the Louisiana coast.

Already the federal government received more than \$890 million in bonuses and rents

in 1970-71, all for leases off the Louisiana coast.

The total receipts by the U.S. from the Outer Continental Shelf for this most recent year then, may top \$1,272 billion.

What do Louisiana, Texas, California and other coastal states get from this really big buried treasure? To date, they've received exactly nothing.

Although it has yet to share in revenues from oil shale from federal lands that have not been placed in production, Wyoming re-

ceived \$18,792,266.71 from revenues produced in 1970 by other federal lands within its borders. The state deserved its share of those revenues. It provided many expensive services to make the inland federal lands productive.

Coastal states perform the same and possibly more services to make offshore federal lands productive. They deserve a fair share of the fruits of that production. Until the Congress acts to end inequity, the coastal states won't receive their just deserts.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF RECEIPTS, FISCAL YEAR 1955 THROUGH 1970

Year	Receipts			Total	Receipts			
	Bonuses, rent	Royalties	Escrow		Bonuses, rent	Royalties	Escrow	Total
1955	\$142,404,630.48	0	\$12,217,134.37	\$154,621,764.85	\$5,870,970.00	\$10,620,439.52	\$135,904,544.80	\$152,395,954.32
1956	111,171,041.53	\$52,814.63	26,518,518.78	137,742,374.94	42,223,700.64	11,246,201.92	89,032,099.84	142,502,002.40
	¹ (57,434,228.69)	¹ (1,656.94)	57,435,885.63		161,893,155.47	86,424,061.11	(39,552,372.76)	208,764,843.82
1957	1,976,361.00	232,342.31	10,968,890.58	13,178,593.89	596,202,951.97	41,107,770.26	148,129,983.44	785,440,705.67
1958	2,630,090.41	830,760.69	12,208,498.48	15,669,349.58	903,330,950.83	57,935,108.40	121,497,143.09	1,082,763,202.32
1959	1,145,720.00	2,266,484.40	20,418,121.35	23,830,325.75	² 350,194,610.43	78,083,889.47	285,633,591.37	713,912,091.57
1960	226,616,838.22	2,839,980.97	172,265,367.50	401,722,186.69	73,280,497.60	¹ 113,580,953.89	146,947,619.87	333,809,072.36
1961	1,716,161.23	5,588,525.60	43,762,875.15	51,067,561.98	890,634,479.13	159,914,891.13	221,707,956.30	1,272,257,326.56
1962	6,006,921.00	5,605,230.15	498,586,287.97	510,198,439.12				
1963	359,370,525.43	7,443,921.55	(229,540,465.57)	137,273,981.41				
Total					3,819,235,376.68	583,771,719.06	1,734,142,678.49	6,137,149,774.23

¹GAO adjustment taken from general fund and placed in escrow.
²Includes transfers to land and water conservation fund: 1969, \$126,783,300.34; 1970, \$107,882,204.45.

Source: Bureau of Land Management.

FED OIL TAKE UP, STATE SHARE DOWN
 (By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Back in 1955, five years before the United States Supreme Court held that Louisiana's historic boundary extended three miles from its coast, this state collected \$44,212,534.53 in bonuses from its submerged lands. Sixteen years later, in 1970, the state's bonuses collections from its submerged lands had dropped to \$1,581,773.07—a decrease of more than 30 to 1.

During the same period the United States Treasury's collections from bonuses from federal lands off Louisiana's coast jumped from \$100,091,262.93 to \$948,601,798.06—up more than nine to one.

Knowledgeable operators in the petroleum industry credit several developments to the sharp rise in receipts from federal lands off Louisiana and to decreases in receipts from state submerged lands.

1. Improvement in technology is permitting the drilling of deep wells far off the coast that would have been considered impossible several years ago.

2. Producers prefer to develop fields in offshore federal lands because oil and gas from

those areas pay no severance tax and no sales tax is levied on supplies and materials used in operations beyond the three-mile limit. Testimony has been presented in public hearings that 6 per cent state and local sales taxes would have yielded more than \$438,000 per year had this total tax been collected on food and beverages alone used on Louisiana offshore rigs and platforms in 1970. Sales tax on pipe, cement, mud and other materials used in the offshore operations, according to estimates, would have yielded another \$22,000,000 in the same year.

The total severance tax which would have been paid, at the Louisiana rates, had this levy been collected on oil, condensate, casinghead gas and natural gas produced between 1958 through 1968 from the Outer Continental Shelf beyond Louisiana's boundary would have amounted to a minimum of \$397,356,668.42.

The net result has been that the U.S. Treasury's total interest in production of minerals from the Outer Continental Shelf—bonuses, rents and royalties—has mounted from about \$154.6 million in 1955 to more than \$6,137.1 million in 1971.

During the same time Louisiana's income

from submerged lands has produced a total of about one-sixth of the federal receipts.

Louisiana's income from royalties on the state's inland minerals deposits rose each year for many years until 1970, when these receipts dropped from \$102,013,241.15 to \$99,632,735.92.

As production from offshore federal lands has increased, the state of Louisiana to make possible this production also has increased.

However, under existing federal law, the United States does not compensate the state for any part of the cost of these expensive services—education, police protection, highway construction and maintenance and others.

Twenty-six states in 1970 received from the U.S. Bureau of Land Management 37½ per cent of receipts from production from federal lands within those states. Coastal states received nothing from receipts of production from federal lands off those states.

They will continue to receive nothing until existing law is amended by the Congress to treat offshore federal lands in the same manner that inshore federal lands are treated today.

REVENUE FROM OIL AND GAS MINERAL LEASES ON STATE LANDS

Year	Inland			Submerged lands			Total
	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	
1945	\$2,574,762.51	\$591,831.21	\$834,092.23	0	0	\$634,997.65	\$4,635,683.60
1946	3,298,980.40	421,136.06	981,088.10	0	\$229,381.07	4,854,612.66	9,785,198.29
1947	5,141,146.63	680,843.39	1,823,995.51	0	2,275,598.96	8,676,522.50	18,598,106.99
1948	8,066,882.20	572,495.27	6,242,296.39	\$32,524.05	5,573,630.90	11,866,374.91	32,354,203.72
1949	8,837,096.92	941,068.94	2,456,750.42	273,813.89	7,663,728.14	0	19,372,458.31
1950	9,218,156.91	1,090,123.85	4,220,646.76	941,800.10	3,941,764.07	1,340,590.04	20,753,081.73
1951	11,508,659.90	1,122,356.59	3,947,828.61	319,958.62	867,455.32	4,087,286.41	21,853,545.45
1952	12,708,412.88	862,593.87	6,046,357.29	136,889.94	1,026,868.99	8,933,573.02	29,714,695.99
1953	13,638,787.90	1,063,870.63	7,028,049.18	3,576,812.09	1,300,175.70	3,766,110.49	30,373,805.99
1954	17,103,753.91	1,254,127.24	9,650,516.90	3,983,146.41	2,091,481.25	36,302,875.08	70,385,900.79
1955	18,652,338.11	1,440,242.50	44,564,388.17	5,839,622.82	1,553,068.66	44,212,534.53	116,262,194.79
1956	20,794,063.39	1,654,620.99	46,784,657.04	6,342,201.65	1,260,145.11	15,951,511.75	92,787,189.93
1957	35,083,879.29	2,677,982.47	24,988,764.23	13,167,241.45	941,054.47	1,522,310.47	78,381,232.38
1958	30,022,757.15	1,643,532.21	13,243,909.22	10,160,215.10	348,777.47	0	55,419,191.15
1959	40,657,718.13	668,979.73	24,106,967.16	13,129,934.42	168,952.93	47,459,266.67	126,191,819.04
1960	39,400,679.41	1,189,417.93	11,267,698.77	13,094,525.06	302,978.60	850,000.00	66,105,335.77
1961	44,494,831.45	1,253,895.68	6,787,951.96	13,299,765.12	72,112.66	10,265,223.61	76,173,780.48
1962	51,487,656.87	479,355.07	10,436,750.62	18,593,278.71	205,819.08	6,641,701.95	87,850,562.30
1963	56,672,037.78	1,043,191.68	34,477,333.71	15,901,028.50	449,098.52	832,360.00	109,375,050.19
1964	58,799,759.36	982,220.16	21,838,107.81	17,445,071.41	468,635.52	13,142,149.44	112,675,943.68
1965	63,029,409.25	2,079,919.00	22,732,440.88	21,787,067.72	628,656.31	7,768,949.00	118,036,442.16
1966	71,267,105.68	1,166,962.66	14,243,497.51	44,610,478.52	857,674.43	21,996,887.30	154,142,606.10
1967	86,341,690.05	1,041,282.64	8,555,217.57	32,945,913.61	630,282.76	6,450,679.94	135,965,066.57
1968	95,098,223.79	1,055,460.23	14,145,477.97	34,992,621.35	575,557.31	4,241,395.13	150,108,735.78
1969	102,013,241.15	1,294,697.44	12,886,377.69	37,516,328.02	717,061.51	1,840,471.16	156,268,176.97
1970	99,632,735.92	1,044,301.61	6,426,423.02	38,276,035.03	367,510.67	1,581,778.07	147,323,684.41
Total	1,004,754,756.94	29,316,509.05	360,717,584.72	346,367,200.59	34,517,479.48	265,220,161.78	2,040,893,692.56

Source: Table by register of state land office for Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

SHELF OIL STAKES RISE
(By George W. Healy Jr.)

Because Louisiana pioneered in production of offshore oil, its citizens probably have a greater appreciation of the potential of the Outer Continental Shelf as a major source of energy than have residents of other states.

This appreciation in other states, particularly coastal states, we predict, soon will grow rapidly. Interest of these states in this production will be stimulated by proliferation of offshore exploration and development activity. This activity already has spread to Alaska, the Pacific and Atlantic coasts and the Great Lakes; and the spread apparently has just started.

The reason?

Since 1958 production of offshore oil has increased more rapidly in the free world than has production of onshore oil.

ONSHORE OIL

1958—15 million barrels per day
1970—30 million barrels per day

OFFSHORE OIL

1958—8 million barrels per day
1970—7.6 million barrels per day

These figures from the trade publication Offshore News reflect that in 1970 20.1 per cent of the free world's oil came from offshore operations. In 1960, according to this publication, 83 rigs were working offshore. In 1970, 309 rigs were working offshore.

Offshore oil wells drilled in the United States in 1970 were distributed: Alaska 19; California 146; Louisiana 838; Texas 60.

In other areas, offshore wells drilled in 1970 were distributed: Africa 30; Middle East 55; Mediterranean 4; Europe 56; Southeast Asia and Pacific 131; Latin America 475.

The North American total, including Canada, was 1,007 offshore wells.

Both official and private sources predict continued growth of offshore petroleum production. The Energy Policy Staff of the United States Department of the Interior is on record as saying: "The entire continental shelf bordering the U.S. is composed of sedimentary deposits favorable for the occurrence of petroleum."

The National Petroleum Council earlier reported to the President of the U.S., "The entire continental shelf area of the U.S., comprising 278,000 square miles, may be considered prospective petroleum province."

Already, of course, preservationists and ecologists are questioning wisdom of the offshore exploration and production program. Several of them were very vocal in their opposition at a hearing held Sept. 13 at

Montauk, N.Y. A panel, sponsored by the New York Ocean Science Laboratory, expressed confidence that energy fuels may be recovered safely and without ecological damage to beaches of Long Island and other areas in that part of the Atlantic coast.

Improved techniques for finding oil and for eliminating spills which already have been used in the Gulf of Mexico, we are confident, will meet the ecologists' objections.

The growth of demand for energy, already acute in practically every section of the U.S., in our opinion, will necessitate development of offshore fields in practically all waters adjacent to coastal states.

This, obviously, will extend to many other states a condition which in Louisiana is becoming more aggravated every day. With each increase in offshore activity in the Gulf of Mexico, demands on the state to provide expensive governmental services for the offshore workers and their families increases.

Today the coastal states receive nothing from the federal government to compensate them for providing services which make possible rich production from offshore federal lands. Until federal law is changed to share revenues from offshore federal lands in the same manner that revenues from inshore federal lands are shared, discrimination against coastal states will persist.

Wyoming and 25 other states received 37½ per cent of the revenues produced from federal lands in those states in 1970. California, Texas and Louisiana received no part of the revenues produced from federal lands off their coasts.

STATE "OIL POPULATION" UP

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

During the past two decades parishes of Louisiana which touch the Gulf of Mexico and contiguous sounds have grown in population at a rate far exceeding that of the remainder of the state.

These eight parishes between 1950 and 1960 had a population gain of 44.8 per cent. In the 1960-70 period their aggregate gain was at a rate of 138.4 per cent.

Total Louisiana population grew 21.4 per cent between 1950 and 1960 and 9.4 per cent between 1960 and 1970.

A major factor in this growth along the coast was an increase in exploration for and production of oil, gas, sulphur, salt and other minerals off Louisiana.

The eight coastal parishes had a population of 293,757 in 1950 and 1,014,372 in 1970. Of the 720,615 additional residents, a substantial number work on drilling rigs and

platforms off the coast, build or maintain exploration and drilling equipment at marinas or in bays or canals which connect with the coast, operate boats or aircraft which supply the offshore operators with food, machinery and other materials or perform other services required for production of revenues from federal offshore lands.

Educating children of these new residents, providing access roads to permit them to get to boats and helicopters which supply offshore needs, protecting homes and business property necessary for successful operation beyond the coast and providing other essential services have cost the State of Louisiana many millions of dollars.

Revenues from federal offshore lands received by the United States government have amounted to about \$6 billion.

None of these revenues has been shared with Louisiana, whose services have made their production possible.

By contrast, the federal government shares with 26 states revenues which it receives from federal lands within those states. Twenty-five states receive 37½ per cent; Alaska receives 90 per cent.

This, in our opinion, is obvious discrimination.

If Wyoming received, as it did, \$18,792,266.71 as its share of revenues produced from federal lands within that state, Louisiana—by right—was entitled to a fair share of the revenues produced from federal lands off its coasts.

Wyoming's population in 1970 of 332,416 was approximately 700,000 less than the population of Louisiana's eight parishes which touch the Gulf of Mexico and contiguous sounds. Wyoming's population probably was less than the number of Louisianians who contributed directly to the more than \$1 billion produced in fiscal 1971 for the federal treasury from offshore federal lands.

Wyoming earned, in our opinion, every penny that it received from federal lands revenues. Louisiana, we insist, deserves a substantial share of the revenues which its services made possible from federal offshore lands.

This state and other coastal states will not receive their just deserts until the Congress of the United States enacts legislation providing for the sharing with adjacent states of revenues from offshore federal lands in the same manner that revenues from onshore federal lands are shared with inland states.

Coastal states will receive just treatment only after this legislation becomes law.

	1950	1960	Growth (percent)	1970	Growth (percent)
Louisiana total	2,683,516	3,257,022	21.4	3,564,310	9.4
Coastal parishes:					
Cameron	6,244	6,909	10.7	7,685	11.2
Jefferson	103,873	208,769	100.9	688,774	229.9
Lafourche	42,209	55,381	31.2	67,652	22.2
Plaquemines	14,239	22,545	58.3	24,700	9.6
St. Bernard	11,087	32,186	190.3	50,729	57.6
St. Mary	35,848	48,833	36.2	59,559	21.9
Terrebonne	43,328	60,771	40.3	73,343	20.7
Vermilion	36,929	38,855	5.2	21,930	7.9
8-parish total	293,757	425,416	44.8	1,014,372	138.4

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. FUQUA, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SIKES, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today,

to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPENCE, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) to address the House and to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOGGS, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL to revise and extend his remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PELY in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BEGICH in five instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. BRINKLEY in two instances.

Mr. BARING in three instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the study entitled "International Cooperation in Outer Space: A Symposium" as a Senate document; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1228. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the current status of the Government's helium program, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 167; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1229. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on donations received and allocations made from the fund "14X8563 Funds Contributed for Advancement of Indian Race, Bureau of Indian Affairs" during fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 451; to the Committee on Interior and Insular 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. BOLLING: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 661. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7248. A bill to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts dealing with higher education (Report No. 92-588). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 11420. A bill to provide for the prevention of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 439. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 50,000 additional copies of the subcommittee print of the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, entitled "A Primer on Money"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 936. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the first week in March of each year as "National Beta Club Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

278. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a national wildlife refuge for south San Francisco Bay, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

149. The SPEAKER presented a petition of D. E. Leveque, Sheboygan, Wis., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 26, 1971

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D. offered the following prayer:

"O God of love, O King of peace,
Make wars throughout the world to cease;

The wrath of sinful man restrain:
Give peace, O God, give peace again!
"Whom shall we trust but Thee, O Lord?
Where rest but on Thy faithful word?
None ever called on Thee in vain:
Give peace, O God, give peace again!"

—HENRY W. BAKER.

As we have remembered with thanksgiving the veterans of the Nation's wars, may we now firmly resolve to bring in the generation of peace. May all who serve here and in all other areas of the Government, all who serve in churches and universities, in business and the profes-

sions, and in every vocation of our common life, concert their best efforts to adjudicate all internal and international conflicts by peaceful methods to bring the era of peace. Grant us peace of mind and soul that our service may be a blessing to our children and their children's children.

We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 20, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 22, 1971, received the following message from the President of the United States:

The nominations of Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; and William H. Rehnquist, of Arizona, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore, on today, October 26, 1971, laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, received on October 22, 1971, submitting the nominations of Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Virginia, and William H. Rehnquist, of Arizona, to be Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, which nominations were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 20, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 21, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7072) to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to further clarify the intent of Congress as to priorities for air-