

ond amendment by Mr. CRANSTON, amendment No. 685, the excise-tax-on-automobiles amendment. It will be made the pending question. A time limitation of 2 hours has been agreed to with respect to that amendment.

Following the disposition of the Cranston amendment—No. 685—on Wednesday, the Senate will proceed to consider the second amendment by Mr. HARRIS, the combined DISC and foreign corporation tax amendment—in other words, the old Gore amendment—on which there is a time limitation of 1 hour.

An agreement has been entered into with respect to the so-called political contributions amendment, with a limitation of 6 hours on the amendment. That amendment will be called up on Wednesday at some point.

Mr. President, there will be rollcall votes tomorrow. It is certainly hoped that the Senate will complete its consideration of the unfinished business on Wednesday. Of course, there will be rollcall votes on Wednesday as well. There will be a long day tomorrow and a long day on Wednesday.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the majority whip yield for one further observation?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In the cases where reference has been made to numbered printed amendments, the Senators are on

notice and can understand what is going to be taken up and can prepare themselves for the debate. In several instances, as the majority whip has indicated the reference has not been to a printed numbered amendment but has been identified with a description, which is helpful. But I would hope that perhaps tomorrow—I am thinking now of the so-called political contribution amendment, whatever that is—we could have something more definite as to what the amendment is, so that Senators could have notice and be able to prepare themselves.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the point that has been made by the distinguished assistant Republican leader is well taken. Certainly, Mr. President, we are operating a little in the dark by virtue of the fact that we are unable to identify all amendments by number.

I think it can be explained by the fact that we are up against somewhat of a deadline, and that we hope to complete our work here on "must" legislation by December 1. In order to expedite the action on the unfinished business as early as possible, we are attempting to get time limitations on the various amendments.

Some amendments to which I have referred are printed, I am positive. For example, the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the combined DISC and foreign corporation tax

amendment, is a printed amendment, I am informed by the Senator. I do not have the number.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Perhaps tomorrow we will be better able to identify them.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Perhaps tomorrow we can do so. I hope we can. I join in the remarks of the distinguished assistant Republican leader with respect to the importance of identifying the amendments by number where possible.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 16, 1971, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 15, 1971:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

H. Guyford Stever, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years, vice William David McElroy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESS ANGRY OVER U.N. ACTIONS

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the press in the First Georgia District, as well as over the Nation, is fighting mad over the recent failures of the United Nations and the declining influence of the United States.

In strong editorials the papers denounce the U.N.'s ousting of Nationalist China, the joyous face-slapping of the United States, the failure of 15 nations to have the fortitude to vote, the dumping of the U.N.'s major expenses on the United States, and the general ineptness of the United States in foreign matters.

The value of the following three editorials in giving a cross section of the mood of the people in my area, is most evident.

The Savannah Press of October 27, 1971, in an editorial entitled "Appalling Decision" said:

The appalling decision of the United Nations to cast out Taiwan should lead the United States to reconsider its role in that organization.

What good can the U.S. accomplish if its members are going to defy the very principles on which the body was founded?

The General Assembly's action was nothing more than capitulation to the Communist Chinese regime which demanded Taiwan's ouster as a price for acceptance of membership in the U.N.

This action was taken despite the fact that Taiwan has observed the U.N.'s rules and Peking has observed none of them.

Is Communist Chinese membership really all that important to the other nations of the world?

At the present time, the United States pays 35 per cent of the expense of maintaining the U.N., an expense hardly justified when the organization bows and scrapes to a Communist nation that has engaged in war against the United Nations and is behind most of the conflict under way in the world.

If Red China is so very important to the U.N., then Red China and those governments which believe in its being essential to the UN should begin to pay the freight now borne by American taxpayers.

Some may argue that because Communist China has a tremendous population, Peking should be in the U.N. Well, what about Taiwan, which has a population larger than that of many U.N. members? Why shouldn't the people of Taiwan be represented?

The outcome in the General Assembly, which was a crushing defeat for the so-called Two-China Policy, smacks suspiciously of a contrived deal by the United States, and it is only fair to ask if the Nixon Administration has provided the proper support for an ally who supported us in vote after vote.

We will get none of that support from Peking. Quite the opposite. With the entrance of Peking as a replacement for a staunch ally, the influence of the United States in the U.N. is now but a wane echo of what it was at the U.N.'s birth.

Other allies of the U.S. may well wonder if the day is coming when Washington will pull the carpet from under them as well. We have done ourselves no honor, and the U.N. has done itself even less.

The Dublin Courier-Herald of October 28, 1971, carried an editorial entitled

"Take a New Look at the Sun," as follows:

Almost since its inception, this country has underwritten the operation of the UN as far as finances are concerned. There are many of the larger nations who take active parts in the UN but refuse to contribute anything but a mere token contribution to the expenses of the world body.

In the past this country has picked up the tab in the naive belief that the UN served as a place for the exchange of ideas and was thus a valuable organization to have around.

But we are a bit weary of being "used" by the nations who make up the United Nations. There are far too many who are active, voting members who do not have as many people as most of the states in this nation.

The two votes this week, one expelling Taiwan and the other admitting Red China to UN membership, demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that most UN nations no longer look to us for leadership. To them all we have become is a big, bumbling, simpleminded giant who can be banded from pillar to post and stripped of its wealth to support every scheme they can conceive.

For our part, we are ready to support the UN in the exact ratio of our vote to every other country's vote. After all, this nation through Supreme Court decisions is committed to the idea of one-man-one-vote. Why not in the United Nations when it comes to financially supporting the operations of that body?

We must admit that our foreign policies have been amateurish and ineffective. Our efforts to buy friends with foreign aid and non-repayment loans have made us persona non grata to many nations, even those whose very existence today was made possible by sacrifices of American lives and millions of dollars in aid for reconstruction, all in one debt.

Thus we think this nation should reevaluate its financial support of a group that has placed itself over overwhelmingly the basic concepts of government that we believe in.

And we also think it is time for the Congress and the Administration to stand up and demand rather than following the pollyannaish policies we have followed since World War II. If we are as great and powerful as we are, let's act like it.

The Augusta Chronicle of October 28, 1971, in an editorial entitled "An Odd Situation," had this to say:

In the wake of the infamous decision by United Nations delegates to throw out a peaceful, law-abiding founding member and replace it with an outlaw nation, a very strange paradox develops.

On one hand, Free China, in the words of President Chiang Kai-shek, will "continue to be guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter."

On the other, the usurping Peking regime, although now in, will work against everything the UN was supposed to stand for. This is not opinion, but a realistic look at facts. The Associated Press, an objective news-gathering organization, states in a dispatch without qualification the obvious fact that the Mao dictatorship undertakes its UN "role while promoting 'people's wars' against regimes that fall to fit Peking's notions of ideological acceptability." Not "has promoted," mind you, but "while promoting"—a realization by hardheaded AP observers that this anti-peace process is due to continue while Chinese Communists hypocritically talk about peace in the UN deliberations.

The Associated Press appraisal of facts also noted that Red China is in a position "to wield a paralyzing veto over whatever peace-making efforts the Security Council might seek."

And it concluded that "there is a good chance that Peking will demand drastic restructuring of the UN and its agencies on the complaint that the poor nations are under-represented." The poor nations referred to also happen to be in many cases those in which Communist subversion has made them puppets—a fact that helped get the Republic of China thrown out in favor of Mao's gang. And their "under-representation" consists of each, no matter how small and lacking in its contribution to UN effectiveness, having the same vote as the United States, Britain, France and other major nations.

Maybe if Mao "restructures" sufficiently, he can get two votes each for Albania, Algeria and Cuba, as compared to the United States' one.

SCHOOL BUSING BECOMES A NATIONAL ISSUE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me quite significant that a large, liberal, Eastern newspaper, the New York Times, in a headline almost entirely across a page, has proclaimed that forced school busings have become a national issue. The Times article has pointed out that the issue has become a national one "primarily because this year, for the first time, a substantial number of urban school districts outside the South were faced with school desegregation plans, many of them requiring additional busing." The forced school

busing problem is spreading throughout the country.

It is interesting to note that not only outraged parents—many blacks as well as whites—in the North as well as in the South, are angry over having their children forcibly bused away from their neighborhood schools, but also even a number of civil rights leaders have spoken out against forced busing, which represents a loss of freedom in America.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD the text of the New York Times article to which I refer. I hope that all who see it will give active support to House Joint Resolution 620, of which I am one of the sponsors. This resolution would initiate action to restore to the American people a part of the freedom which unwise judicial decree has taken away from them.

The article follows:

SCHOOL BUSING BECOMES A NATIONAL ISSUE THAT MAY AFFECT 1972 PRESIDENTIAL RACE

(By John Herbers)

The busing of schoolchildren to achieve integration has emerged this fall as a national political issue.

Busing, which was formerly of interest largely in the South and border states, has become a factor and (sic) school board contests now under way in a number of Northern, and Western cities.

In Philadelphia, for example, both the Democratic and Republican nominees for Mayor in the November general election have come out strongly against a State Human Relations Commission order calling for integration that would require much additional busing.

Nationally, there is a consensus among political leaders that busing could have a significant impact on next year's Presidential race, particularly in some of the Democratic primaries. There is disagreement, however, about how important the busing issues will be.

The issue has become a national one primarily because this year, for the first time, a substantial number of urban school districts outside the South were faced with school desegregation plans, many of them requiring additional busing.

Before schools opened, President Nixon gave the issue prominence with a public statement opposing busing "simply for the sake of busing."

Democrats who are traveling the country as contenders or possible contenders for the Presidency have been asked at almost every stop to state their stand on busing, along with a number of other issues ranging from the economy to drugs.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie's recent experiences with the issues in California and Tennessee point up part of what is involved. Senator Muskie, who is considered the front-running candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, was asked about the issue on Sept. 7 in San Francisco, which was under court order to implement additional busing.

ORDER OPPOSED

The order was opposed by parents of Chinese and white pupils; and Mayor Joseph L. Alioto, a candidate for re-election this year, had added his voice to the opposition.

Senator Muskie voiced distaste for the busing of children to desegregate schools, but he sharply criticized President Nixon for asking Congress to prohibit the use of Federal funds to acquire buses.

He added that until the nation integrated housing patterns, "we're going to have to rely on busing to some extent to deal with the problem."

The comments did not stir much reaction in California, but when he appeared in Chattanooga later in the month and said essentially the same thing, with more emphasis on the need for busing, a number of Tennessee Democrats said that he killed his chances of winning the Presidential primary there next spring.

Tennessee Democrats, seeking a centrist candidate for next year, were reported to have tentatively chosen Senator Muskie to address a party fund-raising dinner in Nashville Nov. 18, but to have changed their minds after the Senator's Chattanooga statement, made in response to questions at a news conference.

"Muskie's appearance would have been totally successful," said Lieut. Gov. Frank Gorell, "if he had not expressed himself on the busing question."

What the Senator said was this:

"All I can tell you is my view of busing and its relationship to the chief objective, which is to break down inequality of educational opportunity in this country. That is a wrong that must be righted. It's a wrong that's ingrained in our educational system, and to right it is going to require the use of means that are not always going to be comfortable, and we must face that as well.

"The courts have told us that busing is a way, and a legitimate way, and in many cases the only way to get at that wrong. So I don't think we ought to exclude it as a tool for doing just that."

Later, the Senator said that what all Americans wanted was "mobility" and that that was what blacks did not have. To deal with that, "we must from time to time use uncomfortable means that put us to inconvenience, that impose burdens, create risks and fears; but if we just are content to remain frozen in our present inequities all we do is exacerbate the problem," he said.

The issue has boiled up in Tennessee because of an integration order imposed this fall in Nashville and is not as likely to be as heated in other states. But it is an important issue in Florida, where Senator Muskie and other liberals hope to make a good showing early next year, and in some of the other primary states.

Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama, who is expected to be an independent candidate for President next year, has indicated that he will run his campaign chiefly on an anti-busing program, contending that President Nixon "talks one way and acts another" and that all the Democratic candidates favor busing.

There is a wider range of opinion among Democrats than Governor Wallace suggests. Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, who is looking to the Florida primary to establish his candidacy, has said he favors busing if it enhances educational opportunity, does not impose hardships on the children and is not arbitrarily ordered. On a swing through North Carolina he left the impression that he opposed busing, at least in some degree.

"He is generally opposed to busing for busing's sake," said a spokesman for Senator Jackson. "He finds it a national issue. He runs into it in Seattle, and in San Francisco and the Northeast it is as validly an issue as in the South."

Representative Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has said in his travels around the country that he opposes busing to achieve racial balance. Mr. Mills is reported to be gaining strength in Tennessee and other Southern states because of this stand.

Senators Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma and George McGovern of South Dakota, who are announced candidates for the Democratic nomination, and Birch Bayh of Indiana, Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota and Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, who are con-

sidered possible candidates, are less equivocal than either Senators Jackson or Muskie in their support of busing as one tool to achieve equal education. They do not believe busing will be a major issue next year.

Senator McGovern has said he does not believe busing would have been a national issue this year if President Nixon had not made his statement against during the summer.

It is such an emotional issue, however, that liberals seldom bring it up themselves. Senators Walter F. Mondale, Democrat of Minnesota, and Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, were among the few liberals who spoke out voluntarily in favor of busing after President Nixon's statement.

On the other hand, a number of civil rights advocates have spoken out against busing. Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, the Republican Senate whip, said in urging the Justice Department to intervene in court cases against busing:

"I am deeply concerned that forced busing solely for the purpose of achieving racial balance is counterproductive. Instead of helping in the effort to promote better race relations, it is resulting in more bitterness and more polarization."

How important an issue busing will be next year depends, some officials believe, on how much of it the courts order next fall.

On the other hand, they add, busing is an emotional issue that peaks in a city just before a busing order is carried out and then diminishes, as has happened many times in the South. By election time, they say, the issue may have declined in Tennessee and emerged elsewhere.

GOVERNOR MILLIKEN'S DECISION AN APPEAL TO REASON

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent controversial ruling by a U.S. district court with regard to the integration of Detroit public schools raised widespread concern over a number of fundamental questions. One of the most important of these derives from the court's suggestion that the busing of students across school district lines may be an appropriate remedy. To date the Supreme Court has upheld integration plans involving the use of busing within a single school district only. In order to obtain a full and complete review by higher Federal courts on this issue, Gov. William G. Milliken has announced that he will order a State appeal of the district court's decision as soon as it is finalized to insure that no new plan goes into effect until the Supreme Court has had the opportunity to examine its legality. The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., in a thoughtful editorial appearing November 7, 1971, supports the Governor's action and the need to encourage the rule of reason in this highly emotional issue, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

MILLIKEN'S DECISION AN APPEAL TO REASON

Like a small brush fire which suddenly becomes a raging inferno, the school busing integration issue has erupted in anger, shouting and fear. Reason, temporarily at least, seems to have gone out the window.

Sparkling what has become a frenzied controversy in Michigan was a ruling by U.S.

District Judge Stephen J. Roth that the Detroit public schools become racially segregated because of both official action and inaction. In both Detroit and Grand Rapids, one suggested remedy is court-ordered busing across school district lines.

Such an order, if it is given, would raise legal questions still untested by the U.S. Supreme Court in previous school bus integration rulings.

Because of the storm of controversy on the proposed crossing of district lines, Gov. William G. Milliken last week announced that he will order a state appeal of Roth's decision when it is finalized.

The governor, we believe, has made a reasoned and sensible decision in an attempt to restore some calm to a dispute which has caused an almost irrational drawing of battle lines and in which a crescendo of political shouting is drowning out common sense.

The issue involved in the Detroit dispute not only involves integration and methods of achieving this goal, but also concerns the independence of local school districts and future methods of state financing of schools.

If a cross-busing decision is made across school district lines it would indeed be a landmark ruling, one which would affect every major school district in the nation. The governor in reality is only asking that such a decision be given a full judicial review all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In view of the Grand Rapids test case and others likely to arise, a Supreme Court appeal is almost certain in any event and Gov. Milliken has decided to take that step now because the state of Michigan is a defendant in the Detroit case.

We do not accept the shallow accusations being made by a few who are calling the governor a bigot, a racist and worse. Gov. Milliken is no racist and those making the charges are only pouring gasoline on the flames by such a tactic.

We also agree with the governor that any effort to prohibit all busing is wrong since that is going to another extreme and could scuttle much progress already made in integrating schools.

Some reasoned solutions must be found to bring about equal educational opportunity. It is correct and sensible, however, that these solutions, when they present wholly new concepts, be decided by the nation's highest legal tribunal.

We believe that was the reasoning behind the governor's announcement, and we support it.

HAVE PLANT, WILL TRAVEL—THE MULTINATIONAL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the administration finally has recognized America's precarious position in the international trade market and taken some steps to alleviate the unfair competition now faced by the American industry and its workers. The 10-percent import surcharge is evidence of that.

However, there is another facet of the trade problem which is attracting ever increasing public attention. I refer to the multinational corporation which, for one reason or another, locates in countries throughout the world and produces goods there for sale here.

The November issue of Steel Labor contains an interesting article on these

globe-circling firms. It states the number of U.S. affiliates abroad has skyrocketed from 10,000 in 1957 to 25,000 today. The direct investment of U.S. firms abroad has doubled in the decade from 1960 to 1970 from \$31.9 billion to \$77.4 billion. The price the United States has paid for this "Have Plant, Will Travel" shift is some 400,000 jobs, according to Steel Labor's story.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the article for the RECORD, and call it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From Steel Labor, November, 1971]

HAVE PLANT, WILL TRAVEL—THE MULTINATIONAL

On Oct. 31 and Nov. 1, as this issue of Steel Labor goes to press, the first worldwide conference of unions in the nickel industry is being held in Lausanne, Switzerland, sponsored by the International Metalworkers Federation in response to a suggestion by the United Steelworkers of America. Earlier this year, union leaders from 19 nations gathered in London to draw up a basic plan for collective bargaining in the worldwide auto industry.

Such international labor conferences can be expected to increase in frequency in the future. Why? Because the rapid rise of the multinational corporation—the company with holdings in two or up to two dozen or more countries—today confronts members of the USWA and all of organized labor with what well may be the most serious threat since the very inception of the trade union movement. This development, involving tremendous economic concentration at the same time that these corporations are spreading out over the world poses these grave problems:

1. For workers, a threat to existing wages and working conditions, as well as the very existence of their jobs.

2. For governments, founded upon the principle that elected officials represent the interests of the people, threat to their ability to carry out that political and social responsibility.

Time and again in recent years, USWA President I. W. Abel and other labor leaders have warned against the growth of conglomerates—widely diversified corporations operating in a variety of unrelated industries. To meet the serious difficulties in negotiating with such companies, unions increasingly have turned to coordinated collective bargaining.

If conglomerates are tough cookies with which to deal, however, multinational corporations may well prove to be even more so. Beyond their ability to endure lengthy shutdowns in any one segment of their operations, labor faces the additional threat that production at struck facilities may be shifted out of the country.

Both workers and government indeed have something to fear if some predictions are correct. Observers see fast-growing supercorporations becoming, in the near future, more powerful economically than all but the world's strongest nations. Howard V. Perlmutter of the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania is one who holds this viewpoint. "By 1985," he declares, "some 300 super-giants will dominate international business, producing more than half of the world's industrial output. The million-man company should not be unusual by the 1980s."

While many top international executives feel that this development will occur over the next 50 years, rather than the 15 years he projects, they generally share his predictions of the emergence of a global industrial system with huge "stateless worldwide firms"

having fantastic business volumes. Assuming that many will be joint ventures between Communist governments and companies of the so-called free world, Perlmutter believes that, by the 1980s, each will be doing from eight to 160 billion dollars' worth of business annually. The nearly 19 billion in total sales reported last year by General Motors, the largest U.S. manufacturer, would rank in the lower end of such a spectrum.

What makes possible the type of corporate internationalism he envisions is modern technology. Through today's methods of communication and transportation, capital, management, technical achievement, and skill are all readily transferrable from one country to another. And what makes that transfer desirable in the search for high and easy profits is the availability, in other countries, or material resources and especially of labor—at cut-rate prices. The fact is that the direct investment of U.S. firms abroad has doubled during one short decade, from \$31.9 billion in 1960 to \$77.4 billion last year. Foreign sales of U.S. affiliates in manufacturing alone totaled almost \$60 billion in 1968 and are estimated at between \$70 and \$75 billion in 1970, which is three times the figure at the beginning of the 1960s.

Since 1957, the number of U.S. affiliates abroad has skyrocketed from 10,000 to about 25,000. The degree of economic concentration that is taking place, however, is indicated by the additional fact that, during that period, the number of parent corporations controlling those foreign affiliates rose only from 2,800 to 3,500. Yet, figures on direct investment overseas tell only part of the story. Licensing and patent agreements with foreign producers also have grown, providing royalties and other advantages to the corporations, while depriving American workers of potential job opportunities. By 1968, some 800 American companies were reporting income from royalties and licensing fees paid by foreign concerns.

Out of the 200 biggest U.S. companies, 40 per cent are now doing one-fourth or more of their business in other countries. For some of these firms, the proportion of business abroad is as high as one-half. Corporations headquartered in other countries also, of course, are getting into the "multinational" game. Eighty of the 200 largest firms outside the U.S. also are doing 25 per cent or more of their business in foreign markets, and some foreign companies are establishing plants in the United States, often financing them with the extraordinary profits derived from low-wage exploitation in other areas. But the trend is mostly in the other direction. "By 1975, about 25 per cent of the approximately \$1 trillion Gross National Product of the rest of the free world will come from branches and subsidiaries of U.S. corporations, and some 35 per cent will be 'U.S. tinged'—that is, would be associated with either direct or portfolio investment by Americans," according to a "Fortune Magazine" report of a National Industrial Conference Board appraisal.

The reasons for this are far from mysterious. Beyond living standards and wage differentials between the U.S. and other countries, current tax laws provide special advantages for American businessmen who control factories overseas. Among those tax breaks is one exempting foreign subsidiaries from American taxes on their profits until those profits are repatriated back to the U.S., which may seldom occur. Patent policies, too, encourage the transfer of technology. Finally, multinational firms can juggle their bookkeeping, their prices and their taxes.

Notes an article on multinational corporations, entitled "New Breed of International Cat," in a recent issue of the IUD's "Viewpoint," "When they have perfected their product, they are able to move production anywhere, to take advantage of low wages,

benign governments, favorable tax laws, and any other factor that boosts profit. In effect, they have created an international economy of their own."

"The multinational," Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Legislation, told a Congressional subcommittee this summer, "is not simply an American company moving to a new locality where the same laws apply and where it is still within the jurisdiction of the Congress and the government of the United States. This is a runaway corporation, going far beyond our borders." Even Ellison L. Hazard, president and chairman of the Continental Can Company, itself an important international concern, has stated that tax and tariff and antitrust laws are inconsistent and discriminatory among the various countries of the world. "Tax havens abound. Fraudulent organizations, often operating with funds fleeced from trusting people, enjoy far-reaching immunity by operating from countries which have no meaningful regulations or supervision to restrict illicit operations, actions that bring disrepute upon private enterprise," he has said.

As the multinational corporations shift operations to areas of the world where living standards and wages are low, American jobs are lost in staggering numbers. Such production shifts have been responsible for U.S. firms eliminating some 400,000 American jobs between 1966 and 1969, the AFL-CIO estimates. Thus, American workers are denied many opportunities for producing goods for export to other countries, and, in many cases, goods imported into the U.S. are produced in factories abroad which are owned or controlled by American manufacturers. Organized labor maintains this is now true of about 25 per cent of all American imports. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated a theoretical loss in 1969 of 2.5 million jobs due to imports, of which almost two-thirds are in manufacturing.

A very large proportion of imported footwear is produced in American-owned factories abroad, according to George O. Fecteau, president of the United Shoe Workers of America. Yet, he continued, "it is sold in the American market at the same price it would command if it had been made here. Thus the cost differential between the low-wage foreign operation and the modest wages of American shoe workers becomes a profit differential for manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers. The consumer gets no share in it."

Nor can it be said that America's loss brings a proportionate gain to the lucky nations visited by the multinational corporations. They are in business to make profits, not to spread social advancement. By adroit management, multinational corporations escape obligations and elude government regulations in both their parent countries and the nations in which they operate as foreign entities. Yet their expansion has often been encouraged by governments. Since 1967, when the Mexican government launched a program to attract U.S. companies into that country, the number of such firms operating in the border area has jumped from 30 to about 250—mostly in the electronics and garment industries. These U.S.-owned plants were granted special Mexican tax breaks as well as a special tariff break from the U.S. government, but the wages paid to their workers range from 20 to 46 cents an hour.

Like conglomerates (and many of the multinationals are conglomerate corporations as well), the company with operations in several countries can shift its production emphasis at will, compounding labor's collective bargaining difficulties. In addition, a multinational corporation can almost be said to benefit from a strike if it produces abroad the same product, which it can sell at prices driven higher in world markets because of

the relative scarcity caused by the shut-down.

A huge conglomerate is but one example of a firm, with which the USWA has experience, that crosses both industry lines and national boundaries. Even a brief description of this family of companies, however, is enough to provide an indication of their growing economic power. Included is the eleventh largest steel company in the U.S. (58 per cent-owned by the corporation); the fourth largest aluminum producer in the world (39 per cent-owned); a cement and gypsum operation (37 per cent-owned); and aerospace and electronics, broadcasting, sand and gravel, and glass fiber operations (all wholly-owned by the conglomerate).

The aluminum and chemical operations alone are among the largest and most widespread in the world. Besides its major U.S. properties, scattered in 27 of the 50 states, this single branch of the conglomerate has its own or subsidiary bauxite mining properties in Jamaica, India, and Australia; primary aluminum production facilities in Germany, India, Ghana, Bahrain, Australia, and New Zealand; and aluminum fabricating plants in Brazil, Argentina, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, India, Thailand, Singapore, Korea, Japan, and Australia.

Herbert Maier, an official of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, has summed up how the multinationals often approach collective bargaining: "By conceiving profitability on a worldwide rather than a national basis, and by centralizing decision-making at their international headquarters, they tend to exploit established industrial relations systems at national levels."

"The following," he continued, "are some of the grounds on which difficulties have arisen in dealing with multinational companies: preconceived anti-trade union policies; foreign managers unaware of or ignoring established industrial relations procedures; difficulties in identifying the real center of decision making; threats dangled during negotiations to shift production to other countries; difficulties in finding out the profit situation of the company because of the practice of 'profit smoothening' or because of transfer of profits to low tax countries."

The rise of the multinational corporation, of course, is partially responsible for the import problem that has alarmed the entire American labor movement. To help combat the problem, labor is mobilizing support for the Burke-Hartke bill recently introduced in the Congress. This proposal would revise our trade rules and plug some of the tax loopholes and wipe out financial incentives that have encouraged U.S. companies to expand abroad.

Several other countries have begun to react to the multinational threat. Certain of them now require that majority control companies operating within their borders be retained by indigenous investors. More drastically, as in Chile, foreign enterprise is being taken over by expropriation of other means. Further American action is needed, too, however, if the multinational corporations are to be brought under effective regulation and control. The failure to do so almost certainly will lead to destructive concentration of economic, political, and social power in the hands of a few unregulated entities that are without any obligation to use those powers for constructive social advancement.

In testifying during the 1911 hearings which led to passage of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, Louis D. Brandeis declared, "You cannot preserve political liberty, you cannot secure American standards of living, unless some degree of industrial liberty accompanies it." Compared with today's industrial elite, the early 28th century business monarchs ruled very modest domains.

BRITAIN'S INVOLVEMENT IN
NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials found in the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Oregonian, the Portland Press Herald, the Arizona Republic, and the Detroit News. Referring to American comment on Britain's involvement in Northern Ireland, the Inquirer's editorial states:

We Americans have enough unsolved problems of our own without blundering into someone else's and making them worse.

I enter in the RECORD six editorials from the newspapers previously cited in hopes that most Americans will refrain from making further rash demands:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 27, 1971]

GRATUITOUS AND MUDDLE-HEADED

Many Britons are infuriated over that congressional resolution introduced the other day by two Democratic senators, Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut and Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts.

The resolution calls upon the British to withdraw the 14,000-man contingent of troops they have sent to keep order in Ulster, where Catholics and Protestants are at each other's throats, and urges that the province, a part of England, be unified with the Republic of Ireland.

The British minister of state for defense, in the House of Commons, said he "resented very much indeed" the resolution. One British newspaper, the Sun, called the speech Senator Kennedy gave in introducing the resolution "a blatant piece of electioneering." The Daily Telegraph advised Senator Kennedy not to interfere, "especially in such an irresponsible manner, in the internal affairs of another country."

Quite. The British have the right to be annoyed. We would suggest, though, that they keep their celebrated stiff upper lips. The Ribicoff-Kennedy resolution is only a mild exemplar of an old American political custom of playing politics with the Irish question.

That it is an old American political custom, however, does not make it any the less inexcusable. The recommendations in the resolution are not only gratuitous; they are muddle-headed. Those British troops are not in Ulster because they want to be or because the British Government wants them to be but because without them the violence would escalate and a satisfactory solution to an ancient problem would become even more difficult to find.

The solutions, though, are for those immediately concerned to find. We Americans have enough unsolved problems of our own without blundering into someone else's and making them worse.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Oct. 27, 1971]

UNWARRANTED INTRUSION

A great disservice has been done the people of Ulster—Catholics and Protestants alike—in the resolution sponsored by Senators Kennedy of Massachusetts and Ribicoff of Connecticut calling for withdrawal of all British troops from the riot torn country and reunification of the country.

Withdrawal of the troops at this juncture would almost certainly precipitate violence on an unprecedented scale, making a peaceful settlement that much harder to achieve.

Members of British Parliament and the Ulster government of Prime Minister Brian Faulkner have reacted with understandable anger to the senators' intrusion. The resolution has done the senators no credit.

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 27, 1971]

SENATOR'S INTRUSION

Precedent is clear that the authority over U. S. foreign relations resides in the presidency. The Senate is confined to "advice and consent," and the Supreme Court has said that the chamber "is powerless to invade" the field of relations with other nations. But senators have, particularly in recent years, violated the spirit of that division of responsibility.

One of the latest instances of senatorial invasion of the field was the call by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy for immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland. Teddy's speech may have been received warmly by his Irish constituents in Massachusetts; but it was not the same with the Irish of Ulster, about two-thirds of whom favor the current union with other parts of the United Kingdom.

Sen. Kennedy's pitch was for the Catholic one-third of the Ulster population, many of whom favor union with Ireland to the south.

Removing British troops (many of whom, by the way, are North Ireland residents) from the embattled counties would be a step toward full-scale civil war between extremists of both sides in Northern Ireland. The chief mission of the troops is to prevent such a major conflict. The Kennedy intrusion in foreign affairs amounts to a reckless political exploitation of the crisis in Ulster.

[From the Portland Press Herald,
Nov. 1, 1971]

KENNEDY IGNORED FACTS ABOUT IRELAND

(By Smith Hempstone)

WASHINGTON.—In aligning himself with the Green Panthers of the outlawed Irish Republic Army, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy has demonstrated yet again that in Irish affairs his passion is matched only by his prejudice.

The Massachusetts Democrat, in a resolution co-sponsored by Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn., who may be forgiven if he sees the gunmen of the IRA as a Gaelic incarnation of the Stern Gang, has called for the "immediate withdrawal of (14,000) British troops from Ulster and the establishment of a United Ireland."

The six counties of Northern Ireland, Kennedy states, are "becoming Britain's Vietnam" and "Ulster teeters on the brink of a civil war that threatens to engulf all of Ireland." If only Britain will pick up its marbles and go home, Teddy asserts, Ulster's Protestants and Catholics more than likely "will work together in a new Ireland, to create the sort of political and social arrangements under which both can live and work in peace together, with full and mutual respect for the rights of all." Beautiful.

To prove his point, Kennedy, whose mathematics apparently are as weak as his Spanish, asserts that the Republic of Ireland's history of tolerance toward its "300,000 Protestants" (there are, in fact, less than 175,000 Protestants under Dublin's rule) shows that there will be no trouble if only the horrid British will go home.

Now Kennedy, like the rest of us, is entitled to think and say anything he wants. But as a putative candidate for the presidency of the United States, his suitability for that office must at least in some measure be judged by his public utterances.

Any examination of the present and future of Ulster must begin with one undisputed fact: For the past 50 years, Northern Ireland's one million Protestants have grievously discriminated against the province's 500,000 Catholics politically, socially and economical-

ly. But Kennedy, in his examination of the situation, chooses to ignore certain salient facts. Among them:

(1) While almost all of Ulster's 500,000 Catholics undoubtedly would welcome unification with the republic, its one million Protestants are equally fervently opposed to any such development and, presumably, they have the same right to self-determination as the Catholics.

(2) As to Ulster being "Britain's Vietnam," surely it is at least worth noting in passing that Northern Ireland is as much an integral part of the United Kingdom as Scotland, Wales or Cornwall and has been so for considerably longer than our own Southwestern states, which we took from Mexico, have been American.

(3) As for those Protestants "who feel they could not live in a united Ireland," Kennedy urges that "Britain could open its arms" to them, thus studiously ignoring the fact that the Protestants have been in Ulster for 30-years, which is to say considerably longer than the Kennedys have been in Massachusetts.

(4) British troops were dispatched to Ulster in 1969 to protect the Catholic minority from Protestant toughs. Since then, IRA gunmen, infiltrating from the republic (where the organization also is banned), have indulged in an indiscriminate orgy of sniping, nall-bombing, arson and high-explosive attacks which have resulted in the deaths of 28 persons on both sides of the barricades.

(5) Under British prodding the provincial government in Belfast has set in train a series of reforms which ultimately will go far toward eliminating many if not most of the inequities which Catholics have endured in Ulster.

The truth is that if Britain were to say it intended to pull out all its troops next week, Irish premier Jack Lynch would be on the first plane to London to urge them to stay a while. For Lynch knows, if Kennedy does not, that Ulster's one million Protestants, who are just as tough and well-armed as the Catholics, would fight to avoid domination by Dublin.

Finally, the intellectual process by which Kennedy determines that the United States has a right to intervene in the internal affairs of the United Kingdom is interesting. He simply states that, because the "Irish yield to none in their contributions to the peoples and culture of America," the principle of non-intervention "is utterly without application."

Under this reverse Brezhnev Doctrine, presumably the United States has an equally "irresistible" right to intervene in the internal affairs of Germany, Italy, Poland or any of the many other nations which have made weighty ethnic and cultural contributions to America. Or perhaps those nations have the right to intervene in our domestic matters since they created America.

In short while Kennedy's speech might have been eminently suitable if delivered before a St. Patrick's Day meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in South Boston, its delivery on the floor of the Senate reflected small credit on that house or on the Senator from Massachusetts.

[From the Arizona Republic, Oct. 28, 1971]

SOPHISTRY ABOUT NORTHERN IRELAND

Sen. Ted Kennedy's speech in the U.S. Senate of Oct. 20, a prelude to his introducing a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland, was both irresponsible and uninformed. As even a Roman Catholic member of Ulster's new Alliance Party, Oliver Napier, noted, Kennedy's main proposals, if taken seriously, "would actually cause the civil war he wants to avoid."

Kennedy's speech and resolution (which would urge the U.S. government to pressure Britain) is an ideologically disoriented bit of

flag waving designed to appeal to America's Irish Catholic voters. It is also a perfect example of liberal dogma in action.

For Kennedy, who was called to task by every responsible British official, suggested that Ulster was becoming Britain's Vietnam. In a letter to the Times of London, in which he claimed that the fierce reaction to his withdrawal proposal issued from "a guilty conscience," Kennedy said that the continuing presence of British troops in Ulster is compounding the violence.

Although Kennedy equated the British presence with colonialism, Jack Lynch, Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland and an outspoken foe of the Ulster government, has said, "There is no real invader here. . . . This whole unhappy situation is an Irish quarrel."

Again and again British governments, Labor and Conservative, have indicated their willingness to allow Northern Ireland to join the Irish Republic. But the Protestant majority in Northern Ireland (approximately 1 million of Ulster's 1½ million population) is vehemently opposed. Protestants account for only 20 per cent of the population of the Emerald Isle, and they are determined to maintain their rule in Ulster where they are a majority.

Ostensibly, Northern Ireland's troubles are religious, but neither group is really interested in converting the other. It is a problem of "religious politics," involving primarily the lower economic Catholics and the lower economic Protestants.

There is no doubt that Ulster's Catholics have been discriminated against in jobs, housing and education. There is also no doubt that the ruling Unionist Party is a coalition of interests firmly united only in its determination to maintain Protestant rule. Therefore, there is good reason to condemn the ruling elite's refractory and even harsh (but not repressive) rule.

But Kennedy did not do that. He tried to blame the British, who are widely credited with preventing more blood from flowing than from the 137 who have already been killed in Ulster—most of them by terrorists—during the past two years.

Indeed, when the British troops entered Ulster in August 1969 they were eagerly welcomed by both sides, but particularly by the Catholics, who feared extermination by B-specials, the all-Protestant 8,000-man police reserve force, a group initially recruited in 1920 to back up Northern Ireland police in special emergencies but which over the years used its special status to intimidate Catholics.

Northern Ireland is confronted by an agonizing problem that affects us all. But it will not be solved by the shallow analysis and superficial comments of Teddy Kennedy, who, to be charitable, hasn't the slightest idea of what he is talking about.

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 31, 1971]

KENNEDY IN TROUBLE ABROAD

If Senator Edward Kennedy's recent performances in the field of foreign affairs suggest how he would conduct foreign policy as president of the United States, one can only hope that he means it when he says he's not a candidate.

His conduct on at least three occasions in the past six months provides classic examples of how to lose friends and alienate people.

Last April, the senator and his wife, Joan, descended upon Germany with a numerous personal entourage and the Boston Pops Orchestra, with which Mrs. Kennedy performed as reader for "Peter and the Wolf."

Although he must know that the Germans put great store in punctuality, Senator Kennedy consistently showed up late for appointments. He kept a chancellery minister waiting for half an hour, a minister president cooling his heels for 90 minutes and a

foreign minister waiting dinner for two hours.

Last August, during a trip to the Far East, Senator Kennedy could not restrain himself from partisan comment on the tragic but politically sensitive situation in India and Pakistan. Pakistan, resentful because of his commitment to the Indian cause, declared him persona non grata and revoked permission for him to visit the country.

Recently, the redoubtable young senator severed his relationships with the British by demanding in a Senate speech that the British pull out of Ireland. The proposal, obviously a bid for the Irish-American vote in this country, drew the retort from the London Daily Mail that Kennedy is playing a "grim and cynical game" which callously ignores the loss of life that would occur if British troops were withdrawn.

Prime Minister Edward Heath was reported extremely angry at what he considered to be an irresponsible, ill-informed and provocative intervention, the U.S. embassy in London stated that Kennedy's proposal does not represent American policy.

Whether blundering or calculated, such disregard for diplomatic subtleties and foreign political issues provides but one more indication of the immaturity of Ted Kennedy. This immaturity has caused his family and associates great anguish, robbed him of his job as Senate Democratic whip, and may rob him of the Democratic presidential nomination, which otherwise—simply because his name is Kennedy—would probably have dropped in his lap like an overripe apple.

RICE POLICIES IN THE 1970'S

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Vernon W. Ruttan recently sent me a copy of his paper, "Rice Policies in the 1970's: A Perspective on the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) Conference." It is a summary of the discussion that took place at the Rice Policy Conference held at the IRRI, Los Banos, Philippines, May 9-14, 1971.

Dr. Ruttan is a professor in the department of agricultural and applied economics, college of agriculture, University of Minnesota. His paper is a useful contribution to our knowledge of the "Green Revolution." It assesses the implications of this important development in national price and trade policies in south and Southeast Asia.

The article follows:

RICE POLICIES IN THE 1970'S: A PERSPECTIVE ON THE IRRI CONFERENCE

(By Vernon W. Ruttan)

INTRODUCTION

What rice policies are currently being pursued by the rice producing countries of Asia? What are the policy implications of the rice problems these countries are facing, or will be facing in the near future? What policy options are open to governments in the region? What research related to rice policy issues is now being done, and what are the priority areas for policy or policy related research? These were the questions which provided a focus for a conference on rice policies held at the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in May 1971.

The conference was attended primarily by economists who are engaged in research related to rice policy or who are directly mak-

ing policies. There was also participation from members of other social science fields, particularly sociology and communications. A number of IRRI staff members from agricultural science disciplines related to rice production also participated in one or more of the conference sessions.

During the first day of the conference, IRRI staff members reviewed their approach to research on rice problems, particularly those of rice production, and outlined the current status and potential developments in rice production technology in Asia. On the second day, the participants discussed policy issues related to farm resource utilization and the distribution of the benefits of new technology. The third day focused on the modernization of rice processing for domestic consumption and for export. The last day of the conference dealt with issues related to price and fiscal incentives for agricultural production and economic development. On the afternoon of the third day, participants visited rice milling facilities, irrigation systems, and rice farms near IRRI in the province of Laguna.

The format of the conference represented a departure from the usual system of formal papers and discussions. On arrival at Los Banos each participant received a set of papers on rice policy in various countries, papers related to rice technology, and reports or research on the economics of rice production, marketing, and policy. Each conference session then operated as an open forum under the direction of a discussion leader. Professor M. L. Dantwala, Director of the Department of Economics, Bombay University (India) served as the conference chairman.

Within this broader perspective, this summary attempts to give an insight into the major areas of agreement and disagreement rather than a precise record of the conference discussions.

RICE TECHNOLOGY IN THE 1970'S

Diffusion of the new rice (and wheat) technology in Asia has been extremely rapid during the last 5 years (Table 1). The initial diffusion of rice technology involved a limited number of new high yielding fertilizer-responsive varieties developed by IRRI and national research agencies. These varieties are now being succeeded by others which incorporate further advances in grain quality, resistance to pests and diseases, and adaptation to varying conditions of water control and weather (rainfall, temperature) uncertainty. Rice research in the 1970s, at IRRI and in many national programs, will place somewhat less emphasis on creating a new high yield potential. Rather somewhat greater priority will be given to realizing the yield capacity that has already been identified under a broader range of environmental and economic conditions.

Throughout the conference, a good deal of discussion related to the environmental, institutional, and economic conditions associated with performance of the new varieties relative to older varieties.

Considerable research has already been completed, particularly in the Philippines, Indonesia, and India on the performance of the "first generation" of new varieties under field conditions. Some discussants emphasized the extremely rapid diffusion of the new varieties in response to their substantial yield advantage in areas in which they are well adapted. Other discussants emphasized the limitations of the new varieties—lack of adaptation to extreme variations in water (under deep flooding, rainfed, and upland conditions), problems associated with disease and pest control, problems associated with market quality in domestic and export trade, and others.

The IRRI director, R. F. Chandler, Jr., emphasized the importance, for purposes of planning and policy, of assessing adequately the potential impact of the varieties that are currently being released or will be released

over the next few years. He stressed the usefulness of feedback from micro-level studies in guiding further research. He also pointed out the danger, in a situation characterized by rapid technological change, of drawing policy implications from limited observations based on the performance of the "first generation" of new varieties.

Augustine Tan (Singapore) and others emphasized the difficulty of drawing inference for macro-economic behavior and policy from either experimental data or micro-economic observations during the initial stages of technological innovation and diffusion. This is clearly an issue to which statisticians and economists have not yet given sufficient attention. As a result, the macro-economic implications of current or potential technical change are not treated with the same level of analytical and quantitative precision as other variables for which more reliable aggregate data are generated by national statistical systems.

The net effect of the discussion of technical change in rice production and processing, both during the first day and throughout the conference, was to reject any simplistic view regarding the characteristics and potential of the new rice technology. There was general agreement, however, that if the momentum of the present research effort in Asia can be maintained, rice producers will have access to new sets of varieties and production practices adapted to a much wider spectrum of environmental and economic conditions.

An important area of policy research emphasized by a number of conference participants is the quantification of several technical constraints on growth.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY AS A POLICY GOAL

Several governments in Asia have identified self-sufficiency as a major policy goal. The goal reflects both political and economic considerations. For most countries of the region, foreign exchange earnings represent a major constraint on the capacity to import either consumption or investment goods. Even where imports of rice, or other food grains are available on concessional terms, dependence on another country for rice may be political suicide for many government leaders. The new rice technology has, in some countries, sharply reduced the cost of achieving self-sufficiency, but has at the same time reduced the cost of imports.

There are also several seeming inconsistencies in the self-sufficiency policies being pursued. In the Philippines, self-sufficiency in rice apparently has great political significance although the growing imports of wheat cause little apparent concern. In Malaysia, the high prices designed to encourage self-sufficiency in rice production impose higher labor costs on the nation's major export commodities. In India and Indonesia and in some other countries, the goal of self-sufficiency has in the past been pursued at the regional level at the expense, in the view of some participants, of national economic integration. These apparent contradictions led some participants to view self-sufficiency primarily in a political rather than in an economic context.

Hayami (Japan) said, however, that the concern with self-sufficiency has a national, though perhaps implicit, foundation in the long term decline in the terms of trade between wheat and rice. Before World War II the prices of wheat and of rice were quite similar. By the early 1960s, the price of rice relative to the price of wheat had increased in both international and domestic markets.

This sharply worsened the terms on which consumers in the rice producing countries of the tropics had access to food grains. It also weakened the competitive position of the rice producing countries of tropical Asia, in which rice is a wage good that enters directly into the cost of producing other (non-rice)

agricultural products, industrial products, and other goods and services for domestic use or for export. He argued that the long run significance of the "green revolution" in rice production for Asia is that, if its momentum can be maintained, food grains may again become available to the underdeveloped countries of tropical Asia on terms that are as favorable as in the developed countries of the temperate region. The national basis of the quest for self-sufficiency becomes more apparent when it is put in the context of removing the food production constraint on economic growth rather than when it is cast in terms of self-sufficiency at any cost.

Discussion of the self-sufficiency issue carried over into the discussion of two closely related issues—trade and diversification.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN RICE

For nearly 3 years the price of rice has been declining in international markets. Rice trade patterns have changed rapidly. The United States has replaced Thailand as the largest rice exporter. Japan has accumulated substantial surplus stocks. The Philippines is approximately self-sufficient in rice. Pakistan, India, and Indonesia have sharply reduced their imports. These changes lent considerable intensity to the discussion of trade policy.

The issue of whether a set of regional trade policies can be evolved that are consistent with comparative trade policies received vigorous discussion. Ruttan (U.S.) argued that agriculture is now a technology-based industry rather than a resource-based industry. Shifts in the production function are being achieved at a relatively low cost. In this dynamic environment the policy implications of traditional comparative advantage are somewhat less clear than in a world in which resource endowments represent the major source of output growth.

Sura (Thailand) pointed out that in spite of the rapid technical changes in rice production elsewhere in Southeast Asia, there can be little doubt that Thailand, where farmers have received less than \$50 a metric ton during the last crop, remains a low cost producer. Noting the high prices of rice in Japan and the U.S., he claimed that the major source of distortion in price and trade relationships, at least up to 1970, has been the domestic price and trade policies in Japan and the U.S. The issue of whether Japan and the U.S. will be content to act as residual suppliers or will be major competitors in the international rice trade was regarded as a serious handicap for Asian countries as they try to plan national rice trade policies during the next decade.

Again the question was debated of whether rice trade policy is amenable to economic analysis or is subject primarily to political considerations. In spite of considerable skepticism, a view was expressed that present policies do reflect, to a considerable degree, the economic circumstances in which countries find themselves. The options available to small countries are clearly different from those available to larger countries. Thailand and Nepal are price takers in the export markets; they remain concerned with maintaining the volume of their exports in spite of adverse price movements. Malaysia and Korea continue talk about self-sufficiency but have not yet been willing to impose the full costs of achieving self-sufficiency on their consumers.

The Philippines, Indonesia, Pakistan, and India—where the proportion of the rice crop imported has now declined—indicate a major concern with stabilization policy. In the U.S. and Japan, the relatively high support prices for rice are viewed as part of the political cost of other policies which have greater national priority than efficiency in rice production. The conference reluctantly, and with considerable criticism, accepted the conclusion that neither Japan nor the U.S.

is likely to bring production capacity in line with domestic consumption in the near future.

It was also generally conceded that the rice export market would remain depressed in the immediate future. There is a general tendency for wheat prices to move more in line with feed grain (corn and sorghum) prices than in the past, and it is possible that the gap between rice prices and wheat prices will continue to narrow in international markets. But in view of current rates of growth in population and per capita income, there was concern that pressure on food supplies might again emerge as a serious issue by the end of the decade.

AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION

The emerging potential in some Asian countries to expand rice-producing capacity more rapidly than the growth in demand raises important problems of resource adjustment at least for the immediate future. If significant growth in rice exports is unlikely, the growth dividends from higher rice productivity must be taken through some combination of lower rice prices in domestic market and a shift of resources to the production of other commodities.

It was pointed out, however, that there are serious obstacles to diversification. Much of the rice production in Asia is in the great river valleys and deltas where water control and climate preclude the production of alternative crops. It was also suggested that a shift of resources from rice to other crops implies a type of resource adjustment that rich countries, such as the U.S. and Japan, have been unwilling to make. Can we assume that resource use is less rigid in the developing than in the developed countries?

There was rather general agreement that resources could be substantially readjusted through diversification, particularly in some upland rice areas and in some highly developed irrigated areas. Most countries have already experienced some diversification though not under as intensive systems of management as in the crop diversification studies now under way at IRRI.

The pace of diversification will reflect not only the rate of growth of productivity in rice but other constraints operating on both demand and supply. On the demand side, the growth of per capita income limits the ability of the market to absorb other crop and animal products. Economic policies which distort price incentives in favor of rice (Japan) or against rice (Thailand) also have important implications for diversification. It does appear, however, that at present income levels consumers will be ready to use a large part of their higher incomes to improve the quality of their diet. If both rice and alternative crop and livestock products can be made available at lower real prices, this tendency will be reinforced by the relatively high priced elasticities.

On the supply side, the potential for diversification is limited by the development of improved technology for alternative crop and animal production, by lack of environmental control, and by the fact that rice in many areas is a subsistence not a commercial crop. If productivity of rice (and other food grains) continues to advance satisfactorily, some research resources should be reallocated to make the production of vegetable proteins, green vegetables and fruits, feed grains, and livestock more efficient.

In his discussion of diversification, Mosher (ADC) placed particular emphasis on the development and management of water resources to achieve greater environmental control. He argued that an appropriate development strategy would aim for neutral policies with respect to the commodity composition of agricultural output. Future investments in water control—irrigation and drainage—should provide potential flexibility in crop-

ping pattern to take advantage of future shifts in demand and technological opportunities.

MODERNIZATION OF PRODUCT AND INPUT MARKETS

The session on modernization of processing and distribution systems focused primarily on two issues: economies of scale in processing, and the appropriate role of the public sector in marketing and distribution.

The initial discussion was characterized by considerable confusion with respect to the dichotomies—large vs. small and modern vs. traditional—as applied to the milling industry. The issue, as it finally emerged, centered on the question of the gain in milling efficiency and product quality in a large modern facility (25-30 tons/hour) as compared to either the existing (huller and sheller) small mills (2-4 tons/sour) or the modern small scale mills now in the development stage. Rawnsley (UNDP-Philippines) stated that the existing small scale mills, when properly operated and maintained, are relatively efficient. Khan (IRRI) indicated that development work now under way suggests that the efficiency of small scale drying and milling operations can be improved. Lele (India) underscored the loss in efficiency in large scale facilities resulting from higher assembly costs and deplored the social inefficiency of substituting capital-intensive milling and warehousing facilities for more labor-intensive systems in economies where labor is relatively cheap.

The view emerged, both among the economists and engineers, that there is a role for large modern drying, milling, and storage facilities to handle the export trade. But with this exception a small scale decentralized system is likely to be more efficient both economically and socially.

It was also observed by Ruttan (U.S.) that the growth dividends from improvements in the product marketing system would under any circumstances be relatively small except where substantial export opportunities existed. Available evidence suggests that in most countries of the region the private sector has performed much more effectively than is frequently assumed. It was suggested that there is an important role for the public sector in the establishment and enforcement of grades and standards, in the provision of market news, and in the stabilization of producer and consumer expectations.

Discussion about the modernization of factor markets (see, fertilizer, pesticides, credit) emphasized the relative under-development of factor markets, compared with product markets. Golden (IRRI-Ceylon), in particular, emphasized the constraints on producer response to the new varieties which are imposed by the lack of development of factor markets capable of making inputs available in rural areas.

In addition to the issues involved in the modernization of the marketing system, the issue of price supports and subsidies in factor and product markets was examined closely in several of the conference sessions. There was general agreement that in most countries, particularly those in transition from deficits to self-sufficiency or to surplus status, buffer stocks could play an important role in stabilizing prices and price expectations in producer and consumer markets. Serious reservations were expressed about the financial and administrative capacity of governments to manage stabilization schemes in which the differential between floor prices and ceiling prices is so narrow that a substantial share of total product is either acquired by or moved through public channels. Representatives of two exporting countries, Thailand and Nepal, said that their countries were so dependent on prices in external markets that any attempt to stabilize prices be-

tween "good" and "bad" years would be very expensive both financially and in terms of real resources.

Desai (India) indicated that he has concluded from his research, that price supports represent an effective device for speeding the rate of diffusion of new varieties and associated technology.

There was also considerable discussion on the effectiveness of input market subsidies vs. product market price support in facilitating the adoption of new technology. Park (Korea) argued that it is useful to distinguish between (a) production practices that depend only on better knowledge; (b) production practices that are embodied in inputs purchased from the industrial sector; and (c) production practices that are dependent on public infrastructure development (such as irrigation development). He contended that subsidies on inputs are less expensive than price supports when the constraints on production can be overcome through the purchase of inputs from the private sector. However, if such subsidies are continued for more than a few years, their effects on the marketing system and on public administration will become costly.

Desai (India) challenged the view that fertilizer should be subsidized at all. He argued that his own studies showed that when fertilizer is introduced it flows first to the crops that are of highest value and only later to lower value crops (such as rice). He stated that for such crops, technical changes leading to a steeper fertilizer response curve are much more significant than modest changes in the factor-product price ratio.

There was a consensus that generalizations with respect to factor-product price ratios had not given sufficient attention to the technical response of varieties or crops to fertilization. There was general agreement that in both factor and product markets the farmer would be better served by efforts to create a viable marketing system by attempts to use factor and product markets to achieve equity objectives. Park (Korea) observed that this good advice is more difficult to follow under democratic than under more authoritarian regimes.

TECHNICAL CHANGES AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION

The implications of the new rice technology for income distribution in rural areas were discussed during the second conference session and emerged as a major item of concern throughout the conference.

On the basis of the questionnaires filled out by the participants before the conference, Mubyarto (Indonesia) suggested four generalizations with respect to the income distribution effects of the new cereals technology for which he found fairly widespread acceptance:

(a) That the new technology has resulted in cheaper rice production, but that it does not necessarily mean higher real income or greater benefits to all concerned, especially the rice producers.

(b) That the landowner and the larger farmers receive a large share and greater benefits than the tenant or the smaller farmers, which means an increase in the disparity in income distribution.

(c) That the new technology does not alleviate but even aggravates the problem of un- and under-employment in the rural areas because it encourages more mechanization in agriculture.

(d) That the general smallness of landholding makes it impossible to measure the farm viability by rice production alone.

There was, however, substantial disagreement with all four hypotheses. Chandler (IRRI) said that all four could be rejected for the Philippines. Ruttan (U.S.) said he would accept only the first part of hypoth-

esis (a) regarding cheaper rice production. He criticized hypothesis (b), asserting that the new technology is neutral with respect to scale but not with respect to such institutions as land tenure, credit sources, village power structure, and others. He noted that political problems may have been increased because of the new technology as the several social classes and economic interests try to gain access to or control over the new income streams resulting from application of the new technology.

Hypothesis (c) was questioned by Rao (India) and Barker (IRRI). Rao cited Indian data for 1964-69 showing rising employment and real wages in areas that had adopted the new technology. He foresaw an increased demand for draft power, and felt that although the structure of employment might change, the total man-hours employed would not. Barker cited the stable demand for labor in Central Luzon in spite of new technology.

On the general effect of technology on equity, Ladejinsky (IBRD-India) cited the experience with wheat in the Punjab. With new technology, land values and land rents rose. Tenants found it difficult to remain as operators and began to be displaced and converted to agricultural laborers. Even in relatively developed areas where agricultural labor has gained from the new technology, there may be increasing mechanization and consequent problems in the future. Finally, access to credit was difficult for tenants and owners without ownership certificates. However, Dantwala (India) and Desai (India) argued that attention should be placed on the absolute gain to the small farm from new technology. Rao (India) disagreed, saying that standards of equity are offended when the relative share of large farms in total income is increased even though small farms also gain in absolute terms.

Managhas (Philippines) observed that the major income distribution problems occur within the rural sector and within the urban sector rather than between sectors. Dantwala said that with respect to the incomes of laborers, whether rural or urban, the most effective way to improve the income distribution is through a sufficiently rapid rate of productivity growth to permit the output of agricultural products to expand more rapidly than growth of demand. The effect would be a decline in the real prices of food to rural laborers in urban and rural areas. Falcon (USA) argued that in view of current population growth rates, large works programs are imperative in rural areas to absorb the unemployed and dampen rural-urban migration.

Perhaps the only level of agreement that was reached in this discussion centers around Mosher's (ADC) assertion that growth involves a continuous disequilibrium. Technical changes lead to new income streams that are distributed differently than earlier sources of growth. A society that achieves viable economic, social, and political development must institutionalize transfer mechanisms and redistribute the income streams in a manner that will reduce the social and political stress resulting from development.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

In assessing the implications of the rice price policy conference for further research, it seems reasonable to assume that:

(a) During the 1970s, it will become feasible to shift away from a primary policy objective of simply meeting food needs to one which evaluates national investments in agricultural development in terms of contribution to national economic growth, the welfare of agricultural producers, and the generation of employment.

(b) The material and human resources available for organizing programs and projects will continue to be a major limitation

in achieving agricultural development objectives, though clearly this is less serious than in the 1960s.

(c) The substitution of formal quantitative information and analysis for less formal qualitative judgments in economic policy and planning has a relatively high pay-off in achieving development objectives.

There seemed to be agreement that two areas of research deserved particularly high priority:

(1) Research designed to identify and evaluate quantitatively the technological

investment and institutional constraints on growth of agricultural output. This research is essential if research resources, capital investment, and planned institutional changes are to be directed into high pay-off areas.

(2) Research related to the resolution of conflicts arising from the distribution of the new income streams resulting from technical and institutional change. The design of economic policies that are consistent with economic viability in factor and product markets and that distribute the gains of progress in a manner consistent with viable social and

political development represents an important challenge to economic, social, and political innovation.

There was considerable disagreement about the skills and perspectives which economists must bring to this task. There was general agreement that the traditional pattern of academic organization of professional resources in the West, and in institutions based on Western models, wastes professional manpower. There also was disagreement about the role of the economist, as an economist, in the political process.

[In thousands of acres]

	Rice				Wheat			
	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Turkey.....					1	420	1,430	1,540
Iran.....							25	222
Afghanistan.....					5	54	302	361
Nepal.....		10	105	123	16	61	133	185
West Pakistan.....		166	761	1,239	250	2,365	5,900	7,000
East Pakistan.....	1		382	652			30	(1)
India.....	2,195	4,408	6,625	10,800	1,270	7,270	11,844	15,100
Ceylon.....			17	65				
Burma.....		8	47	356				
Malaysia.....	104	157	412	316				
Laos.....	1	3	5	5				
Vietnam.....		1	100	498				
Indonesia.....			488	1,850				
Philippines.....	240	1,733	2,500	3,346				
Total.....	2,505	6,486	11,620	19,250	1,542	10,170	19,654	24,409

¹ Not available.

Source: Dana G. Dalrymple, "Imports and Plantings of High-Yielding Varieties of Wheat and Rice in the Less Developed Nations," Foreign Economic Development Service, U.S. Department of

Agriculture, in cooperation with Agency for International Development, (Washington, D.C. January 1971), pp. 35-36.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Dr. Rutan, also forwarded me his observations on the NEP of President Nixon and its reception in Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. His remarks which follow, are helpful and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

OCTOBER 14, 1971.

Representative DONALD R. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I have recently returned from a trip to Japan, Korea and the Philippines. During the trip I was in contact with a number of economists closely identified with economic policy in the three countries. It occurred to me that you or your staff might find the following observations of interest.

In Japan there was clearly very great official concern with the "new economic policies" particularly the surcharge and the use of "voluntary" and other quota arrangements to regulate trade. At the same time, I sensed a good deal of confidence that the Japanese economy does have the capacity to adjust to the structural changes that may be necessary as a result of Japan's changing role in the Asian and world economy.

In Korea, I sensed much greater concern than in Japan, at both the official level and among economists who are not attached to the government. Korea has, in the last few years, begun to achieve substantial growth. This growth has been fueled to an important extent by exports to the U.S. and world markets.

There is real concern in Korea and in the Philippines that their development will be severely dampened as a result of a trade struggle between larger countries which the smaller or economically weak countries are powerless to influence. The economic growth of the smaller and less developed countries are more vulnerable to these policies since their economies do not have the capacity for structural change that the more developed countries possess. In my own judgment a strong case can be made for immediately removing the 10% surcharge on imports from

the developing countries. This would not substantially weaken the value of the surcharge as a bargaining device in negotiations with the other industrial countries.

At a more general level I am personally concerned with two related issues. First, part of the pressure of Japanese imports on the U.S. market could be relieved by more liberal trading policies with respect to imports from Japan on the part of the European common market countries. I fear that the mutual interest of both the U.S. and Japan in trade liberalization in Western Europe may be obscured by the short-run struggle that is now going on between the United States and Japan. Secondly, I continue to be concerned with the lack of Congressional control over the executive action in the area of economic and foreign policy. The interpretation that the Trading with the Enemy Act gives the executive the right to impose quotas on imports without new Congressional sanction, in order to appease the interests of a particular industrial sector, is to me quite disturbing.

Your staff may find the enclosed paper "Rice Policies in the 1970's: A Perspective on the IRRI Conference" useful to have on file. The paper summarizes the results of a conference held to assess the implications of the "Green Revolution" on national price and trade policies in South and Southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON W. RUTTAN.

OFF-RESERVATION INDIAN LAND

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7701 will provide 99-year lease authority for off-reservation Indian land in New Mexico. If passed, it will provide for the following:

First. Permit economic development.

Off-reservation land cannot be leased for more than 30 days. The bill will permit leases up to 99 years which will spark increased interest in the area. Inquiries have already been received from companies interested in locating there.

Second. Extend coverage of existing legislation. Reservation land is already covered by 99-year lease authority. Unfortunately, the facilities—such as rail and interstate highway—that would be most useful are on the off-reservation Indian land. The bill would permit off-reservation land to be equal to reservation land in this respect.

Third. Would permit homeowners to qualify for FHA insurance under the National Housing Act, mortgage insurance is available for residential housing loans only if the lease on the land has less than 50 years to run. The bill would stimulate investing in homebuilding and homeownership.

THE 18- TO 21-YEAR-OLDS

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my voice to those who have commented on the inconsistency between laws that recognize the maturity of persons between 18 and 21 years of age when it comes to the most important responsibility in a democracy—voting in Federal and State elections—and yet deny it in selection of jurors.

I am proud to be a sponsor of H.R. 11415, a step in the direction of giving full citizenship to persons between 18

and 21 who are old enough to fight, die for and pay taxes to their Government and have, by the recent ratification of the 26th amendment, been given the right to assist in choosing our national leaders at all levels of government.

It is inconsistent for us to say that our newly-enfranchised citizens can play such an important role in our political processes and yet be denied the equivalent role in the judicial process.

Furthermore, it is wrong to treat an 18-year-old as an adult when he is a criminal defendant in our courts—and all Federal courts and 49 of our State courts classify an 18-year-old offender as an adult—and yet deny the 18-year-old admission to the panel to consider the guilt or innocence of such young people.

The legal exclusion from juries of persons who can be convicted of crime is inconsistent with the oft-repeated constitutional requirement that the right to a trial by jury carries with it the right to be judged by a panel in which the peers of the defendant could serve.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the Constitution requires that our juries consist of a cross-section of the community. Even before most of the civil rights cases were considered by the Court, in 1942, the Court in *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60 at page 86, declared:

The proper functioning of the jury system, and, indeed, our democracy itself, requires that the jury be a "body truly representative of the community" and not the organ of any special group or class . . . (Jury officials) must not allow the desire for competent jurors to lead them into selections which do not comport with the concept of the jury as a cross section of the community . . . If such practices are to be countenanced, the hard won right of trial by jury becomes a thing of doubtful value, lacking one of the essential characteristics that have made it a cherished feature of our institution.

From my exposure to persons between the ages of 18 and 21, I have not the slightest doubt of persons in this age bracket's ability to serve competently on juries in civil and criminal trials. There is nothing magic in the age of 21 that has not usually occurred earlier, as we recognized when we lowered the voting age.

A person of 18 is no more likely than a person of 30 to make a wise or a foolish voter. In the court system, we have greater safeguards than in the election registration system to keep incompetent or biased persons from service. In the power of trial counsel to exercise their power to strike jurors for cause or to a lesser extent by exercise of personal privilege to strike, we have a greater check on keeping unworthy or undesirable persons off juries than we do at the polls.

Furthermore, at a time when our Federal judicial system is creaking under the strain of huge backlogs, the additional manpower that would be available by lowering the minimum age for jurors is badly needed. Congress has not been reluctant to increase the number of judges in our district courts to meet the added demands upon our judicial system. Congress should not be reluctant to give these judges jurors to hear cases that are awaiting trial for often far too long periods of time.

It has often been difficult for persons advanced in their careers or with family responsibilities to serve as jurors. The time required away from occupation and family has often made jury service a burden from citizenship joyfully accepted. Persons between the ages of 18 and 21 often have not yet acquired the positions or responsibilities that have made jury service an unwelcome duty thus increasing the likelihood that from this source will come truly dedicated jurors.

I hope that Congress will set an example for the States as we did in our approval of the 26th amendment and promptly approve H.R. 11415.

MUSKIE'S SOUTHERN STRATEGY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, issues are certainly important in a campaign, yet one must avoid the opportunity to create or design issues for mere political gain. I call your attention to the following editorial from the Birmingham News in hopes that we follow the advice provided by a southern newspaper concerning the South and southern political strategy:

MUSKIE'S SOUTHERN STRATEGY

Sen. Edmund Muskie was at the University of Florida last week to make a speech which was, coincidentally, interrupted by a company of women's libbers.

If there were such a thing as "Southern lib," its members would be the ones who should have protested, for Muskie delivered still another in a seemingly endless series of denunciations of the so-called "Southern strategy" allegedly guiding the Nixon administration.

This "Southern strategy," Muskie said, is "an insult to the South" which must be rejected in 1972.

We understand Sen. Muskie's political motivation in making such charges. He (or almost any of the other national Democratic presidential aspirants) would be beaten badly by Mr. Nixon in most Southern states—although a "Southern strategist" headquartered in Montgomery could be a complicating factor if the '72 choice is three-way rather than two-way.

But the Maine senator should explain just what it is about the President's "Southern strategy" that is insulting to this region.

For that "strategy" is purely and simply to treat the South as an equal part of the Union.

This is not insulting to Southerners. What is insulting is the anti-South bias on the part of "liberals" who assume that every white Southerner is a racist who has only hidden his Kluxer sheet in the linen closet until another day, and that the South is a hopeless region that has to be governed by discriminatory policies and punitive legislation formulated by pure hearts elsewhere who know what's best for us.

It is these people, Sen. Muskie included, who are following a "Southern strategy."

Their strategy is to promote themselves in the rest of the country by trying to make it appear that anyone the South supports—especially if he is a Republican and his name is Richard Nixon—must be somehow un-American.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE MIDDLE EAST: A POLICY PAPER

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful study prepared for the New England Leadership Conference on the Middle East has been brought to my attention. Prepared by Arnold M. Soloway and the ad hoc policy committee consisting of Sumner Z. Kaplan, Prof. Gerald Caplan, Prof. Ben Halpern, Prof. Marshall Goldman, Prof. David Landes, Dr. Herbert O. LeVine, Prof. Henry Rosovsky, Dr. Richard Wurtman, and Prof. Manuel Zymelman, the report is well worth reading by my colleagues as a cogent analysis of the situation. At this point, I wish to include the report in the RECORD:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE MIDDLE EAST: A POLICY PAPER

Shortly after the outbreak of the June 1967 War, it became evident that the third Arab attempt in twenty years to annihilate the State of Israel had failed. Only days earlier, Egypt, Syria and the U.S.S.R. had ridiculed Israel's and America's futile efforts to induce the strangely apathetic U.N. Security Council to take action following President Nasser's unexpected and unprovoked acts of war against Israel—his blockade of the Israeli port of Ellat, and mobilization and forward thrust of his army toward Israel's border. While the international community passively awaited Israel's doom, Israel's citizen army defeated the Soviet-equipped Arab military machine. In the wake of this self-inflicted catastrophe, the Arab-Soviet bloc initiated psychological and diplomatic warfare aimed at distracting world public opinion which overwhelmingly supported Israel.

With memories too fresh for the facts to be obscured by rhetoric, Moscow's and Cairo's first efforts to transform their intended victim, Israel, into the "aggressor" appeared patently absurd. Even the United Nations, where the numerical predominance of Soviet and Arab bloc votes for years had produced a one-sided pattern of anti-Israeli resolutions, found this too much to accept. However, the incessant reiteration of "anti-Zionist" slogans and slanders by the U.S.S.R. and its clients, abetted by France, showed its first effects in U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, of November 22, 1967. An avowed "compromise" between the victorious Israeli victim and the defeated Arab aggressors, in fact the Resolution was less than "even-handed": Israel, by name, was called upon to make only concrete and irreversible concessions such as "withdrawal from territories"—a major strategic sacrifice—while the Arab states, referred to only implicitly, were asked merely to make symbolic, verbal and easily reversible concessions.

Israel nevertheless accepted Resolution 242, hoping that this might, at long last, persuade Arab leaders to enter into the meaningful negotiations required by the Resolution, and trusting U.S. assurances on the operative meaning of 242.

Ever since its adoption, and as the true meaning and intent of Resolution 242 have faded with time, the Soviet-Arab bloc has solicited diplomatic support for an utterly distorted reading of the Resolution's key principles. In effect, Moscow has been attempting to fulfill its promise to its Arab clients that it will maneuver the international community, and especially the U.S., into forcing Israel to withdraw from all territories that the Arab states had occupied be-

tween 1949 and 1967, and, moreover, without a freely-negotiated peace treaty. Developments since 1969, have seemed to bring Moscow closer to gaining such a gratuitous victory, while also encouraging the Arab regimes to maintain a militantly uncompromising posture. Most regrettably, the U.S. State Department now appears to be joining the effort to "reinterpret" Security Council Resolution 242, and thus handing the U.S.S.R. its sought-after victory—even at the expense of any remaining trust that Israel, or other small nations, may have in the good faith and reliability of U.N. and U.S. undertakings.

The facts concerning Resolution 242 and the lamentable erosion in the posture of the U.S. State Department on this as on other Middle Eastern issues are of sufficient significance to require detailed analysis:

U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, adopted on November 22, 1967, recommended basic guidelines in its first operative paragraph for "the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

"(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

"(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force . . ."

These two principles were subjected to intensive debate and negotiation; their meaning and intent were amply clarified before the Security Council unanimously adopted the British-sponsored Resolution in its original English-language formulation.

Under these circumstances, it is all the more surprising that otherwise informed commentators have offered so little resistance to the Soviet-Arab-French campaign since 1967 to distort the meaning and intent of these two key principles in the carefully worded and delicately balanced Resolution.

The Arab-Russian claim is that the Resolution requires Israel's commitment to withdrawal from *all* occupied territories, and, moreover, *before* any negotiations can take place. (Hence, the argument that Big Four pressure is justified in order to force Israel to comply with that "requirement".)

In fact, of course, the precise wording of the Resolution reads "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories"—not withdrawal from *the* territories or from *all the* territories. The omission in the authoritative English text of the definite article before the word "territories" was not accidental or casual; the fact that the Resolution did not call for Israeli withdrawal from *all the* territories marked a deliberate and considered policy decision. Security Council Resolution 242 makes no reference to, nor even implies, re-establishment of the situation existing before June 5, 1967. On the contrary, it couples the withdrawal principle with that of each State's right to live in peace "*within secure and recognized boundaries*".

The pro-Arab bloc in the United Nations made strong efforts to amend the British draft introduced by Lord Caradon, which eventually was adopted as Resolution 242:

On November 16, 1967, Arab delegates met with Mr. V. V. Kuznetsov of the Soviet Union, and insisted that the wording read either that Israeli forces would be withdrawn from "*all the territories*", instead of "territories", or that Israel should "*withdraw to the positions of June 4, 1967*". The Arabs also stated their objection to the phrase "*recognized boundaries*".

On November 17, 1967, Arab representatives argued the same points with Lord Caradon, who steadfastly refused to upset the delicate balance of the draft.

On November 20, 1967, the Soviet Union

introduced a draft resolution calling for *withdrawal of all forces to the positions held before June 5, 1967*, which was not even put to a vote in the Security Council. Earlier, the Security Council had repeatedly rejected various Soviet-sponsored resolutions calling for *a return to the former armistice demarcation lines*.

On November 22, 1967, after these attempts to amend the text of the draft resolution had failed, Lord Caradon firmly rejected an Indian-Soviet maneuver to interpret the text as if it were in fact consonant with the amendments which the Security Council had refused to accept. The U.S. Representative, supporting Lord Caradon and the majority, emphasized that the voting would be on the draft resolution as it stood and "not on the individual discrete views and policies of various members". Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban similarly declared: "The resolution says what it says. It does not say that which it has specifically and consciously avoided saying."

The Resolution's primary territorial objective was the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries" in the Middle East. It was precisely because the Arab delegates had clearly recognized the incompatibility between that requirement and the re-establishment of the fragile armistice lines of June 4, 1967, to which they aspired, that they had attempted to insert "*all the*" before "territories" and had sought to delete the requirement for "secure and recognized boundaries". The majority of the Security Council refused to accede to these Arab demands precisely because it considered the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries" of primary importance, and regarded the old armistice lines as incompatible with the objective of a lasting peace.

Thus, the Security Council Resolution did not and does not require Israeli withdrawal from *all the* territories or the reestablishment of the June 4, 1967, armistice demarcation lines. It does require the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries", acknowledging that the pre-June, 1967 armistice demarcation lines were neither "boundaries" nor "secure" nor "recognized". In fact, Jordan's Permanent Representative to the United Nations had himself stressed this point before the Security Council on May 31, 1967, less than a week before the outbreak of the June War:

"There is an Armistice Agreement. The Agreement did not fix boundaries; it fixed the demarcation line. The Agreement did not pass judgment on right—political, military or otherwise. Thus I know of no boundary; I know of a situation frozen by an Armistice Agreement."

On June 19, 1967, one week after the June War, President Lyndon Johnson underlined this very point:

"The nations of the (Middle East) region have had only fragile and violated truce lines for twenty years. What they need now are recognized boundaries that will give them security against terror, destruction and war."

On November 15, 1967, the U.S. Representative told the Security Council:

"Historically there have never been secure or recognized boundaries in the area. Neither the armistice lines of 1949 nor the ceasefire lines of 1967 have answered that description. . . . Now such boundaries have yet to be agreed upon."

On September 10, 1968, President Johnson added:

"We are not the ones to say where other nations should draw lines between them that will assure each the greatest security. It is clear, however, that a return to the situation of June 4, 1967, will not bring peace. There must be secure and recognized borders. Some such lines must be agreed to by the neighbors involved as part of the transition from armistice to peace. At the same time, it should be clear that boundaries cannot and should

not reflect the weight of conquest. Each side must have a reason, which each side, in honest negotiation, can accept as part of a just compromise."

The clear intent of Resolution 242 is that the parties to the conflict should arrive through negotiation at mutually determined "secure and recognized" boundaries, replacing the vulnerable June 4, 1967 armistice lines which had constituted a standing invitation to aggression.

That this indeed is the correct interpretation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, was made clear repeatedly by the sponsoring United Kingdom Government. On November 17, 1969, in the House of Commons, Mr. Stewart, the then Foreign Secretary, was asked about the "wording of the 1967 Resolution" and whether the right honourable Gentleman understands it to mean that the Israelis should withdraw from all territories taken in the late war". The Foreign Secretary replied:

"No Sir. That is not the phrase used in the Resolution. The Resolution speaks of secure and recognized boundaries. Those words must be read concurrently with the statement on withdrawal."

Some three weeks later, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, subsequently Mr. Stewart's successor as the Foreign Secretary, demanded that "the House should be told whether or not this Resolution requires the complete withdrawal of the Israelis." Mr. Stewart replied:

"As I have explained before, there is reference, in the vital Security Council Resolution, both to withdrawal and to secure and recognized boundaries. As I have told the House previously, we believe that these two things should be read concurrently and that the omission of the word 'all' before the word 'territories' is deliberate."

The fact that Resolution 242 can be implemented only through negotiations between the parties themselves, and not through Big Power dictates, was stressed on January 25, 1970, by President Richard Nixon:

"The United States believes that peace can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them. We do not see any substitute for such negotiations if peace and security arrangements acceptable to the parties are to be worked out."

"The United States does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace. It will not impose the terms of peace. We believe a durable peace agreement is one that is not one-sided and is one that all sides have a vested interest in maintaining. The United Nations resolution of November, 1967, describes the principles of such a peace."

Despite all the evidence which the public record so amply provides, the Arab-Soviet campaign to distort Resolution 242—to rewrite it after the fact—has made ominous gains. Sir Alec Douglas-Home, now Britain's Foreign Secretary, has moved to reverse the United Kingdom's position. In his Harrogate speech, and more recently in Cairo, possibly motivated by oil and other commercial considerations, he called for virtually complete Israeli withdrawal from the territories. Thus, three of the Big Four have now undermined the balance and negated the intent of Resolution 242.

Somewhat more circuitously, the U.S. State Department has been moving in the same unfortunate direction. The speech delivered by Secretary Rogers on December 9, 1969, reflecting the customary attitude of the Department's Arab-Affairs specialists, diverged substantially from established U.S. policy and moved toward the Soviet-Arab position. Reneging on the commitments of Presidents Johnson and Nixon to leave the drawing of boundary lines to the parties themselves, the speech called for Israeli withdrawal to the old "international border" with Egypt—in fact, practically a return to the armistice lines of June 4, 1967. With re-

spect to Jordan, the speech would allow nothing more than "insubstantial" alterations of the June 4, 1967 lines.

Yet, President Nixon, in a television interview on July 1, 1970, specifically stated: "Israel's neighbors, of course, have to recognize Israel's right to exist. Israel must withdraw to borders—borders that are defensible."

Clearly, in speaking of "defensible" borders, the President could not have been referring to the ludicrously fragile lines of June 4, 1967. The contrast, therefore, between the President's concept and that of the State Department's Arab-Affairs specialists is obvious.

Nevertheless, the State Department has persisted with efforts to implement the so-called "Rogers Plan", thus fostering the illusion in Cairo that U.S. pressure will induce Israel to hand back the entire Sinai without meaningful negotiations. As in 1957, Egypt has again been insulated from the need for negotiating with Israel; Cairo believes that it need only deal with the Big Powers. Despite public assurances, the U.S. appears to be increasingly pressing Israel to surrender her rights under Resolution 242 to negotiate "secure and recognized boundaries" with the Arab states.

Moreover, this retreat from the intent of Security Council Resolution 242 has undermined the Jarring mission. Under the influence of the erosion in the U.S. State Department's posture, Jarring's controversial letter of February 23, 1971, in effect called on Israel to subscribe to the Soviet-Arab distortion of the Resolution. The letter asked Israel to make a prior commitment, without negotiations and without reaching an agreement with the Arabs, that she will withdraw not to "secure and recognized boundaries" but—significantly repeating a phrase from the Rogers speech of December 9, 1969—to the old "international border" with Egypt.

It is Israel, in refusing to accept this distortion of Resolution 242, which is upholding the integrity of the U.N. Resolution.

One may ask why it is important that the meaning of a U.N. resolution accepted four years earlier is being reinterpreted in the light of 1971 political convenience. The importance, and it is crucial, involves both the issue of equity and fairness, upon which a viable United Nations must base its appeal for universal support, and also the issue of juridical contractual obligations incurred by signatories to a U.N. resolution. If each time the balance of political power shifts we permit a cynical departure by one side from positions that all parties previously accepted, resolutions will become meaningless pieces of paper, and the U.N. will fail in its mission of restraining the stronger and more violent national groupings from infringing on the security of their weaker fellows, who will then be forced into wars of desperate resistance to protect their integrity. And if the international community accepts the Rule of Law, a contract must bind those who sign it and must not be set aside by tendentious reinterpretations of its wording. If the U.N. is allowed by the United States to abandon these principles, it will become a dangerous instrument of international power politics rather than the instrument of reconciliation and peace that the world so desperately needs.

The erosion of 242 also has had its inevitable effect on chances for reaching a limited agreement covering the Suez Canal area. It has encouraged Egypt to insist that any such agreement can be only a first step toward a complete retreat by Israel to the old indefensible armistice lines of June 4, 1967. However, this is not the only damage resulting from the current posture of the State Department toward a limited as well as a complete Middle East settlement.

In this connection, it is necessary to recall the origin of the present concept of a limited

Suez Canal area agreement: After suffering a devastating defeat in 1969/70, in his self-proclaimed "war of attrition" against Israel, declared in open defiance of the U.N.'s unlimited and unconditional cease-fire resolution of June 10, 1967, the late President Nasser sought a breathing spell for his shattered forces by suggesting a limited cease-fire of a few months, which would be made conditional on Israel's acceptance of the Egyptian interpretation of Resolution 242. The U.S. State Department adopted a major portion of this concept, even though a limited and conditional cease-fire at this stage gave Nasser ex-post-facto legitimization for having unilaterally broken the unconditional, unlimited U.N. cease-fire resolution.

Under heavy U.S. pressure, and with dire forebodings that such an arrangement would enable the Egyptians and Russians surreptitiously to push their sophisticated missiles to the very edge of the Canal, Israel accepted the cease-fire. However, Israel stressed that it regarded this step as a re-institution of the open-ended cease-fire of June 10, 1967, and that any subsequent Israeli withdrawal would not be to an Egyptian-dictated line, but to secure recognized and defensible frontiers to be negotiated between the parties.

Egypt and the U.S.S.R. immediately violated the cease-fire, as feared by Israel, by unlawfully introducing missiles into the cease-fire standstill zone adjoining the Canal, and the U.S. State Department proved incapable of making the violators respect the agreement they had only just concluded.

At this point of apparent deadlock, Israel's Defense Minister Dayan suggested the elements of a partial agreement covering the Suez Canal area: The Egyptians would withdraw their illegally-introduced missiles and other heavy war material from the west bank of the Canal; Israel would then thin out its forces on the Israeli side of the Canal, even though they had been positioned there prior to the cease-fire and did not constitute a violation of its clauses; the cease-fire would be unlimited and unconditional, as originally stipulated by the U.N.; the opposing forces would disengage from each other, diminishing the likelihood of conflagration and, in the semi-demilitarized zone thus created, Israel would allow Egypt to reopen the Canal to international shipping and to resume normal civilian life on both banks of the Canal.

Egyptian President Sadat subsequently altered Dayan's concept beyond recognition: Israel's troops were not only to be thinned out along the eastern bank of the Canal, they were to be totally withdrawn into the heart of the Sinai peninsula; the Egyptians and Soviets not only would refuse to withdraw their unlawful missiles from the Canal, but would even insist on sending military units across to the Israeli side of the Canal, a feat they had been incapable of achieving in four years of sporadic warfare; the cease-fire would be prolonged for a mere few months and Egypt not only refused to commit herself to keep the peace without limitation, but specifically threatened to resume warfare unless Israel subsequently withdrew to the old armistice lines, as dictated by Moscow and Cairo; the Suez Canal would be cleared with no promise to permit Israeli shipping through the Canal, as specifically required by U.N. Resolution 242.

In other words, Egypt was to be rewarded for its unilateral and blatant violation of the original cease-fire as well as for its unlawful introduction of missiles into the standstill zone, and Israel was to pay a major strategic and political price for a development which, in fact, would benefit Egypt rather than Israel—namely, the re-opening of the Canal with the consequent flow of income to Egypt and the resumption of normal Egyptian civilian life on both banks. A most

significant benefit would accrue to the U.S.S.R., whose warships would be able to debouch into the Indian Ocean.

The U.S. State Department initially described President Sadat's demands as unreasonable, especially his call for a crossing of the Canal by Egyptian military forces which would vitiate the very purpose of a limited settlement, namely, the disengagement of the opposing armies. Developments since then, however, including Secretary Rogers' U.N. speech of October 4, 1971, reveal that State Department officials have substantially acquiesced in President Sadat's ultimative demands.

It should be noted that Israel has consented to steps which require it alone to make all the concessions, such as an Israeli withdrawal without a corresponding Egyptian withdrawal of missiles, and the abandonment of the shortest and most defensible strategic line along the Canal without a final peace settlement, at a time when Soviet troops remain in Egypt to threaten Israel. Nevertheless, it is Israel that is deemed "intransigent" by State Department officials, and it is President Sadat's extravagant demands that are appeased.

Yet, the U.S. has repeatedly and solemnly declared that it does not expect and will not demand that Israel should withdraw "a single soldier or from a single inch of territory" except in the context of a final peace agreement freely negotiated between the parties.

However, this is precisely what State Department officials now are requesting Israel to do in return for a mere prolongation of the cease-fire for a limited period. Moreover, as part of this new posture, the State Department is putting heavy pressure on Israel, at the expense of Israel's vital security needs in the face of the common Soviet adversary, by withholding essential aircraft in spite of repeated solemn U.S. declarations that Washington will not permit the military balance in the Middle East to be affected to Israel's disadvantage.

In the face of the uninterrupted massive influx of ultramodern Soviet military equipment and personnel into Egypt, confirmed by U.S. officials, it is absurd to pretend that the Middle Eastern military balance has remained unaffected. A meaningful concept of balance can hardly be based on the assumption that Israel should be able merely to stave off defeat in a potential conflict, after heavy loss of life and materiel. If renewed warfare is to be avoided, Israel's strength must visibly suffice to deter and discourage the hostile Soviet-Egyptian force from implementing its openly proclaimed aggressive intentions. This deterrent strength is clearly undermined when the U.S. State Department, to all intents, imposes an embargo on aircraft requested by Israel.

President Nixon, in his press conference on March 4, 1971 told Robert Semple of the *New York Times* that

"The question is whether or not the United States will impose a settlement in the Middle East, and the answer is no . . . we can make suggestions, but we are going to have to depend upon the parties concerned to reach an agreement. And we, of course, will be there to see that the balance of power is maintained in the Mideast, which we shall continue to do. Because if that balance changes that could bring on war."

Unless State Department officials are instructed to desist from the erosion of President Nixon's clearly enunciated policy, a gratuitous victory will be handed to the Soviet Union. The U.S. will have undermined and abandoned Israel, its only dependable friend in the Middle East, for the sole benefit of its adversaries. The self-defeating posture of the State Department's Near Eastern section reflects not only the classic delusions of futile appeasement; it also demonstrates a pathetic blindness regarding Mid-

die Eastern realities. Surely it is most unrealistic to believe that one can make "arrangements" for the region behind the backs of the leaders of the one modern, progressive, democratic nation in the area, whose people have repeatedly demonstrated an unshakable resolution and ability to defend their vital security interests.

Both the cause of a genuine, lasting Middle Eastern peace and a realistic evaluation of U.S. national interests, require the faithful and consistent implementation of America's solemn commitment and promises.

In President Nixon's own words:

"Peace can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them. We do not see any substitute for such negotiations. The U.S. does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace. It will not impose the terms of peace."

UNVEILING OF CONGRESSMAN F. EDWARD HÉBERT'S PORTRAIT

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, recently many of us were privileged to gather in the chamber of the Committee on Armed Services and to pay tribute to its distinguished chairman, our friend and colleague, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT. The occasion was the unveiling of the chairman's official portrait. It was a memorable ceremony, but it was made more memorable by the presence of his excellency Archbishop Philip M. Hannan who offered the invocation. Archbishop Hannan's prayer, I think, eloquently conveys our esteem for EDDIE HÉBERT and our best wishes to him as he conducts the important business of the Committee on Armed Services. I am inserting the text of Archbishop Hannan's invocation in the RECORD, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues of all faiths:

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF CONGRESSMAN F. EDWARD HÉBERT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 12, 1971

(By Philip M. Hannan)

O God, our Father, we implore your special blessing today on your servant, F. Edward Hébert, his family and all assembled here on this memorable occasion.

As an institution is the lengthened shadow of a great man, so the work of defending freedom through the Armed Services Committee has been the achievement of the great men, past and present, who have served as chairmen and members of the Committee.

We ask you to continue your blessing on our Chairman and his colleagues so that our might will only be used to defend the right. Make us remember that while might does not make right, right will not prevail today unless supported by our might. O God, bless our honoree and his colleagues so that this Committee will continue to give an example to the world of the judicious use of means to protect the freedom of the family of man so that this nation under God will merit His blessing as we have received His bounty.

Bless our honoree and his colleagues with the highest dedication and loyalty so that they, and we, may serve our country as it deserves—with our minds to serve it, our strength to protect it, our hearts to love it so that it may be the beacon for the whole human family. Amen.

CXVII—2601—Part 31

FACTS AND PROBLEMS FACING THE U.N.

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, these recent articles in the Christian Science Monitor of October 29, 1971, outline the facts and problems involved in recent actions in the United Nations:

WE REPEAT, DON'T BLAME THE U.N.

Secretary of State William Rogers has stated the responsible and proper position for the United States to take on the subject of the United Nations and China. His position is:

The admission of Communist China to the U.N. "is consistent with the policy of the U.S."

While Washington regrets the unnecessary vote to expel Taiwan it must abide by the decision of the majority and "we, of course, accept that decision."

"We hope that the UN will not have been weakened by what it has done. We continue to believe in its principles and purposes . . ."

"We will not support a reduction of funds for the United Nations in retaliation for this vote."

This position is consistent with the facts, which can stand repeating.

The admission of Communist China to the UN became inevitable from the moment President Richard Nixon disclosed his new policy toward China.

The effort to soften its impact by the campaign in the UN for the "two-China policy" was dubious from the beginning. Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung are united on the one essential point of Chinese doctrine; that there is only one China. At no time did it seem probable that Peking China could enter the UN without Taiwan China going out.

It was not necessary for the UN to expel Taiwan. It would have gone out anyway, once Peking came in. Quite possibly, quiet diplomacy might have allowed Taiwan to go out quietly on its own, instead of being thrown out.

But Washington chose a visible campaign to achieve the impossible. Veteran diplomats say they have never even heard of such an extravagant pressure campaign as was waged. It proved to be counterproductive. The resentment which welled up last Monday night on the floor of the UN was a reaction not against the U.S. but in response to that pressure campaign, as the accompanying article by former UN Ambassador Charles W. Yost makes clear.

Even Israel voted against Washington on the Taiwan issue. Like others it had its own reasons; perhaps including not yet getting the promise of those Phantom jets.

We can understand (while regretting) the domestic political reasons why the Nixon White House unleashed the noisy campaign in the UN at the very moment that its emissary, Henry Kissinger, was in Peking. Mr. Nixon had shocked the right wing of his party by his opening to China.

But there is a disturbing and dangerous feature to this. Antiforeignism is a weapon used down through the ages for domestic political purposes. Russians and Chinese love to hurl the charge of "chauvinism" at others; and are themselves the most flagrant users of it.

There is latent chauvinism in the U.S., as in all countries. It can always be aroused, easily enough, as a smoke screen or turned against a scapegoat. But it is terribly dangerous to arouse it, particularly right now. Mr. Nixon is conducting one of the most

difficult of all maneuvers in the affairs of great nations: a withdrawal from overextended positions. The U.S. was overcommitted in the world. The "Nixon doctrine" and "Vietnamization" both mean the same thing: getting back to commitments and positions which can be held within the range of available resources.

But the danger in any withdrawal is moving too fast and too far. And nothing could so speed the withdrawal as the unleashing of a wave of antiforeignism. The end result could be that very return to isolationism which Mr. Nixon himself warns against.

So it needs to be repeated, loud and clear, that all the UN did last Monday night was to make de jure what Washington had already made de facto. The deed came from Washington. To blame the UN can only be domestic politics, of a most dangerous variety.

SOUR GRAPES OR BITTER TEA

(By Charles W. Yost)

While it is natural for the administration and some members of Congress to express disappointment at the outcome of the UN vote on Chinese representation, the reactions are excessive and in some cases disingenuous. They taste more of sour grapes than of bitter tea.

When a simple majority of the General Assembly in November, 1970—a year ago—approved the Albanian resolution [attempting to substitute Peking for Taipei] it was quite clear that, whatever the United States might do, the days of Taiwan in the UN were numbered. It would clearly be impossible for the UN much longer to ignore that Mao, not Chiang, governs China.

President Nixon, presumably for this and other reasons, decided that a dramatic new departure in U.S. policy toward the People's Republic was in the United States national interest. That was a wise decision.

However, from the moment he announced his trip to Peking, it became extremely unlikely that a seat for Taiwan in the UN could be preserved. The final blow to the American attempt to preserve it through a "dual representation" formula was Henry Kissinger's second visit to Peking at the very moment the UN vote was about to be taken.

Prominent members of the Congress are now reproaching some of our friends for having "deserted" the U.S. on the vote, and are threatening in consequence either to cut aid to them or to the UN or both. Particularly at a time when an unhealthy trend toward "neoisolationism" is appearing in the U.S., members of Congress would do well to look at the other side of the picture.

What do our friends who voted "against us" say? First, they point out that the U.S. had for 20 years insisted that only one Chinese government should sit in the UN. Others had repeatedly proposed a "dual representation" formula, and we had repeatedly rejected it. Our sudden conversion to it in August, 1971, was simply too late.

Nor were our protestations that it would be outrageous to exclude the representatives of the 14 million people on Taiwan very persuasive, when we ourselves had for two decades been excluding the representation of the 700 million people on the mainland.

Second, it was clear that "dual representation" would not bring the People's Republic into the UN, as the U.S. now professed to desire, because Peking considered that its acceptance of such a formula would admit the existence of a rival Chinese government, which Chiang Kai-shek still unshakably claims to be.

Third and most important, as the representative of a NATO ally said to me, at the moment you are reestablishing your relations with Peking by setting up the Presi-

dent's visit, you are asking us to jeopardize ours by this vote. And you are exerting the crudest sort of pressure on us and others to do so. Is that a proper way to treat your allies?

If the U.S. wishes the support of its friends and allies in a matter of major importance, it must hammer out with them a policy of common interest to all.

In this case a substantial majority of our allies had decided that it was in their interest to bring Peking into the world community and the UN, whatever might be the effects on Taiwan of doing so. They interpreted President Nixon's decision to visit Peking, over the strong objections of Taiwan, as a recognition of the wisdom of that policy.

From their point of view, therefore, it was the U.S., not they, which by its last-minute introduction of the dual-representation proposal was deviating irresponsibly from a policy in the interest of the alliance as a whole.

It seemed to them, moreover, that the administration was behaving in this contradictory way primarily for domestic political reasons—in an attempt to appease rightwing Republicans who had been outraged by the President's intention to visit Peking and to deflect their rage from him to the UN.

It is heartening that the administration has opposed "retaliation" against the UN through cutting our contributions to it, but unfortunate that the administration and some members of Congress have suggested that cuts might be appropriate because U.S. contributions to the UN are "disproportionate."

Of course the real sense in which our contributions are "disproportionate" is that they are considerably less than our share of the world's GNP would warrant. On that basis we should be contributing closer to 40 percent than to 30 percent of the regular budget, and more—rather than less, as the administration has itself proposed—to UN development programs.

Moreover, all the major UN programs to which we contribute are ones for which we voted—indeed, often ones we proposed and vigorously advocated on national as well as international grounds.

The overriding fact should be that it is clearly in the U.S. national interest to strengthen rather than weaken the UN.

LANGUAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if, at this late date, any Member of Congress or any member of the Executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

Following is the language of House Resolution 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy

of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

"A cease-fire will be observed between the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, as soon as the parties reach agreement on the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from South Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: *Provided*, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

SOVIET JEWS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, last week I attended a rally in White Plains, N.Y., sponsored by the Westchester Conference on Soviet Jewry which was attended by more than 3,000 people who came to express their conviction that the struggle of the Jews of the Soviet Union shall not be forgotten.

These people turned out at this rally to express their outrage at the fact that the more than 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union are being exposed to a course of religious and cultural repression which is aimed at destroying their religious identity.

I feel that we in the Congress must view every abuse of the rights of a Russian Jew as a blow against the freedom of religion all over the world, and for this reason I urge my colleagues in the Congress to speak out on this matter and to tell the Soviets to end their repression of these people.

Furthermore, I urge the President to put discussion of the handling of Soviet Jews on this agenda for his upcoming trip to the Soviet Union, and for him to plead for more humane treatment of these people. It is my strong hope that by doing this, President Nixon will make it very clear to Soviet officials that we in this country are very concerned about this situation and world opinion is focused on this situation.

OVERPOPULATION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misinformation in circulation concerning overpopulation. It was refreshing to have the insights of Dr. Andre Hellegers, director of the Kennedy Institute for the Study of Reproduction and Bioethics, as set forth in the Evening Star today.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

THEY'RE ALL "OUT OF WHACK"

(By Mary Anne Dolan)

In the forensics of population debate, Andre Hellegers is something akin to Sir John Gielgud in a room full of cockneys. Most of his fellow spokesmen speak a markedly different language.

The hawks on the affirmative side of whether there is a "population explosion" in the U.S. say the country is overrun and the "baby boom" will soon suffocate us if we don't achieve a zero population rate by any means available—including sterilants in drinking water.

The negativist doves, on the other hand, say there's still plenty of room "out West," "on the frontier." If we hand out enough contraceptives, they claim, the "baby bust" (a reported 15.5 percent decrease in the under five population in 1970, the greatest in U.S. history, according to the Census Bureau) will take care of everything.

ACADEMIC SORT

Dr. Hellegers, a lean looking, academic sort of man who has been named director of the newly established Kennedy Institute for the Study of Reproduction and Bioethics at Georgetown University, thinks they're all "out of whack."

"It's absurd, if you take an aeroplane (sic) out of Washington to Los Angeles and take a window seat, to say the United States is too densely populated. The problem is that it's totally maldistributed.

"The population grows and contracts, grows and contracts and gives people all kinds of problems . . . We build a mass of schools and in a few years they're empty . . . We must decentralize, but decentralize with justice."

We cannot, says the Catholic executive of a Catholic-funded foundation located at a Catholic University, go by what "Catholic priests have been saying for years: 'There's no population problem because there's lots of room in Brazil.'"

HOLLAND-BORN

Born in Holland—a country 18 times more densely populated than the U.S., Hellegers is pleading for emphasis on planning based on demography (the statistical study of populations in regards to size, density, growth, distribution, migration, etc.)

Properly anticipated, he says, "a trip from Washington to Bethesda could have taken you through the country," as does a trip from Antwerp to Ghent, instead of, "what will be concentrated ugliness 50 years from now."

But we cannot plan, Hellegers says over and over again, until we approach the key question in population: not whether the American woman is having too many babies or not enough, but how many children she and her husband want to have and why:

"People who do not want to have children do not have them.

"In France in the early 19th century, they were at a state of two children per family

and that was before IUDs, pills, condoms, diaphragms or even the vulcanization of rubber."

LIKE A HEADMASTER

Sitting in his third floor office at Georgetown University Hospital, the 45-year-old professor of obstetrics and gynecology speaks in lengthy, thought-ridden sentences which are touched with a Flemish-British accent.

From appearances, Hellegers could be someone from a "think tank," or, maybe the prep school headmaster in a Louis Auchincloss novel, khaki pants, striped tie, blue blazer. Left hand in his pocket, right hand on his cigarette.

"In the United States in the 1950s, people suddenly liked having children. In the 30s, they did not like having children and they didn't have them. Today, they do not like having children."

But, says the expert populationist from beneath framed pictures of his four children, "If you were to come out tomorrow with the absolutely perfect contraceptive, and people want four children, chances are they will have them and will contribute to the population growth." (The present replacement rate is 2.2 children per family).

Hellegers jumps from his chair to a desk piled with books, pamphlets and reams of sheets carefully underlined with red magic marker. He pulls out a demographic curve prepared at Princeton University.

"In the white population of America in 1800, the average total fertility per child-bearing woman was 7.2 children. Steadily decreasing, the average hit the four child family mark in the late 19th century.

By the Depression years of the 1930s, the average went down to slightly over two children. Then, in the prosperous '50s, families shot up to 3.6, before falling off again in the '60s and '70s.

"This question is, what is it that makes you determine to have four or one or none. That has nothing to do with contraceptive technology, it has to do with the sociology of family building, what factors make people decrease their family size. And that is precisely the part we know least about.

"Ironically," Hellegers adds with a mocking chuckle, "it is also the part which the United States government is the least interested in."

In fiscal 1971, the budget for contraceptive services was \$39.6 million. The accepted proposal for 1972 was \$90.9 million. The increase in the same period of time for what Hellegers would call "true population research" (demography, sociology, behavioral sciences) was a little over \$1 million.

Hellegers' dream, after studying fetal physiology in Britain, lecturing in population dynamics at Johns Hopkins University, and participating in population research nationally (on President Lyndon Johnson's special committee) and internationally (on Pope John XXIII's commission on world population), was to "get it all together."

GIVEN HIS CHANCE

He decided that "someplace I'd like to see established a unit in the study of 'bioethics' that would combine all the biological, ethical and social problems related to the whole question of reproduction."

Now, after nearly seven years as resident expert on population at Georgetown, Hellegers has been given his chance in the form of \$1.35 million from the Joseph Kennedy Foundation.

There are several known answers which Dr. Hellegers mentioned as giving some light to the enigma of when, why and how many children people want.

Used properly, he adds, this knowledge renders "pleasant ways of inducing small family size."

For example, "is a very well established fact that migrants have a lower fertility rate

than non-migrants . . . People that came off the farm in the South and moved into the big cities, had fewer children when they got through than they would have had they stayed on the farm . . . They were 'upward socially mobile,' and consequently they had smaller family sizes.

"Now we have taken the factories out of the cities . . . imprisoned the workers in the inner city and taken away their mobility.

"In other words, there are two ways of decreasing family size which are utterly reasonable. One is to give a job to the poor who have the larger family sizes and thereby give them some hope and upward social mobility.

"The other, which, up to now we have chosen is to take everything away, take the condoms in and stand surprised that they are not used."

Hellegers says too that "one of the greatest things to be done to decrease family size is to have women go to college. Then, there are a number of options open to her instead of sitting around and having a bunch of kids."

VIEWS ON ISSUES

"We also know," Hellegers stressed, "that contrary to what the man in the street tends to think, middle and upper class negroes—Income for Income—have fewer children than whites of the same class. And, upward socially mobile negroes have smaller families than whites of equivalent income."

Hellegers also commented on these population-connected issues:

Abortion.—In the future, he feels abortion will probably resemble some sort of tribalistic ritual: "It is philosophically out of date and will not be viable historically. I have a suspicion that in 50 years, the idea of regulating family size by putting your legs in the stirrup and being scraped out is something we'll look back on as, my God . . . incredible.

". . . A large fraction of abortions—and much more than we thought—is used in the never pregnant or unmarried women, that is shown in the annual register of abortions performed.

"But—and here is the thing—the fact that in the unmarried state, she got an abortion does no at all mean that when she gets married she will have a fewer than 2.2 children.

"What we hope to find out is what happens to ultimate family size with those aborted in the unmarried state."

Catholic Church.—"I am perfectly convinced that, as far as the position of Catholicism is concerned, it is going to have to go for the perfect method of family planning (contraception) because people are just not going to have 7 or 12 children.

"By the same token, I think the church is on excellent historical grounds in holding on to the dignity of the fetus and considering it in the human race instead of out of it."

Divorce.—"I tend to believe that divorce is counter productive in terms of population decrease. There is an increase in the number of people who have the family size they intend having, say three kids, by the age of 24 or 25, who then at age 32 or 30 get divorced and remarried and then have another child to 'cement' the new marriage."

Male contraceptive.—"It's nowhere and it's got real problems. The thing is that with the pill, you do not hit the woman's ovaries. You fire at the pituitary and that takes care of the ovary.

". . . The difficulty in the male is that it's much harder not to hit the gonad itself. There is no nice indirect way of hitting it and that means your methodology endangers the sperm that you want to keep intact for the future.

". . . In the female, what you are after is the money that's in circulation. In the male, it's rather like attacking the mint."

A HARD LOOK AT BUSING

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I delivered a statement to the Rotary meeting in Flint, Mich., discussing our educational crisis today and the need for positive leadership to end school segregation and provide equal educational opportunities for all American children. With your permission, I would like to insert my remarks and add them to the ongoing congressional discussion of this important problem:

A HARD LOOK AT BUSING

As we all know, recent court decisions have found numerous instances of deliberate school segregation and unequal educational opportunity based on race. Deliberate racial segregation—in schools, jobs, housing, or public accommodations—is a violation of our Constitution and Bill of Rights—and where found—must be corrected. This is the law of our land, and I support those laws as do virtually all of our citizens.

In an effort to remedy segregated schools and unequal educational opportunity, some courts in some instances have ordered busing plans to achieve racial integration and equal education.

Each case is different and each has to be weighed on its own individual merits.

As I review these cases one by one, some findings seem reasonable, some do not. For example, where busing has previously been used to create a separate black and white school system, as often was done in the South, I believe that same existing busing system can now be used to intelligently integrate these same schools. I do not believe black youngsters should be bused 25 miles past a white school because of race, or vice versa. And I think that is the view of most Americans. Further, I believe that in cases where the courts have imposed busing plans which have been implemented, the federal government should provide emergency funds for communities that otherwise will have to lay-off teachers, policemen or make other critical cutbacks.

In other cases we find school systems, in various regions of the country, where racial segregation was not practiced openly, but where school boundary lines have been deliberately drawn to prevent the natural integration of students. In these instances, a conscious effort was made to force black students and white students in adjoining neighborhoods to attend separate black and white schools. That practice is a violation of the law and, where it exists, must be stopped. It was in the Pontiac case here in Michigan that the courts found that school boundary lines had been redrawn repeatedly in order to keep students segregated on the basis of race.

We have not done that here in our own city of Flint. There has been no effort—that I am aware of—to segregate our school children based on race. In racially mixed areas we find racially mixed schools; in areas which are all black or all white, the neighborhood schools there reflect that fact. Although I have not done a detailed study of our school boundary line history here in Flint—as the court would if a suit were brought—it appears to me that a good faith effort has been made by local officials to avoid arbitrary school assignment based on race. And I congratulate our local school officials for this.

Flint is different in yet another respect. Virtually all of our neighborhood schools are

also community schools offering a wide variety of after-hour activities. The community school idea—one of the best educational developments in the last century in America—works best if students are naturally assigned to the schools nearest their homes. I strongly favor neighborhood schools—especially for elementary school children—and I am personally committed to finding an answer that will produce racial integration and equal education within the framework of neighborhood schools.

We now face a new and difficult issue. It concerns the difference between deliberate school segregation on the basis of race (de jure) and unplanned school segregation based on housing patterns (de facto). Some courts seem on the verge of ordering massive cross-town, or cross-district, busing plans to overcome unplanned, or de facto, segregation.

Understandably, this has touched off great public concern and anxiety. And many of us who strongly support integrated schools and truly equal education are deeply troubled about the practical wisdom of large scale busing to overcome de facto segregation.

Many factors have to be considered and they include: cost of buses, student time spent on buses, safety of buses, traffic congestion, pollution—etc. Also, do we wish to see neighborhood schools eliminated with children sent to distant schools? In such cases after-school activities become harder to participate in, parents find it harder to serve as home-room mothers and in the PTA, and youngsters are harder for parents to get to in emergency situations—particularly those of elementary school age.

Also we must consider the general social disruption that occurs when citizens are asked to accept governmentally imposed programs they do not favor. While the law is the law—and we all should obey it—wise law is that which earns the support of reasonable people.

I personally see the benefits of racially integrated education. I endorse it and support it. I had the good fortune in Flint to attend school with students of all races, and I feel fortunate to have had that opportunity. Further I believe in equal education—and want to see each and every American youngster receive an equal educational opportunity. At the same time I support the neighborhood school/community school concept—and do not wish to see that system disrupted.

These goals necessarily bring me to the conclusion that the wholesale busing of students to overcome de facto segregation is not, in my judgment, a sound practical answer to the problem at hand. I believe better answers exist which can, and must, be found. I am personally dedicated to the search to find those better answers.

In that respect, several things seem clear. First, we must end racial discrimination in our society in all its forms so all our people are free to develop and succeed on the basis of their individual abilities. When this occurs, I believe economic equality will follow for all races and will substantially eliminate other racial inequities we now find in our society.

In housing integration, our community took the lead nationally and became the first major city in America to pass an open housing ordinance in a public referendum. When people of all races are free to move into neighborhoods of their own choosing, I believe the present heavily segregated housing patterns we find in our country will begin to dissolve.

Further, I am convinced we must find a new method of financing education—no longer relying mainly on property taxes—and then we must truly equalize the expenditure among our school children so that each youngster in America has an equal educa-

tional opportunity to learn and develop. Poor children in poor neighborhoods—whether black or white—must not be condemned to a second-class education in a run down school. That is wrong.

After long thought then, most citizens, myself included, have concluded that wholesale busing of students is not the best way to achieve the above goals. And so I have joined with others to seek to delay the implementation of court-ordered busing plans until all appeals have been heard and all other remedies considered. I strongly support the position Governor Milliken has taken in this regard and the general statement he made.

That would give us time—if we get busy—to figure out a better and permanent answer as an alternative to large scale busing. I think we can, but it will mean knowing more than just “what we are against”—it also means doing some work so we can decide “what we are for”.

So I am asking each citizen to help find that answer. To engage in a thoughtful, reasoned search for alternatives based on an objective evaluation of the facts we have to work with. It will mean blacks and whites working together to find the answer that is best for all our people and for our country.

That means it is no longer a question of “which side you are on”. Our job is to find an answer that can unite us—that will let us come together on the same side. If we remain divided and polarized, we hurt our country—and ultimately ourselves and our children.

Education in America has traditionally been a local responsibility. I favor that approach. I believe we have the creativity and devotion here in our communities to devise and operate our own school systems. I would prefer to see us keep the Federal Government out of the act as much as possible. But gentlemen, today—that requires leadership. And not just from those few people elected to local public office, but also from each of you as well. Your brains, problem solving ability, experience, and ability to persuade and lead, is essential at this time, and on this issue.

You, here in this room, will play an essential part in finding the “better answer” to our education problem. If your role is passive—and limited to armchair observations, our community faces a prolonged period of potential agony and turmoil. Frankly that would be inexcusable. If you invest yourselves actively and take your leadership out into the community and put it on the firing line, then we can start building the bridges and bring our people together behind new plans and ideas that can work.

I ask you—in behalf of every youngster in this district—to take up this challenge, and at this critical moment in our history, to use your talent to make self government work.

I believe there's a better answer than bussing—let's find it.

MEMORIAM TO RICHARD EMBLY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, only a few men have had the front row vantage point and the backroom knowledge of history in the making as did Richard Embly, 58, a former superintendent of the House Press Gallery, who passed on November 11 after a heart attack at his home in his native Port Deposit, Md.

Before his retirement in 1969, Mr. Embly served 30 years in the gallery, the last 9 as superintendent. The daily flow of news releases, reports and other official paper plus the flood of telephone calls that engulf the gallery were always handled with efficiency and courtesy by Dick Embly and his staff. For a Congressman and his staff, Dick Embly always seemed to know here to find needed newspapermen, who can be just as elusive as Congressmen.

For 30 years Dick Embly watched Congressmen arrive and depart, newspapermen come and go, and he knew them all by sight and by name as well as much of their background. He was conversant with every move of the legislative battles on Capitol Hill which have done so much to shape the course of this Nation's history. Every 4 years, he was one of those who handled press arrangements at the national political conventions, so he knew Presidents before they became Presidents.

A member of my staff, Ed Edstrom, tells me that members of the Capitol's press galleries count the ballots at the often hotly contested annual elections of the National Press Club.

“I ran for office four times at the club and Dick was always one of those who tallied the votes,” Ed says. “I won each time so I know that Dick was an honest man.”

I think Dick Embly would have chuckled at that.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR MAYOR'S COMMITTEE TO SUPPORT HEROIN MAINTENANCE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, there are proposals now being advanced in New York City to legalize the dispensing of heroin on a test basis. I am distressed to see that the city administration is giving support to these proposals by creating a committee to advance them. I am opposed to the legalization of heroin. Legalization in effect means that we are throwing in the towel and saying to the estimated 200,000 addicts in New York City “you can go on ruining your lives and the lives of your families and we the public will help you do exactly that.” Not me.

I have been in communication with Dr. Vincent P. Dole who is the originator with his wife, Dr. Marie Nyswander of the methadone program and I have asked his opinion on the advisability of the proposed free heroin test program advocated by New York City's administration. For the interest and information of our colleagues, I am appending the correspondence with Dr. Dole.

Mr. Speaker, a board of education report in New York City shows that more than 25,000 youngsters are on heroin and I find it indefensible that anyone would suggest that we follow that habit.

The correspondence follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1971.

DR. VINCENT DOLE,
Beth Israel Hospital,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. DOLE: I hope you will recall that we met when I was in the City Council. At that time, I requested your assistance in obtaining a methadone bed for a young man who desperately wanted to go into your program. My recollection is that at the time you had 43 such beds. He was fortunate and went into the program in, as I recall, 1968.

About a month ago, I was standing at a subway at 8th Avenue and 57th Street handing out reports to my constituents. This young man came out of the subway and introduced himself to me and told me how his whole life had been changed. He has since married and is now working in the building construction trade. He is doing very well and is still, of course, on methadone maintenance.

I have taken a position in opposition to the Mayor's Committee which has proposed heroin maintenance. Aside from every other argument which one might use in opposition to heroin maintenance, my major argument is that there are thousands of heroin addicts who are standing in line waiting to get into the methadone program. And before we begin a heroin program, we ought to at least give to everyone eligible for methadone that opportunity.

I would appreciate your advising me as to how many methadone beds now exist, how many people are waiting to get into the program and how long one must wait before he or she is accepted. Whatever else you might give me by way of information in support of extending and funding the methadone program would be very much appreciated.

With the thought it might be of interest, I am enclosing a recent statement I made on the subject of drug addiction.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., August 17, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I am very glad that you are taking a position in opposition to the Mayor's Committee on the issue of heroin maintenance. This proposition is wholly unjustified in terms of social need or scientific merit. There are at least five thousand heroin addicts who have applied for methadone maintenance and are forced to remain on the street as heroin addicts for lack of facilities. Basically, this means lack of about \$1,000 per man-year to provide maintenance treatment and the essential minimum of social supports.

As you probably know, I have been working in the Detention Prisons for the past five months. Here we have started an interview system to enable prisoners, while still in detention, to apply for aftercare in a treatment program of their choice. The great majority of these criminal addicts have asked for methadone maintenance treatment. All that we can do at present is to put their names on a list and assure them that we are trying to expand facilities to provide treatment in the future. If adequate facilities were available to meet the needs of every criminal addict who applied to us for treatment, I believe that within a two year period we could make a substantial impact on the problem of criminal addiction.

Scientifically, the only justification offered by proponents of heroin maintenance is that it is an experiment. This label is hardly justification for doing something foolish. What we know from past experience is that it is not possible to stabilize an addict on heroin. With this drug he requires several injections per day and his need for the drug constantly increases. If he is not given increasing doses,

he feels symptoms of abstinence and, of course, will go back to the street to seek supplementary drug. Moreover, it would be necessary to give large amounts of heroin and needles and syringes to addicts to take home to the neighborhoods. Experience in England has left no doubt that this procedure leads to a spread of heroin addiction.

I do not see any merit in distributing heroin, but if any competent professional feels that more pharmacological studies of heroin maintenance are indicated, the way is open to him now, and he need only follow normal procedure for research on human beings: He prepares a careful protocol of the proposed experiment, submits it to his institutional review group and then, with their support, makes application to a medical granting health agency, such as New York City's Health Research Council, or the National Institutes of Health. These agencies again subject the application to review, and if it meets their standards, funds and support are forthcoming. This is the procedure that I followed when, in a quiet, unpublicized series of experiments at Rockefeller University Hospital, I actually tested the effect of administering narcotic drugs in different doses and by different routes to volunteer addict subjects. It was clear to me from these experiments, as it has been clear to previous investigators at the Lexington Hospital in Kentucky, that heroin maintenance has no promise as an answer to our social problem of heroin addiction. I am afraid that the proposals generated by the Mayor's Council were more political than scientific.

I do indeed remember our first meeting when you were in the City Council and have followed with interest your career in the House of Representatives. It is good to know that you are there and although it has not been necessary to put the matter to test, I have always felt confident that you were there as a strength if I needed you.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT P. DOLE, M.D.,
Professor and Senior Physician to the
Hospital.

NOVEMBER 1971, REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be advised of its contents I insert the text of the November 1971 issue of the Council on Environmental Quality's "102 Monitor" to appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONE HUNDRED TWO MONITOR COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

TWENTY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS EXPLAINING THE NEPA SECTION 102 ENVIRONMENT IMPACT STATEMENT PROCESS

(NOTE.—CEQ Weekly Notice of 102 Statements in Federal Register—Beginning this month, the CEQ will give faster public notice of the availability of 102 Statements and comments by inserting a weekly list in the *Federal Register*. You may subscribe to the *Federal Register* for \$25 yearly by sending your name and address to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. You will also find copies of the *Federal Register* in many public libraries.)

Question. 1. What is a "102 statement"?

Answer. It is a detailed analysis of environmental aspects of proposed action which all Federal Government agencies are required to prepare and use in their agency review processes before they take any "major actions" (including recommendations and reports on legislation) which "significantly affect the quality of the human environment."

Question: 2. Why is it called a "102 statement"?

Answer: Section 102, in particular 102(2)(C), of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") (Public Law 91-190, 91st Congress, January 1, 1970, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 4332(2)(C)) created the requirement for the statement, and set forth the procedure to be followed in its preparation and the topics it must discuss:

- (i) The environmental impact of the proposed action
- (ii) any unavoidable adverse effects
- (iii) alternatives
- (iv) the relationship of short-term uses and long-term productivity
- (v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources.

The Council on Environmental Quality has issued Guidelines on how agencies are to meet this requirement (36 *Federal Register* 7724, April 23, 1971) and most agencies have set up procedures applying the requirement to their own programs.

Q: 3. Who prepares 102 statements?

A: The law says only that it shall be prepared by "the responsible official". Agencies are currently working to prepare final procedures for making their particular operations accord with the Act, and each agency's procedures identify which official must issue 102 statements.

Q: 4. Do agencies of State Government have to prepare these statements?

A: Unless the State requires this under its own law, States prepare statements only when their actions are supported by Federal contracts, grants, or permits, and the Federal agency procedures have delegated initial preparation of statements to the state level. An example is the Federal Highway Administration, which provides matching grants for many state highway construction programs. The draft statements here are generally prepared by the State Highway Departments; the Department of Transportation takes responsibility for the final statements.

Q: 5. Must industry prepare 102 statements?

A: Generally speaking, no. The exception comes when an industry action requires a Federal license or permit—such as a Corps of Engineers dredging permit, a transmission line right-of-way across Federal land, or Federal Power Commission license for a dam.

When a Federal regulatory or permit action calls for a statement, the Federal agency will still prepare the environmental statement, but may require the private industry proposing the action to file a preliminary environmental report analyzing the environmental aspects of what it proposes to do.

Q: 6. What if two or more agencies are involved in the same project?

A: One is chosen to be the "lead" agency and made responsible for the environmental impact statement.

Q: 7. How large must a project be before it is considered a "major action" with "significant impact"?

A: Again, this varies from department to department, as each applies NEPA to its own activities and problems. The CEQ Guidelines (§ 5(b)) indicate that "highly controversial" actions are to be covered, as well as decisions taken over a period of time which, though individually not major, have a "cumulatively significant impact."

To note some examples, the Corps of Engi-

neers' proposed final procedures (*Federal Register*, June 11, 1971) call for statements not only on the Corps Water Resource Projects but also on "leasing of project lands for industrial uses, requests for overhead rights-of-way mineral extractions such as sand, gravel, rock, etc. . . ."

The Federal Power Commission's proposed regulations (36 *Federal Register* 13040, July 13, 1971) place the cutoff line for hydroelectric projects at 2,000 horsepower; above that, regulation involves a major action, while below it does not.

Q: 8. When are statements prepared?

A: The Council's Guidelines indicate that they must be made "early enough in the agency review process before an action is taken in order to permit meaningful consideration of the environmental issues involved" (§ 10(b)). In addition, the "action-forcing" 90 day waiting period requirements (see Q #17) means that the Federal agency considering a project must anticipate a minimum ninety day wait from filing the draft statement to beginning action.

Q: 9. How many 102's does the CEQ receive in a month? How many since enactment of NEPA?

A: The November 1971 Monitor listed 101 draft and 95 final statements, for a total of 196 of which over half related to highway construction. Since enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act on January 1, 1970, almost two thousand draft and 850 final statements have been catalogued, covering a total of 2040 actions (including legislative proposals and reports) subjected to environmental analysis under the Act.

Q: 10. What is the difference between a "draft" and a "final" statement?

A: The CEQ Guidelines require that each statement be prepared in two stages: first, the sponsoring agency prepares a draft statement using its own expertise and information. The draft is then reviewed and commented on by other agencies which have specialized expertise relating to the project. Finally, the sponsoring agency uses these comments to modify the project plans (if indicated) and to prepare a final statement.

Q: 11. Who is asked to comment?

A: The Guidelines contain an appendix which lists Federal agencies with expertise in particular aspects of the environment which should be asked to comment. In addition, when State or local review is relevant, copies of the draft are either sent to the State, regional, and metropolitan clearinghouses set up by Circular #A-95 of the Office of Management and Budget or directly to State and local agencies authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards. The CEQ receives ten copies of every statement and may also comment.

Q: 12. What role do members of the public have in the commenting process?

A: The agency preparing the draft statement is responsible for making it available to the public (under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552)—see Q #18). Any individual or organization may then comment on the draft; he may express support or opposition, suggest alternatives, or point out project effects that may have escaped the attention of its sponsors. These comments may be in the form of a letter, a critique, or even, as done by some citizen's groups, a "counter-102" setting forth their views and analysis in as great a depth as the draft itself.

Q: 13. How soon must comments be made?

A: Ordinarily agencies must allow at least thirty days for comments (forty-five for EPA comments on projects with effects in the areas of EPA jurisdiction). Some have written longer periods into their procedures. The Guidelines suggest that requests for 15 day extensions should be considered favorably.

Q: 14. How can people find out about comments?

A: The summary sheet attached to each draft statement lists the agencies consulted; the final statement is made available with copies of all comments received. The sponsoring agency is responsible for making comments available on request (under the Freedom of Information Act); such request should be directed either to the sponsoring agency's nearest regional office, or to its environmental liaison officer (listed in Appendix II of the Guidelines).

Q: 15. How can the public get copies of statements and comments on such statements?

A: All draft and final statements, unless classified are listed in the 102 Monitor; since May they have been given a NTIS (National Technical Information Service) order number, and since August, an ELR (*Environmental Law Reporter*) order number. (see p. 8 for information on how to order the statements from NTIS or the Environmental Law Reporter). It is particularly important to a prompt response that the order number be sent to NTIS.

Copies of statements are also kept at the offices of the agency that prepared them, as well as being available to the public at the State and regional clearinghouses (see Q #11).

Representatives of conservation groups who feel that they will want to comment on many of an agency's statements should contact either the nearest regional office or the agency's environmental liaison official (see Q #14) with the request that their names be added to the mailing list for commentators.

Q: 16. Is there any other way to involve the public in project review?

A: Yes—the public hearing. Some agencies (e.g., the Federal Highway Administration) are required to hold them as a matter of statute, while others are encouraged by Executive Order 11514 to hold them as a point of contact with public opinion. For non-regulatory hearings, the draft statement must be made available fifteen days in advance of the hearing.

Q: 17. What chance is there for the draft and final 102 statements to affect agency action?

A: CEQ's Guidelines § 10(b) provides that "to the maximum extent possible" no administrative action is to be taken within 90 days after the draft statement has been made available to the Council and the public, nor is it to be taken within thirty days of the final statement's availability (the time periods may overlap). In other words, an agency cannot start work until the public and the Executive have had at least 90 days to examine the environmental consequences of the plan—and if the final follows the draft by more than 60 days the review time is extended as well.

These waiting periods only apply to actions the agency can take itself—not legislative proposals or reports—and may be modified with the CEQ's consent when emergency circumstances, expense to the Government, or impaired program effectiveness make modification appropriate.

Q: 18. What is the CEQ's role in the 102 process?

A: As the agency supervising the whole § 102 process, the Council must pay special attention to maintaining the "traffic rules" for the flow of reports, leaving most substantive comments to the particular "expert" agencies.

The Council also serves as advisor to the President on environmental questions. In this capacity the Council may comment on particularly important or controversial projects and suggest what courses of action might be followed.

Q: 19. What effect has the § 102 process had?

A: Federal agencies have taken, modified, and avoided actions on the basis of the NEPA environmental analysis. For example, the Corps of Engineers refused to grant some dredge and fill permits in order to protect ecological and esthetic values. The Corps also has suspended some water resource projects pending consideration of the environmental impacts. The Coast Guard has denied several bridge construction permits to avoid adverse environmental consequences. The Forest Service switched from clearcutting to selective cutting in a National Forest, the Department of Transportation reconsidered several proposed Interstate Highway routes, and the Department of Defense amended plans for munitions disposal.

(For a fuller discussion of this question see the CEQ's Second Annual Report, pp. 25-27 and Chapter V, "The Law and the Environment.")

Q: 20. What legal rights does the citizen have under NEPA?

A: Most courts have concluded that the NEPA "102" environmental statement procedure is court enforceable at the suit of interested citizens. The extent of the citizen's right to sue is still being defined by the courts, particularly since it is linked to broader questions of administrative law, such as scope of judicial review, "standing," sovereign immunity, etc. (see Chapter V "The Law and the Environment," of the Council's Second Annual Report for more detailed information).

The 102 Monitor is published by the Council on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. If your address is incorrect, please write to Hope Hale, Acting Editor.

The title of this publication refers to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). File this and subsequent issues in a ring binder for handy reference.

SOURCES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

In order to receive more efficient and prompt service, requestors are urged to order draft and final impact statements from the Department of Commerce's National Technical Information Service (NTIS) rather than the preparing agency. Each statement will be assigned an order number that will appear in the 102 Monitor (at the end of the summary of each statement) and also in the NTIS semi-monthly Announcement Series No. 68, "Environmental Pollution and Control." (An annual subscription costs \$5.00 and can be ordered from the NTIS, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151.)

Final statements will be available in microfiche as well as paper copy. A paper copy of any statement can be obtained by writing NTIS at the above address and enclosing \$3.00 and the order number. A microfiche costs \$0.95. (Paper copies of documents that are over 300 pages are \$6.00.)

NTIS is offering a special "package" in which the subscriber receives all statements in microfiche for \$0.35 per statement.

Statements will still be available for public scrutiny in the document rooms of the various agencies. However, only limited copies will be available for distribution.

Yet another possible source of statements is from the Environmental Law Institute, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. To order a document, please indicate the Department, date, and ELR Order No. (given at the end of each summary). The Institute charges \$0.10 per page, and as you will note the number of pages is also given at the end of the summaries. Please enclose the correct amount of money with

your order and mark the envelope to the attention to the "Document Service."

SOURCE FOR BACK ISSUES OF THE 102 MONITOR

Because the supply of past issues of the 102 Monitor is not sufficient to meet all requests, a list is provided below indicating where the various issues of the 102 Monitor appeared in the *Congressional Record*. You may wish to order these *Congressional Records* from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (\$.25 per copy).

Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2 & 3—*Congressional Record*—April 28 (Extension of Remarks), page E 3607.

Vol. 1, No. 4—*Congressional Record*—May 27 (Extension of Remarks), page E 5151.

Vol. 1, No. 5—*Congressional Record*—June 16 (Extension of Remarks), page E 6023.

Vol. 1, No. 6—*Congressional Record*—July 28 (Extension of Remarks), page E 8458.

Vol. 1, No. 7—*Congressional Record*—Sept. 13 (Extension of Remarks), page E 9483.

Vol. 1, No. 8—*Congressional Record*—Sept. 24 (Extension of Remarks), page E 10002.

Vol. 1, No. 9—*Congressional Record*—Nov. 1 (Extension of Remarks), page E 11596.

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS RECEIVED BY THE COUNCIL FROM OCTOBER 1 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1971

(NOTE: At the head of the listing of statements received from each agency is the name of an individual who can answer questions regarding those statements.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Dr. T. C. Byerly, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20250 (202) 388-7803.

Agricultural Research Service

Draft

Title, Description, and Date of Transmittal

Cooperative Diapause Control Program for Boll Weevil, *Texas* and *Mexico*. The statement describes present and future plans for controlling the spread of boll weevils in the Texas High Plains. Recommends the use of the insecticide, aldicarb, in order to reduce the use of malathion. Aldicarb is highly toxic and will be applied only to rows in the margins of selected fields near ideal overwintering quarters. Some studies have been done to determine aldicarb's effect on insects, animals, etc. (ELR Order No. 1069, 18 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 608-D) 10/22.

Forest Service

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Proposal to declassify the Uncompahgre Primitive Area, Uncompahgre National Forest, *Colorado*: consists of 53,252 acres of National Forest and 16,001 of privately owned lands that embody few characteristics of wilderness as defined in the Wilderness Act of 1964. (ELR Order No. 1050, 29 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 515-D) 10/14.

Six Rivers Timber Management Plan, Six Rivers National Forest, *California*. Plan to use a combination of even-aged and all-aged management with emphasis on even-aged management for developing timber resource. Some 2,064 million board feet will be harvested over a 10 year period. Statement discusses impact on soil, water, wildlife, fish, etc. Thought had been given to making Six Rivers National Forest a Wilderness area. Comments made by DOI, various State of California agencies, Sierra Club, KIEM Television Station, Western Lumber Mfg. and consulting foresters. (ELR Order #1001, 49 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 319-F) 10/12.

Soil Conservation Service

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Hollow Creek Watershed, Lexington and Saluda Counties, *South Carolina*. Proposes conservation land treatment over 2,700 acres supplemented by two floodwater retarding structures. Project will destroy agricultural use and wildlife habitat on 91 acres of pasture—and woodland. (ELB Order #936, 8 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 233-D) 10/6/71.

Carbon Hill Watershed project, *Montana*. Includes land treatment measures such as ditch lining, land leveling and water control structures. Other parts of the project are: 4 reservoirs, and open channel, floodway and drainage system, etc. Purpose: reduce flood water and sediment damages, etc. Requires 287 acres for these measures; may also increase salinity of the water. (ELR Order #998, 12 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 315-D) 10/8.

Palatlakaha River Watershed project, *Florida*. Involves installation of 19.4 miles of channel improvement, 10 grade stabilization structures and 11 water control structures. Purpose: reduce erosion, sediment, floodwater damages, etc. Will result in loss of 185 acres of sloughs, marshes and open water since will be used for spoil storage. (ELR Order #1014, 27 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 477-D) 10/13.

East Fork of Whitewater Watershed project, *Indiana*. Provides for land treatment practices on over 91,000 acres with 47 small dams, 3 multiple purpose structures for flood prevention and public recreation, 10.3 miles of stream environmental corridor development for public recreation, 19.6 miles of channel improvement, etc. Purpose: reduce flood damage, erosion of sediment. About 250 acres of woody wildlife habitat, 250 acres of grassland and 800 acres of cropland will be inundated or destroyed. (ELR Order No. 1044, 16 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 512-D) 10/19.

Hurricane Creek Watershed structural project measure, Hopkins, *Kentucky*, in the Tradewater River Resource Conservation and Development Project (flood prevention). Consists of accelerating land treatment, installing 3 floodwater retarding structures, and improving 4 miles of channel. (ELR Order No. 1057, 10 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 511-D) 10/20.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

Lost River Watershed project, *Indiana*. (An earlier statement was sent on August 11, 1970. It was considered a final, but in fact was a draft.) Plan calls for a comprehensive land treatment program, 11 floodwater retarding structures, 2 grade stabilization structures and 44 miles of stream channel improvement. Purpose: reduce erosion, flood damages, increase recreation area. Will result in a change of land use. For example, 327 acres of woodland and 52 acres along channel banks will be lost for its wildlife value, approximately 22 miles of River will be inundated. (ELR Order No. 903, 76 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-202 976-F) 9/27.

Yaeger Ditch Project Measure, Southeast Texas Resource Conservation and Development Program, Orange County, *Texas*. Involves additional land treatment measures on 150 acres of pastureland supplemented by about 12,135 ft. of channel work. Of this 10,735 ft. will be to increase capacity of the Yaeger Ditch and about 1,400 ft. will be construction of a lateral channel. Purpose: reducing flooding, erosion and sediment damage. Comments made by Army COE, USDA, South East Texas Regional Planning Comm., EPA, various State of Texas agencies. (ELR Order No. 906, 14 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-201 350-F) 9/29.

Sugar River Watershed project, *New Hampshire*. Includes land treatment on about 80,000 acres and installation of 10 impoundments. Purpose: to reduce annual flood damage. Will flood or cover by dams 1,198 acres of land and 4.4 miles of stream. (ELR Order No. 929, 49 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 159-F) 9/30.

Headwater-Yellow River Project Measure, Gwinnett County Resource Conservation and Development Project, *Georgia*. Consists of a floodwater retarding structure (earth embankment) and a spillway, designed to form a 32 acre sediment pool and work on 11.3 miles of channel (removal of trees and debris). Purpose: reduce flood damages, bank erosion, etc. Comments made by Army COE, DOI, USDA, EPA, various State of Georgia agencies (ELR Order No. 595, 18 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-201 331-F) 10/8.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of Air Force

Contact: Col. Cliff M. Whitehead, Room 5E 425, Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20330 (202) OX 5-2889.

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

National Guard Use of Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Coffee and Franklin Counties, *Tennessee*. Air Force proposes making available to Tennessee National Guard for training of mechanized units 2,500 acres of AEDC land near Tullahoma. Will involve conversion of land from wildlife management area. (ELR Order #948, 22 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 238-D) 10/4.

Department of Army

Corps of Engineers

Contact: Francis X. Kelly, Assistant for Conservation Liaison, Public Affairs Office; Office, Chief of Engineers, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20314 (202) 693-6329.

For the reader's convenience we have listed the numerous statements from COE by State in alphabetical order.

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Fish and Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Cache Piver Basin Project, *Arkansas*. Modifies authorized project to acquire approximately 30,000 acres of woodland in the flood plains of lower Cache River and Bayou DeView and their development for mitigation of anticipated fish and wildlife losses. (ELR Order #924, 152 pages) (NTIS Order #UBX203 158-D) 9/30.

Columbia Drainage and Levee District No. 3, Monroe County, *Illinois*. Modification work on the levee project consists of constructing 2 pumping stations, 2,500 linear ft. of interception ditches, 36,160 linear ft. of drainage ditches, etc. Purpose: remove impounded interior drainage, reduce flooding. (ELR Order No. 1062, 13 pages) (NTIS Order PB-203 614-D) 10/20.

Falmouth Lake, Licking River, Pendleton County, *Kentucky* (flood control project). Consists of constructing dam and lake 9 miles upstream from Falmouth. Will inundate about 12,300 acres of land and convert 75 miles of free-flowing stream to a slack water impoundment, with concomitant loss of wildlife cover. (ELR Order No. 946, 4 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 221-D) 10/7.

Bucks Harbor navigation project, Machiasport, *Maine*. Consists of dredging an 11 acre anchorage, 8 ft. deep along the southwesterly side of Bucks Harbor. Purpose: improve commercial fishing capability at the Harbor. Dredged materials will be placed at an offshore site, as yet not determined. (ELR Order No. 1095, 11 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 693-D) 10/22.

Choptank River, Caroline County, *Maryland*

(navigation project). Consists of dredging a navigation channel 12 ft. deep by 100 ft. wide from Pealiquor Shoals to Denton, Md. Will use hydraulic method for dredging. (ELR Order No. 1078, 30 pages) (NTIS Order No. —) 10/22.

New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbor navigation project, *Massachusetts*. Provides for widening 1,100 ft. long section of 15 ft. deep channel by 100 ft.; deepening 900 ft. long, 10 ft. deep channel to 15 ft. and widening it by 100 ft. and at a depth of 6 ft. Purpose: to upgrade navigation and to accommodate commercial fishing craft and recreation boats. (ELR Order No. 923, 103 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 156-D) 9/23.

Mud Creek flood protection project, Broken Bow, *Nebraska*. Channel improvement involves enlarging and realigning, replacing 4 bridges, constructing levees, etc. Also involves diverting the South Branch Mud Creek into North Branch Mud Creek. Will reduce the amount of wildlife habitat. (ELR Order #1024, 12 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-203 473-D) 10/13.

Sugar and Briar Creeks project, Catawba River Basin, *North Carolina* (flood control project). Consists of creek channelization for a combined 7.5 miles from Archdale Dr., Charlotte, to Princeton Ave. on Little Sugar Creek and to Randolph Rd. on Briar Creek. (ELR Order #53, 16 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 232-D) 10/5.

Jetties at Beaufort Inlet, Morehead City Harbor, *North Carolina*. Involves construction of an east and west jetty—the East Jetty tying into the Shackleford Banks and the West Jetty tying into the jetty in the Fort Macon State project. Purpose: improve navigation by reducing shoaling in the inlet. (ELR Order #1015, 8 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-203 478-D) 10/12.

Dyersburg, *Tennessee* (flood protection project). Consists of constructing a levee from Highway 51 Bypass, east to the leveed sewage treatment plant and northeast to a point south of the Illinois Central Railroad. Purpose: provide flood protection which will enable implementation of an urban renewal project. (ELR Order #954, 8 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-203 237-D) 10/4.

Arkansas-Red River Basins Water Quality Control Study, Part I, Areas VII, VIII and I, *Texas*. (This draft statement supersedes statement sent April 14, 1971 described as Arkansas-Red River Chloride Control Part I.) Involves construction of 4-low-flow dams, 3 brine storage dams and about 37 miles of pipeline. Purpose: provide facilities for water quality control and control brines entering Lake Kemp. (ELR Order #1074, 26 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-203 603-D) 10/15.

Stonewall Jackson Lake, West Fork River, *West Virginia* (flood control project). Constructing a multipurpose dam 680 ft. long and 97 ft. high and a lake. Purpose: flood and water quality control, water supply, and recreation. Will inundate 3,470 acres of farmland and wildlife habitat and will result in loss of 35 miles of free flowing stream. (ELR Order #907, 10 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 980-D) 9/16.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

Chena River Lakes flood control project, Fairbanks, *Alaska*. Construction of 2 earth-fill dams on the Chena and Little Chena Rivers and a levee system on the Tehana River. Project will impound 2 miles of free-flowing stream habitat and will inundate 10,000 acres of marsh and stream habitat during peak flood levels. Purpose: provide protection from flooding, recreation, etc. Comments made by DOI, USDA, EPA, various State of Alaska agencies. (ELR Order #1088, 72 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 532-F) 10/27.

Stockton Ship Channel, Venice Island to Stockton, *California* (bank protection project). Involves placement of 6,765 lineal ft. of rock revetment at 6 selected erosion sites on slope of levees, clearing and dredging. Purpose: to repair presently eroded levees, reduce future damage from wave action against levees. Comments made by DOI, Commerce, EPA, HEW, various State of California agencies. (ELR Order #1021, 62 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 873-F) 10/14.

Fort Myers Beach Channel, *Florida* (navigation project). Dredging a 2,000 ft. channel extension (11 ft. x 125 ft.) with a turning basin at the easterly end of the existing channel (adjacent to Matanzas Pass). Dredge material will be pumped across Estero Island and placed along the beach. Purpose: to facilitate shrimp boats and barge traffic to and from terminal facilities. Comments made by EPA, DOI, DOT, HUD, various State of Florida agencies. (ELR Order #999, 35 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 611-F) 10/11.

Okeechobee Waterway, vicinity of Ft. Meyers, *Florida* (navigation project). Involves enlarging a 5-mile reach of the Waterway in the Caloosahatchee River. Purpose: to improve navigation conditions for commercial use from the Gulf to Lake Okeechobee. Dredge material will be placed in upland diked area and 7 open water areas enclosed by barriers. Comments made by USDA, DOI, EPA, DOT, various State of Florida agencies. (ELR Order #1089, 44 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 872-F) 10/27.

Cottonwood Creek Dam, Cottonwood Creek, *Idaho*. Construction of an earth and rockfill structure 117 ft. high. Purpose: provide flood protection to eastern section of Boise. Comments made by EPA, DOI, USDA, Ada County, City of Boise, various State of Idaho agencies. (ELR Order #1090, 36 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 724-F) 10/27.

Martin Channel improvement project, *Kentucky*. Involves enlarging and realigning 4.5 miles of channel in Beaver Creek at the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River. Purpose: reduce flood stages in Martin. Will result in loss of some wildlife habitat. Comments made by EPA, DOI, Commonwealth of Kentucky Dept. of Natural Resources. No draft statement received. (ELR Order #933, 20 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 157-F) 9/30.

Taylorville Lake flood control project, *Kentucky*. Construction of a dam and lake about 25 miles southeast of Louisville. Will inundate 3,050 acres of land and 18 miles of stream, stream bank habitat and stream fishery. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, various State of Kentucky agencies, Lincoln Trail Area Development District, Ind. (ELR Order #1091, 48 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 789-F) 10/27.

Mill Creek (Ohio River Basin), *Kentucky*. This channel improvement project involves work on about 3.5 miles of Mill Creek (located between Cane Run Road and US-3100, in southwestern Jefferson County). Purpose: flood relief, drainage control, etc. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, various State of Kentucky agencies and Ohio Metropolitan Council of Governments. (ELR Order 1099, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 653-F) 10/28.

Goose Creek navigation project, Somerset County, *Maryland*. Involves dredging channel to a depth of 6 ft. with an additional 2 foot overdepth by hydraulic dredge methods. Begins at Manokin River and extends for 4,400 ft. to a point about 500 ft. upstream of the county wharf at Rumbley. Purpose: improve navigation for commercial fisherman. Comments made by DOI, EPA, various State of Maryland agencies. (ELR Order #1048, 24 pages) (NTIS Order PB-202 642-F) 10/19.

Tocks Island reservoir project, *New Jersey*,

New York and Pennsylvania. Proposed construction of a dam and 12,400-acre reservoir on the Delaware River. Purpose: flood control, water supply, hydroelectric power, etc. Will result in the loss of 37 miles of free-flowing streams and 10,000 acres of wildlife habitat. Comments made by DOI, HEW, FPC, EPA, Delaware River Basin Commission, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Delaware, State of New Jersey, State of New York, Del. Valley Conservation Assoc., Lenni Lenape League, Save. N.J.'s Natural Environment, Sandyston Township Assoc., Inc., Sierra Club, Tocks Island Citizens Assoc., Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council, Trout Unlimited, Water Resources Assoc. of Delaware River Basin. (ELR Order #902, 214 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 972-F) 10/1.

New Hope Lake project, Haw River Basin, *North Carolina*. Involves construction of an earth dam, forming lake with a surface area of 14,300 acres. Will inundate about 22 miles of free-flowing stream. Purpose: flood protection, water supply, water quality control, etc. Statement is divided into three volumes—Vol. 1 includes items required in a 102 statement; Vol. 2 provides additional correspondence received after March 30; and Vol. 3 contains the transcripts of depositions. Comments made by EPA, USDA, DOI, DOT, HUD, various State of North Carolina agencies, ECOS, Inc. N.C. State University. (NTIS has assigned a separate order number for each volume—Vol. 1: PB-198 999-F-1; Vol. 2: PB-198 999-F-2, Vol. 3: PB-198 999-F-3. Vol. 1 & 3 are over 300 pages and therefore cost \$6.00 apiece.) 10/22.

Mill Creek Lake, Mill Creek, Scioto River Basin, Delaware and Union Counties, *Ohio*. Construction and operation of a dam and other facilities. Purpose: flood control, recreation and water quality control. It will regulate the runoff from a 181 square mile watershed. Will result in loss of farm land and some types of aquatic and terrestrial habitat. Comments made by DOI, EPA, Ohio Historic Society. (ELR Order #1005, 54 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 949-F) 10/7.

Salt Creek Reservoir, Salt Creek, Scioto River Basin, *Ohio*. Involves construction of a dam and reservoir in Appalachian Region. Purpose: regulate runoff from a 285 square mile watershed. Comments made by Public Health Service, EPA, DOI, USDA, various States of Ohio Historical Society. (ELR Order #1022, 66 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 654-F) 10/28.

Los Esteros Lake, Santa Rosa, *New Mexico*. Involves construction of an access road, an earth and rolled rockfill dam, a tunnel type conduit, and an uncontrolled spillway channel in Guadalupe County. Purpose: flood control, irrigation, etc. 7,360 acres of wildlife habitat will be lost, and about 14 miles of free-flowing stream will become a slack water area. Comments made by DOI, EPA, various State of Mexico agencies, N.M. Ornithological Society, Sierra Club (ELR Order #1078, 69 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 431-F) 10/28.

Bristol Harbor navigation project, *Rhode Island*. Consists of an offshore breakwater 1600 ft. long. Purpose: to protect vessels and shore facilities from storms. Comments made by Commerce, EPA, DOI. (ELR Order #950, 31 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 240-F) 10/6.

Office of the Assistant Secretary

Contact: Col. William P. Gardiner, Chief of Construction Division, Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Washington, D.C. (202) OX4-4380.

Draft

Title, description, and date

Demilitarization of Toxic Munitions at U.S. Army Materiel Command Installations: Anniston Army Depot and Pine Bluff Arsenal, *Alabama*; Pueblo Army Depot, *Colorado*; Lex-

ington-Bluegrass Army Depot, Kentucky; Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon; and Toccole Army Depot, Utah. Involves disposal of toxic (6B, VX, and Mustard) filled munitions. (ELR Order No. 1046, 137 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 509-D) 10/14.

Final

Title, description, and date

Phase 1 deployment of the SAFEGUARD Ballistic Missile Defense System, Grand Forks, North Dakota and Malmstrom AFB, Montana. (System must be located close to Minuteman fields in N.D. and Mont. to protect them.) System consists of Missile Site Radar (MSR) and Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR), two types of interceptor missiles (SPARTAN and SPRINT), a high speed computer system, etc. Purpose: protection from ICBM attack. Information attached on community impact (several thousand persons will move into the communities to work on the system). Comments made by USDA, HEW, AEC, EPA, DOI, Montana Water Resources Board and North Dakota State Planning Comm. (ELR Order No. 1008, 65 pages—does not include information on community impact) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 321-F—does not include information on community impact) 10/15.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Contact: Mr. George Marienthal, Acting Director of Environmental Impact Statements Office, 1750 K Street, N.W., Room 440, Washington, D.C. 20460 (202) 254-7420.

Draft

Title, description, and date

Waste Treatment project, Spencer, Iowa. Application by City of Spencer for a grant to construct a system consisting of an anaerobic-aerated-aerobic lagoon system, intercepting sewer, 2 pumping stations, odor control facility, etc. (ELR Order No. 1000, 17 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 316-D) 10/4.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Rod Kreger, Deputy Administrator, GSA-AD, Washington, D.C. 20405, (202) 343-6077.

Alternate Contact: Aaron Woloshin, Director, Office of Environmental Affairs, GSA-AD, (202) 343-4161.

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Disposal of portion of Camp Parks, Alameda County, California. Involves 4 parcels totaling about 767 acres and 245 buildings. Some of the land will be conveyed to schools. (ELR Order #908, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 977-D) 9/29.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

Transfer of 12.36 acres of Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, Orange County, California to the Office of Education, HEW. Purpose: to enable the Office of Education to consolidate the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory by constructing a building on this land. Comments made by HEW, DOT, DOI, EPA, City of Los Alamitos, Resources Agency of California. (ELR Order #1004, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 459-F) 10/6.

Disposal of 35.3 acres comprising the Administrative and Launcher Areas, NIKE Batteries LA-70 and LA-73, Los Angeles, California. Proposes sale of this land to the Calif. Department of Airports. Comments made by DOT, HEW, EPA, City of Los Angeles. (ELR Order #969, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 886-F) 10/12.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Contact: Richard H. Broun, Director, Environmental and Land Use Planning Division, Washington, D.C., (202) 755-6186.

CXVII—2602—Part 31

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Marshall Union Manor Corporation Apartments, Portland, Oregon. (Section 236 Project No. 126-44802-NP.) The Union Labor Retirement Association has applied for mortgage and interest subsidy assistance for development of a high-rise designed for senior citizens. (ELR Order #993, 8 pages) NTIS Order #PB203 312-D) 10/1.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

New Community of Maumelle near Little Rock, Arkansas. Proposed offer of commitment to guarantee up to \$7.5 million in obligations to finance costs of land development over a 20 year period to Maumelle Land Development, Inc. Projected population is between 45,000 and 60,000 on this 5,319 acre site. The site has a 3.5 mile frontage on the Arkansas River. (The Army Corps of Engineers has underway presently a flood control and navigation project in this area.) Comments made by EPA, Army COE, Metroplan, OEO. (ELR Order #928, 50 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 236-F) 10/1.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Contact: Office of Communications, Room 7214, Washington, D.C. 20240 (202) 343-6416.

Bureau of Land Management

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Jim Bridger Thermal-Electric Generation Project, Wyoming and Idaho. Includes a 1,500 MW coal-fired steam electric plant (under construction in Rock Springs, Wyoming), a strip mine nearby, a 42-mile water delivery system, and rail and highway access. Distribution system includes three 345 KV transmission lines between plant and substations in Bingham and Bannock Counties, Idaho. (ELR Order No. 1045, 145 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 520-D) 10/15.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

Proposed Oil and Gas Lease Sale, Outer Continental Shelf, Gulf of Mexico. Lease sale consists of 86 tracts of submerged lands offshore Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama. Would add 396,250 acres to the total 3,782,796 presently under Federal lease offshore Louisiana. 75 to 125 additional platforms and other structures may be necessary to develop these tracts. Also may require 40 new pipelines. (ELR Order No. 1058, 129 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-201 517-F) 10/21.

Bureau of Mines

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Oil Shale Retort Research project, Colorado. Proposes further research on the development of surface retorting of oil shale (retorting is a process of extracting oil) at the Anvil Points Oil Shale Research Facility near Rifle, Colorado. In addition will provide information on how to dispose of retorted shale. Project is to be conducted over a 5-year period. (ELR Order No. 1003, 22 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 318-D) 10/13.

Bureau of Reclamation

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Huntington Canyon generating station and transmission line. The Utah Power & Light Co. plans to build a coal-fired thermal-electric generating plant at Huntington Canyon, Utah. (This draft statement is an updated version of the statements sent 4/23. It contains information from the Forest Service, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of

Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. See 102 Monitor, May 1971, p. 32, for more details on the project.) (ELR Order No. 925, 169 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-198 736-D) 9/30.

Gila Gravity Main Canal: Yuma County, Arizona (Irrigation project). Rehabilitation and betterment of approximately 14.7 miles of channel, consisting of access road construction, canal bank road improvement, and drainage structure construction. (ELR Order No. 951, 17 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 222-D) 10/5.

Dust Abatement at Canyon Ferry Lake, Canyon Ferry Unit, Helena-Great Falls Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Montana. Involves construction of dikes to form subimpoundments to cover exposed areas, dredging of fine material into subimpoundments, and flooding subimpoundments for development as wildlife habitat. (ELR Order No. 930, 11 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 097-D) 10/5.

Navajo Project: Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. A consolidation of materials presented in 5 draft statements for: (1) Navajo Generating Station: construction begun April 1970 of coal-fired, 2,310-mw generating station (see 102 Monitor, March 1971, p. 33); (2) Black Mesa and Lake Powell R.R. (formerly called Navajo-Black Mesa Coal Haul R.R.): electric railroad to haul coal to Navajo Generating Station (102 Monitor May 1971, p. 32); (3) Black Mesa Coal Mining Operation: development of strip mining operating to supply fuel for Navajo and Mohave Steam Generating Stations (102 Monitor, August 1971, p. 34); (4) Southern Transmission System (formerly called Navajo-Phoenix Transmission System): construction of two 250-mile, 500,000 v transmission lines (102 Monitor, May 1971, p. 31); and (5) Western Transmission System (formerly called Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line): construction of 500 kv transmission line (102 Monitor, July 1971, p. 34). (ELR Order No. 951, 279 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 222-D) 10/5.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

Manson Unit, Chief Joseph Dam irrigation project, Washington. Works include a main pumping plant on Lake Chelan, 8 relief pumping stations, 12 regulating reservoirs, 71 miles of buried pipe. Conversion of grazing and dryland crop acreage to irrigated farmland. Will reduce winter range for deer, and reduce food for game-birds. Comments made by DOI, USDA, Commerce, DOT, FPC, Army COE, various State and local agencies in Washington. (ELR Order No. 1060, 86 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-198 968-F) 10/18.

Mt. Elbert pumped-storage powerplant, Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Colorado. Located on the north shore of Twin Lakes, construction includes a 100 megawatt reversible pump-turbine-motor generator unit and preparatory work on a second unit. Powerplant structure equivalent to a 15 story building. Will have an impact on marine life of Twin Lakes (a prize trout fishery is located there). Purpose: irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, industrial water, etc. Comments made by DOT, USDA, FPC, DOI, various State of Colorado agencies, National Wildlife Federation. (ELR Order No. 1059, 37 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 507-F) 10/19.

National Park Service

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area: Northampton, Monroe, and Pike Counties, Pennsylvania and Warren and Sussex Counties, New Jersey. Establishment of 70,000-acre recreation area on the 12,000-

acre Tocks Island Reservoir and 60,000 acres of adjacent lands. Will involve Federal acquisition of 47,000 acres of land, most privately owned, and will create problems of water supply and waste disposal. (ELR Order No. 949, 59 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 234-D) 10/6.

Recreation Development Plan for Lake Berryessa, California. Outlines land use and development of public recreation opportunities to serve San Francisco Bay, Sacramento and Stockton region. Proposes acquisition of approximately 4,300 acres. (ELR Order #1098, 108 pages) (NTIS Order #—) 10/27.

Office of the Secretary

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Proposed Geothermal steam leasing program: Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and prospectively Arizona, Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Implementation of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 involves adopting leasing and operating regulation redevelopment and production of geothermal resources in Federally owned lands. (ELR Order #931, 233 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 102-D) 10/6.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Ralph E. Cushman, Special Assistant, Office of Administration, Washington, D.C. 20546 (202) 962-8107.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

John F. Kennedy Space Center, Cape Kennedy, Florida. Statement is a general description of the Space Center's programs, facilities and consequent environmental impact. (ELR Order #927, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 059-F) 9/29.

Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, and White Sands Test Facility, New Mexico. Describes environmental impact of these facilities and their current and planned activities. The test facility is in a remote location where NASA can run hazardous tests associated with development of the Apollo Spacecraft Propulsion Systems. (ELR Order #926, 48 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 160-F) 9/29.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Contact: Dr. Francis Gartrell, Director, Environmental Research and Development, 720 Edney Building, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401 (615) 755-2002.

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Construction and operation of Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee. To be located on a peninsula jutting out into the Tennessee River on the west shore of Chickamauga Lake about 18 miles northeast of Chattanooga. The plant will be composed of 2 reactor containment buildings, a turbine building, auxiliary building, 500-kv and 161-kv switchyard, etc. (ELR Order #1093, 293 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 607-D) 10/19.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact: Martin Convisser*, Director, Office of Program Co-ordination, 400 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, (202) 462-4357. For the reader's convenience we have listed the numerous statements from DOT by State in alphabetical order.

*Mr. Convisser's office will refer you to the correct regional office from which the statement originated. In the case of the Federal Highway Administration, a separate page is included in this Monitor giving the names of the Regional Administrators (see page 57).

Federal Aviation Administration

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Danbury Municipal Airport project, Danbury, Connecticut. Involves relocation of airfield lighting vault, installation of drainage culverts and security fencing, and runway end identifier lighting system (REILS). Purpose: to assist pilot identification of runway ends and provide circling guidance. (ELR Order No. 904, 14 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-202 979-D) 9/28.

Honolulu International Airport project, Honolulu, Hawaii. Proposes construction of new runway, necessitating a breakwater to prevent storm wave damage, in order to reduce noise levels and improve safety. Involves loss of 1,240 acres of marine and wildlife habitat and aquatic recreational area. (ELR Order No. 952, 28 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 235-D) 10/5.

Purdue University Airport project, West Lafayette, Indiana. Consists of lengthening and widening runways, constructing new taxiway and installing ALS. (ELR Order No. 1071, 55 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 605-D) 10/16.

Fleming-Mason Airport project, Flemingsburg, Kentucky. Involves land reimbursement and acquisition, construction of runway and taxiway, etc. Purpose: provide a 24-hour landing area capability. (ELR Order #1072, 20 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 604-D) 10/26.

Pittsfield Municipal Airport project, Pittsfield, Massachusetts. Involves installation of runway lighting and relocation of approach lighting system. (ELR Order #1035, 22 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 471-D) 10/18.

Manchester Municipal Airport project, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. Proposes acquisition of easements and removal of trees and poles obstructing approaches to a runway. (ELR Order #963, 10 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 226-O) 10/5.

Lorain County Regional Airport project, Lorain County, Ohio. Proposes construction of taxiway, expansion of pad, and acquisition of 27 acres. (ELR Order #947, 7 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 236-D) 10/5.

Abernathy Field airport project, Pulaski-Giles County, Tennessee. Consists of extending runway 500 feet, installing a medium intensity lighting system, and adding to apron. (ELR Order #955, 15 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 231-D) 10/5.

Shively Field airport project, Saratoga, Wyoming. Involves extending and paving runway, constructing taxiway, etc. (ELR Order 1010, 24 pages) (NTIS Order PB-203 475-D) 10/15.

Final Title, Description, and Date

Autauga County Airport project, Prattville, Alabama. Construction of a General Aviation Airport to accommodate propeller aircraft under 12,500 pounds. Requires use of 55 acres of land for airport. Comments made by EPA, USDA, DOI, Army COE, HEW, Alabama Development Office, City of Prattville, Town of Autaugaville. (ELR Order #992, 26 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 580-F) 10/1.

Chandler Municipal Airport project, Chandler, Arizona. Involves extending runway, taxiway, paving access road, etc. Will result in shift in traffic pattern. Comments made by DOI, HEW, Army COE, HUD, USDA, City of Chandler Maricopa Assoc. of Governments and Ariz. Dept. of Economic Planning and Development. (ELR Order #885, 25 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 578-F) 10/1.

Nut Tree Airport project, Vacaville, California. Involves acquisition of land, extending, overlaying and widening of runway and taxiway, channel relocations, runway light system, etc. Comments made by USDA, DOI, Army COE, HEW, State Clearinghouse, Assoc. of Bay Area Governments, various State of

California agencies. (ELR Order #984, 49 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 226-F) 10/1.

Santa Barbara Municipal Airport project, Santa Barbara, California. Involves constructing a portion of a parallel taxiway to serve the main instrument runway at the Municipal Airport and installing lights. A portion of this taxiway will be constructed on the edge of a tidal lagoon, which is a haven for birds and other small wildlife known as the Goleta Slough. Comments made by EPA, DOI, USDA, Army COE, HUD. (ELR Order #983, 107 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 533-F) 10/7.

Waterloo Municipal Airport project, Black Hawk County, Iowa. Extension of existing runway, connecting taxiway, and strengthening of taxiways, etc. Purpose: to accommodate the Boeing 727-200 aircraft. Comments made by USDA, Commerce, EPA, DOI, Army COE, various State and city agencies in Iowa. (ELR Order #1082, 25 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 686-F) 10/26.

McCarran International Airport project, Las Vegas, Nevada. Involves land acquisition, runway extension, etc. Purpose: accommodate larger aircarrier aircraft. Comments made by DOT, EPA, Army COE, DOI, USDA, AEC, HEW, and the State and Metropolitan Clearinghouses. (ELR Order #1086, 36 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 801-F) 10/26.

Sidney Municipal Airport project, Sidney, New York. Involves land acquisition, construction of runway, taxiway, apron, parking area, perimeter fencing, installation of medium intensity lights, etc. Will allow business jets to land. Comments made by Army COE, DOT, EPA, DOI. (ELR Order #997, 40 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 755-F) 10/1.

Grove City Airport project, Pennsylvania. Involves acquisition of land, construction and marking of runway, installation of medium intensity lighting system including VASI, etc. Comments made by DOT, HUD, Army COE, DOI and various State of Pennsylvania agencies. (ELR Order 965, 24 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 247-F) 10/1.

Wittman Field Airport project, Oshkosh, Wisconsin. Involves acquisition of land (117-43 acres) for clear zone, expansion of existing apron; construction of an entrance and service road, etc. Comments made by DOI, various State of Wisconsin agencies. (ELR Order #1083, 45 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 766-F) 10/26.

Federal Highway Administration

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

FAS Rte. 5313: Perry County, Alabama. Proposes replacing gravel road and steel truss bridge over Cahaba River to complete improvement of route. Will begin approximately 2 miles southeast of Marion at Rice Creek to Alabama Hwy. 14. at Fullers (5 miles). Highway project S-5313(102). (ELR Order #956, 7 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 230-D) 10/5.

US-82: Pickens County, Alabama. Construction of a rural type 4-lane highway on new location between Alabama-Mississippi State Line and Reform, Alabama (16 miles). Rerouting will be in wooded undeveloped areas. Highway project F-432(2). (ELR Order #989, 9 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 218-D) 10/6.

Northway Road: Alcan Highway, Alaska. Realigning and constructing 7.4 miles of roadway between Northway Village and Northway Junction. Will include grading, alignment, drainage, bridges, and other minor construction. Highway project S-0791 (1). (ELR Order #912, 41 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 108-D) 9/27.

Winslow-Kayenta Highway, extension of SH-87: Navajo County, Arizona. Extending Rte. 87 making it a connecting link with the Black Mesa area, Peabody Coal operations and

Page. Will involve loss of approximately 1,300 acres of rangeland which is Indian land. Highway project S-244-507, 509, 510, 511. (ELR Order #913, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 109-D) 10/1.

Santa Ana Freeway: Orange County, California. Constructing new overcrossing at Broadway and modifying interchange at Main St. Will require relocation of 130 residents. (ELR Order #915, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 103-D) 10/1.

Route 405: Orange County, California. Modifying interchange between points 1 mile south of Seal Beach Blvd. and 4 mile south of Route 605 (San Diego Freeway). (ELR Order #908, 38 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 106-D) 10/1.

Route 20: Yuba County, California. Initial construction of a 2-lane expressway (ultimate conversion to a freeway) on new location between the east city limits of Marysville and the Nevada County Line. Replacement of this section of highway is necessary because of the Army Corps of Engineers' Marysville Dam project. Discusses different alternate locations—lengths vary between 15.7 miles and 17.5 miles. Project will intrude upon the Spenceville Wildlife Area. Highway project 03-YUB-20 P.M. 3.3/21.7 (ELR Order #1042, 37 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 519-D) 10/15.

SH-152: Los Banos, California. Construction of a pedestrian overcrossing at intersection of 7th and SH-152. Will affect the Los Banos Recreation Park. TOPICS Project T-3042(). (ELR Order #1070, 22 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 612-D) 10/21.

SH-16: El Paso County, Colorado. Extension of highway to intersect the extension of Marksheffel Road. Ultimately will be constructed to expressway standards. Discusses different alternatives. Highway project S 0016 (34). (ELR Order #1063, 81 pages) (NTIS Order #PBZ203 617-D) 10/19.

A1A: Volusia County, Florida. Modernizing and expanding Ocean Shore Blvd. from 2- to 4-lane capacity between SR-40 (Granada Ave.) in Ormond Beach and a point approximately 6 miles north. State Job 79080-1509, Federal Highway project U-030-1(13). (ELR Order #937, 45 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 161-D) 9/29.

SR-24: Levy County, Florida. Replacing bridge No. 4 with a low-level concrete structure and realigning and replacing 8 curves with 1. Approaches will be a rural 2-lane roadway. Length of project will be about 1.5 miles. Will alter about 15 acres of salt marsh and natural vegetation. State Job 34070-1510, Federal project S-702(2). (ELR Order #909, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 162-D) 9/29.

SR-312: St. Johns County, Florida. Construction of a multi-lane facility, including a bridge across the Matanzas River, on a new alignment at SR-5 (US-1) east to SR A1A. State job # 7800 2-1502. (ELR Order #1016, 30 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 486-D) 10/12.

SR-50: Brevard County, Florida. Improvement of 5-mile facility to 4-lane highway from Orange-Brevard County line to I-95. Involves land under option by the Dept. of Interior for proposed St. Johns National Wildlife Refuge and will require a 4(f) determination. State Job 70110-1502; Federal Job F-022-1(10) 10/20.

SR-45 (US-41): Charlotte County, Florida. Construction of a multi-laned facility and bridge along same alignment northwesterly from the Lee County line, 15.3 miles to the 4-lane pavement at Charlotte Harbor. Bridge will go over the Peace River. Federal highway project F-011-1(11). (ELR Order #1079, 27 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 606-D) 10/21.

FAP Route 51, Ahukini-Nawiliwili Cut-off Road: Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii. Construction of 1.1 mile section of highway to provide a faster road between the Lihue Airport and the Lihue Industrial Park, Nawiliwili Harbor and resort areas. Will require agricultural land for right-of-way. Highway project F-051-1(1). (ELR Order #996, 9 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 313-D) 10/8.

Halawa Heights Road: Oahu, Hawaii. Extending road from Halawa Interchange to Salt Lake Blvd. Will provide a major access to the new Oahu Stadium. Highway project I-H1-1(94) (ELR Order #1066, 21 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 609-D) 10/21.

Illinois Route 4 (FAP Route 68), Section 11-R: Madison County, Illinois. Relocation of a 1-mile section of road about 25 miles easterly of St. Louis, Missouri. Involves replacing or upgrading structure of US-40. Highway project F 171 (). (ELR Order #990, 30 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 220-D) 10/5.

Harding Blacktop (County Highway 1, FAS Route 257): LaSalle County, Illinois. Reconstruction of 10 miles of road beginning at the intersection of US-52 and 23, north of Ottawa, and extending northwesterly through Harding to US-34. Will require a total right-of-way of 100 ft., presently 60 ft. Approximately 60 maple trees that are 100 years old will be removed. Highway project S-257(101), Section 129. (ELR Order #1012, 10 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 479-D) 10/14.

FAS Route 459 (North Ninth Street Road): Tippecanoe County, Indiana. Replacement of bridge and approaches over the Wabash River on adjusted alignment about 400 ft. east of present facility. Bridge is about 2 miles north of Lafayette. Highway projects S-154(11), S-154(12). (ELR Order #1011, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 476-D) 10/8.

E. Jacksonburg Road: Wayne County, Indiana. Involves relocating a bridge and approaches over to No Name Creek, just east of Jacksonburg. A 4(f) determination is attached describing .2 acre of land required for the right-of-way which belongs to the Martindale Lake Preserve. Highway project S-789(3). (ELR Order #1047, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 517-D) 10/15.

SR-1 (FAS Route S-175): Franklin County, Indiana. Construction of a bridge over Whitewater River to replace present structure. Will be on new location. (ELR Order #1077, 15 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 689-D) 10/22.

US-65: Polk County, Iowa. Widening road by adding 2-lanes on northbound side. Begins just north of the I-80 interchange and extends northeasterly to junction with Iowa 238 in Bondurant (3 miles). (ELR Order #1065, 8 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 611-D) 10/21.

US 62 (Blandville Rd.): MacCracken County, Kentucky. Proposes widening section to 4-lane, divided roadway from Lone Oak Rd. (US-45) to Friendship Church Rd., excluding I-24 interchange limits. Highway project S 318, SP 73-132. (ELR Order #964, 9 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 233-D) 10/6.

I-69: Clinton and Eaton Counties, Michigan. Extending interstate from Charlotte to I-96 northwest of Lansing as a final line of a freeway network connecting all major State population centers. Highway project I-69-2(7) 62, Item 1156. (ELR Order #911, 27 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 107-D) 10/1.

Trunk Highways 61 and 316: Goodhue and Dakota Counties, Minnesota. Relocating between points 1 mile south of Red Wing and 4 miles southeast of Hastings. Will involve acquisition of approximately 360 acres of tillable land. Highway project F 003-3, S.P. 1926, 2514, and 2518. (ELR Order #910, 37 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 104-D) 9/27.

County State Aid Highway 12: Olmstead County, Minnesota. Construction of two 12 ft. driving lanes generally on the same alignment between T.H. 52 at Oronoco and T.H. 63 about 8 miles north of Rochester (6.7 miles). There will be an entrance to an Olmstead County operated park. (ELR Order #985, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 215-D) 10/6.

Bridge over Red Lake River: Polk County, Minnesota. Replacement of existing bridge at Mallory at a different location. Discusses alternative locations. Will provide bypass of East Grand Forks. Highway project SP 60-663-01 ER 69 (11). (ELR Order #988, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 217-D) 10/7.

US-71: Jackson County, Missouri. Constructing 4 lanes in either direction for portion of South Midtown Freeway extending south from 14th to 63rd Sts. in Kansas City. Will connect Rte. 71 into the Kansas City Freeway network. Relocation of 78 businesses and 1,626 residences required. Highway project U-71-4(15)-R/W. (ELR Order #938, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 239-D) 9/27.

Howdershell Road: St. Louis County, Missouri. Extending and improving road from a point 450 ft. north of Utz Ln. to a point west of Brown Road Bridge to facilitate safe and efficient traffic movement. Highway project T-4189 (36). (ELR Order #934, 5 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 105-D) 10/4.

Route 86: Newton County, Missouri. Reconstruction of route between I-44 in Joplin to south of Spring City, generally on same alignment (about 4 miles). Will cross Silver Creek and Shoal Creek. 59 people will be displaced. Section 4(f) lands are involved since project requires use of land in Wildcat Park; a 4(f) determination is attached. (ELR Order #1096, 22 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 691-D) 10/26.

Nebraska Highway 100: Rockville, Jefferson County; and Highway 68: Buffalo County, Nebraska. Hard-surfacing of 2 sections of highway, N-100 for 8.1 miles from N-10 west of Rockville to N-58 in Rockville and N-68, which will be relocated, for 4.5 miles from .5 miles north of Ravenna to N-100. Highway projects S-36(4) and S-201(5). (ELR Order #921, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 099-D) 9/30.

Nebraska Highway 10 (2nd Avenue): Kearney, Nebraska. Widening road between 31st and 39th St. on the same alignment (1.4 miles). Highway project U-73(10). (ELR Order #1041, 10 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 518-D) 10/18.

US-6 (FAP 4): Ely, Nevada. Relocation and construction from a point near intersection with Mill St. and Aultman St. to an intersection with Fayette Ave. (2 miles). (ELR Order #1067, 32 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 610-D) 10/14.

US-3: Tilton-Sanbornton-Belmont, Belknap County, New Hampshire. Proposes construction of a bridge, improved bridge approaches, and a service road. Purpose: to replace inadequate bridge. State projects BR-S-319(1); P-1663-A; S-319(2); P-1663. (ELR Order #960, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 227-D) 10/5.

SR-44: San Ysido, New Mexico. Construction work begins near the west boundary of the Zia Indian Pueblo Reservation and extends northwesterly for 8.6 miles. Highway projects F-033-1(13) & F-033-1(14). (ELR Order No. 986, 13 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 214-D) 10/7.

Route 9: Westchester County, New York. Upgrading route between Tarrytown and Crotonville. Discusses various alternate routes ranging from reconstruction on existing location to an expressway on new location. All alternatives will have an impact on residences, churches, recreational areas, historical sites, etc. (ELR Order No. 991, 180 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 219-D) 10/5.

Route 9D: Dutchess County, New York. Reconstruction of 3.5 miles of route beginning south of Dutchess Jct. extending northerly through Beacon to point just north of

I-84. A Section 4(f) determination is attached as project requires 8 acres from the Hudson Highlands State Park. Highway project PIN 8327.00. (ELR Order No. 1005, 30 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 317-D) 10/8.

SR-2564: Raleigh, Wake County, *North Carolina*. Widening of Tarbor St. and Rock Quarry Rd. to 4-lane roadway from New Bern Ave. to Raleigh corporate limits (2.7 miles). State project 9.8052037. (ELR Order No. 961, 26 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 224-D) 10/7.

US-17: Pasquotank and Camden Counties, *North Carolina*. Upgrading and widening highway to 4-lanes from end of present 4-lane facility near SR-1338 to Virginia State line (about 17 miles), including construction of 3 interchanges and dual bridges. Will necessitate relocation of 28 to 37 families and 3 to 10 businesses. State project 6.803143. (ELR Order No. 1051, 31 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 516-D) 10/20.

Charlotte Inner Loop: Mecklenburg County, *North Carolina*. Construction of the southwestern segment of the circumferential thoroughfare (between NC-49 to I-85). Right-of-way will require land from a proposed city recreational site; 4(f) submission attached. Highway project 6.801777. (ELR Order No. 1043, 36 pages) (NTIS Order PB-203 514D) 10/20.

Corporation Freeway: Forsyth County, *North Carolina*. Construction of freeway beginning at intersection of US-421 and I-40 to South Main St. in Winston-Salem. Project will require 6 acres of Bolton Street Park; a 4(f) determination is attached. Highway project 9.8091831 (ELR Order #1068, 44 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 613-D) 10/20.

Relocated Mason Road C.R. 13: Erie County, *Ohio*. Constructing and maintaining .84 miles of 2-lane roadway, including replacement of bridge over Huron River. Purpose: to correct deficiencies in alignment and grades. (NTIS Order #PB-203 164-D) (Cannot be reproduced by ELR) 9/28.

Succor Creek Secondary Highway No. 450: Malheur County, *Oregon*. Replacement of Ridgeview School-Mallory Ranch Section between Jordan Valley and Adrian, about 32 miles, 1.7 miles of which is within park boundary. Will require 4(f) determination. Highway project S-23-00(-). (ELR Order #1023, 127 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 472-D).

Pacific Highway West (Rte. 99W), Hess Creek-Chehalem Creek Section: Yamhill County, *Oregon*. Consists of separating the northbound and southbound traffic through the city center of Newberg, several streets are involved. (ELR Order #1097, 14 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 692-D) 10/27.

Tulleytown Bridge projects: Bucks County, *Pennsylvania*. Proposes new bridge over Penn-Central R.R. connecting US-13 (LR 778) with Bordentown Rd. (LR 09015), an interchange at US-13 and widening of US 13. Will involve channelization of highway drainage into Martin's Creek. Project S.P.N. 6:778:A:3:A10:061 (ELR Order #962, 10 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 225-D) 10/6.

SH-50: Yankton and Clay Counties, *South Dakota*. Providing additional lanes and upgrading road between Yankton and Vermillion (24 miles). Includes new structures across the Vermillion River and James River. Involves acquisition of additional right-of-way. Highway project F 012-3 and F 012-4. (ELR Order #995, 11 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 313-D) 10/1.

SH-36: Brazoria County, *Texas*. Construction of a 4-lane divided highway for about 2.5 miles on new location and a fixed structure over the Brazos River Diversion Channel. Located near Freeport. (ELR Order #987, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 216-D) 10/12.

Park Road 100 on Padre Island: Cameron Island, *Texas*. Construction of 11.7 miles of new road from 7 miles north of Andy Bowie

Park to the Cameron-Willacy County line. Will provide access to a large undeveloped section of the Island. (ELR Order #1013, 7 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 480-D) 10/15.

Vermont Route 30: Newfane, *Vermont*. Continuing reconstruction of substandard highway from a point adjacent to the Dummerston-Newfane Town Line 2.5 miles north to southerly Newfane Village limits. Will involve conversion of 11 acres of woodland to highway. Highway project S 0119. (ELR Order #934, 28 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 163-D) 9/29.

SR-83: Wise and Dickenson Counties, *Virginia*. Improving curvatures of 4.3 mile, 2-lane roadway beginning in Georges Fork and ending west of Pound, Rte. 83 is ultimately planned as a 4-lane divided facility. Will displace 22 families. Highway project F-DP-034-1(1). (ELR Order #917, 32 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 098-D) 9/29.

Route 612: Augusta County, *Virginia*. Reconstruction of route from west of the intersection with Rte. 626 (Quicks Mill) to the intersection with Rte. 11 (Verona) (1.6 miles). Will improve the horizontal alignment by reducing the curves and increasing the width. Highway project S-1128. (ELR Order #1009, 6 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 474-D) 10/14.

SR-82 (I-82): Yakima and Benton Counties, *Washington*. Construction of a 42 mile segment of divided highway beginning near Union Gap and ending near Prosser. Four alternate routes under consideration for 27 mile section. (Not available for ELR due to the size and shape of the document) (NTIS Order #PB-203 487-D-\$3.00) 10/12.

US-51: Boulder Junction Road, County Trunk "M", Vilas County, *Wisconsin*. Reconstructing C.T.H. "M" in Boulder Junction 7.3 miles south to C.T.H. "N". A 4(f) determination included as approximately 90 acres of Highland State Forest lands will be converted to roadway and landscaping. Hwy. projects S 0811(2), (3) & 4; ID 9508-3-00, 9408-4-00, and 9508-5-00. (ELR Order #905, 12 pages) (NTIS Order #202 978-D) 9/27.

Robert Street Bridge and approaches: Fort Atkinson, Jefferson County, *Wisconsin*. Relocating structure and approaches, approximately 1,500 feet in length, to relieve congestion and unsafe conditions. (ELR Order #914, 12 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 096-D) 9/30.

S.T.H. 150: North County Line Road, US-41, Menasha, Winnebago County, *Wisconsin*. Proposes closure of public access by construction of roads paralleling US-41 from interchange with S.T.H. 150 to interchange with C.T.H. "BB" and construction of interchange for US-41 traffic and the proposed Little Lake Butte des Morts crossing of the ultimate Tri-County Expressway. Project ID 1122-0-00, F 03-2(). (ELR Order #957, 11 pages) (NTIS ORDER #PB-203 229-D) 10/5.

S.T.H. 13 (Marshfield-Abbotsford Road, Marshfield Belt Line Section): Wood and Marathon Counties, *Wisconsin*. Construction of a freeway to the west of Marshfield to serve as a peripheral route around the City (11 miles). Approximately 450 acres of land presently used for dairy farming operation will be converted to highway use. Highway project F 04-4(); ID 1623-0-00. (ELR Order #1030, 12 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 470-D) 10/15.

Sauk City-Utica Road: Dane County, *Wisconsin*. Construction of a freeway facility on relocation around the south and west sides of Madison to join with I-90-94 near Lake Delton (46 miles). Will pass through Stoughton, Fitchburg, Verona, Springfield, etc. Highway ID 1671-0-61. (ELR Order #1076, 21 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 688-D) 10/26.

Final

Title, Description, and Date

US-72: Madison and Jackson Counties, *Alabama*. Construction of a 4-lane highway from west of Gurley, Alabama to Ala. 79 south of Scottsboro (24.5 miles). Present facility is two lanes. 4(f) approval given by DOT for project utilizing 90 acres of land from the North Sauty Wildlife Refuge (130 acres on the south side will be isolated by the project). Highway project F-235(12) & S-182-E. Comments made by EPA, DOI, DOT, AEC, USDA, Commerce, TVA, FPC, Army, various State of Alabama agencies, City of Scottsboro. (ELR Order #980, 56 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 246-F) 10/6.

Eastern Bypass and US-80: Montgomery County, *Alabama*. Construction of a diamond interchange at the intersection of Montgomery Bypass and US-80. Involves relocation of existing frontage roads along Eastern bypass. Highway project F-352(5). Comments made by DOI, Army, DOT, HUD, EPA, various State of Alabama agencies. (ELR Order #1040, 23 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 508-F) 10/18.

I-65: Mobile-Baldwin Counties, *Alabama*. Projects I-65-1 (84), (85) & (87). The last gap to be closed in I-65 between Alabaster and Mobile. Route will bridge many rivers, lakes, and streams in an area with much wildlife. It will provide a bypass of Bay Minette. Project begins near US-43 (at end of construction project I-65-1(56)) and goes to project I-65-1(55) near Alabama 225. Comments made by HUD, DOI, DOT, EPA, various State of Alabama agencies. (ELR Order #1094, 44 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 696-F) 10/27.

Steeze Highway: *Alaska*. Reconstruction of two portions: from Montana Creek to Eagle Summit, and from Eagle Summit to Central (44 miles). Alaska projects S-0670(8), S-0670(9). Comments made by DOI, DOT, various State of Alaska agencies. (ELR Order #979, 54 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 147-F) 10/7.

SH-59: Benton County, *Arkansas*. Widening and straightening highway from Illinois River Bridge to Siloam Springs (5.5 miles). Highway project S-SU-444(4). Comments made by Commerce, DOI, various State of Arkansas agencies. (ELR Order #969, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 630-F) 10/7.

Route 49: Amador County, *California*. Construction of a 4-lane controlled access highway from Rte. 88 at Martell, California to Rte. 16 at Central House, California (7.7 miles). Highway project FPA-76, 10-Ama-49. Comments made by Army COE, HEW, DOI, AEC, various State of California agencies, American Forest Products. (ELR Order #1031, 39 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 316-F) 10/18.

Colorado State Highway 340 (Grand Junction-West): construction of 2 additional lanes (to make a 4-lane divided facility) beginning 1.2 miles west of the junction of US-50 and SH-340, proceeding easterly for about 1.2 miles, to 1 block west of US-50 and SH-340 junction. Grand Junction, *Colorado*. Highway project SU 0340(2). Comments made by HUD, The Assoc. for Beautiful Colorado Roads, concerned citizens. (The statement was not changed from its draft form.) (ELR Order #1064, 19 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 320-F) 10/4.

Colorado State Highway 65: realignment and improvement from .75 mile south of Mesa, northwesterly for 2.8 miles. Highway project S 0065(4). Comments made by USDA, HUD, DOI, Col. Dept. of Natural Resources. (The statement was not changed from its draft form.) (ELR Order #1065, 23 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 672-F) 10/4.

SH-34: Weld County, *Colorado*. Extending the Greeley Bypass beginning at the South Greeley Interchange of US-34 and US-35 and ending near the community of Kuner

(11 miles). Highway project F-084-2(1). Comments made by Army COE, USDA, DOI, HUD, EPA, various State of Colorado agencies. (ELR Order #1007, 33 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 320-F) 10/13.

I-75E (Tampa Bypass): Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, Florida. Project diverges from alignment of proposed I-75 north of the Bradenton-Palmetto area. Merges with it about 3.5 miles south of Pasco-Hillsborough County Line. Federal job no. I-75E-6(31)435. Comments made by Army COE, EPA, USDA, DOT, HUD, DOI, various State of Florida agencies. (ELR Order #1502, 64 pages) (NTIS Order PB-199 006-D) 10/19.

I-95: Palm Beach, Martin and St. Lucie Counties, Florida. Construction of a multi-lane facility beginning at Monet Rd. in Palm Beach Gardens extending northward 59.6 miles to Indian River-St. Lucie County line. This will provide route along east coast of Florida. According to statement, the recommended corridor described above compared with the other alternate routes would have the least adverse effect on the Jonathan Dickenson State Park and Loxahatchee and St. Lucie Rivers. Federal job no. I-95-2(8)88, I-95-1(142)78. Comments made by DOI, DOT, HUD, EPA, USDA, AVC, various State of Florida agencies. (ELR Order #1085, 92 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 624-F) 10/22.

Maitland Boulevard interchange and connector road (SR-528): Orange County, Florida. Provides for an interchange with SR-400 I-4 between existing interchange at SR-438 (Lee Road) and SR-436 and a connecting roadway corridor from SR-400 (I-4) to SR-600 near Maitland. Highway project UI-4-2(65)108, State project 75280-1438 and 75504-1601. Comments made by HUD, DOI, USDA, Commerce, various State of Florida agencies, City of Maitland. (ELR Order #1092, 75 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 536-F) 10/22.

Section of S-1010 (Secondary Route S-2481[2]): Gilmer and Fannin Counties, Georgia. Highway construction through scenic mountain and national forest area, from intersection of S-2481(1) to Newport Rd. Comments made by USDA, DOI, HUD, Army COE, various State of Georgia agencies. (ELR Order #1029, 24 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 242-F) 10/18.

US-27 (SR-1): relocation of 4 miles of 4-lane highway in Walker-Catoosa Counties, Georgia. Purpose: to provide for future development of Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, and eliminate through traffic within the park. 4(f) approval has been given. Comments made by USDA, EPA, Army COE, DOI, HUD, various State of Georgia agencies. (ELR Order #1025, 31 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 481-F) 10/18.

US-441, SR-31: Douglas, Coffee County, Georgia. Constructing an urban type roadway through the city. Highway project F-075-1(4). Comments made by EPA, USDA, HUD, various State of Georgia agencies. (ELR Order #1084, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 626-F) 10/27.

Federal Aid Secondary Route S-644: Bartholomew County, Indiana. Involves replacing bridge over the East Fork of White River and the appurtenant approach work. 4(f) approval given for the required 49 acre permanent land use from the Azalia Public Fishing Site. Project will require removing several sand bars and relocating an overflow channel. Highway project S-834(2). Comments made by DOI, USDA, various State of Indiana agencies. (ELR Order #1032, 31 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 201-F) 10/18.

US-20: Black Hawk County, Iowa. Relocation of highway between Cedar Falls and Waterloo. Requires 13 acres of the Cedar River and George Wyth State Park; 4(f) approval has been given. Highway project U-20-6(9). Comments made by DOI, EPA, HUD, various State and local agencies in Iowa.

(ELR Order #978, 28 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 242-F) 10/6.

US-50: Reno County, Kansas. Upgrading and widening road from Reno-Stafford County line to a point 1.5 miles north of Sylvia (about 4.8 miles). Discusses 2 location studies. Location A would require land from the city park and Sylvia Grade School. Highway project 50-78 RF 050-4(36) (ELR Order #971, 53 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 328-F) 10/7.

Kansas-96: two construction projects which are a part of the state freeway system and serve as the final link on K-96 from Hutchinson to Wichita, Kansas. Two alternate routes are under consideration. One would require all new right-of-way. Highway project (SF) 96-87 F-044-1(11) and (SF) 96-87 U-044-1(13). Comments made by USDA, HEW, DOI, Army COE, EPA, various State of Kansas agencies. (ELR Order #1026, 44 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 322-F) 10/18.

I-670: Wyandotte County, Kansas. Construction of 1.6 miles of new highway from I-70 near Mill St. easterly to the Kansas-Missouri line. All but 350 ft. of construction will consist of viaduct or bridge structures. Proposed segment of highway will provide interchange with I-70. Highway project 670-105 I-670-6(25). Comments made by USDA, HEW, DOI, DOT, Army COE, EPA, various State of Kansas agencies. (ELR Order #1055, 68 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 784-F) 10/19.

Donaldson-New Orleans Highway and Killona-Sunshine Bridge Highway (Westbank Expressway): St. James, St. John and Ascension Parishes, Louisiana. Project is part of long-range plan to have a 4-lane highway from Shreveport to New Orleans. Highway projects F-420(1), F-420(2). (ELR Order #1037, 34 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 482-F) 10/18.

Industrial loop arterial in Shreveport, Louisiana. Construction of a 4-lane divided highway from Flournoy Interchange on I-20 to the east terminus of the Inner Loop Expressway (15 miles). Highway project 700-06-93. Comments made by DOI, Commerce, AEC, USDA, HEW, various State of Louisiana agencies. (ELR Order #1038, 30 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 485-F) 10/18.

Maryland Route 2: Baltimore, Maryland. Replacement of Hanover Street Bridge over the Patapsco River and upgrading approaches. Highway project U 903-1(300) Comments made by Army COE, various State of Maryland agencies. (ELR Order #972, 15 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 726-F) 10/17.

Route 61: Lewis County; Routes 24 and 66: Marion County, Missouri. Project is between communities of LaGrange and Palmyra, beginning at Wakonda State Park. Involves reconstruction and relocation of 5.4 miles of Rte. 61, as well as upgrading interchange at junction of Rtes. 24 and 61. Highway project F-FG-61-4(10), F-61-4(11). Comments made by USDA, DOI, EPA, various State of Missouri agencies. (ELR Order #918, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 058-F) 9/30.

Route M: Iron County, Missouri. Construction of 4.3 miles of highway (2 miles over an existing country road) between the Johnson Shut-Ins State Park and towns of Pilot Knob, Ironton and Arcadia. Highway project S-329(2) Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI and various State of Missouri agencies. (ELR Order No. 966, 15 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 248-F) 10/1.

Route H: Boone and Callaway Counties, Missouri. Road construction from Route H east to Route J, partly on new location. Will serve as connecting link between US-63 and US-54. Project will require land from Cedar Creek Management Area. Highway project 5-S-9. Comments made by DOT, USDA, EPA, and State of Missouri. (ELR Order No. 944, 22 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 244-F) 10/1.

Route 65: Taney County, Missouri, Boone

County, Arkansas. Involves improving alignment and surface of existing road from Rte. 165 8.6 miles to the Arkansas line (includes 2000 ft. of construction in Arkansas). Missouri project F-64-1(16). Comments made by HUD, DOI, HEW, State of Missouri. (ELR Order No. 975, 14 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 251-F) 10/4.

Route B: Cole County, Missouri. Construction of a multi-lane, controlled access facility on new location from Ellis Blvd. in Jefferson City to Wardsville (4 miles) Highway project CO26-B(2). Comments made by USDA, DOI, EPA, and State of Missouri. (ELR Order No. 977, 19 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 243-F) 10/4.

Midland Boulevard: St. Louis County, Missouri. Extension of roadway westwardly to Dorsett Road, with the construction of an interchange and grade separation at Lindbergh Blvd. Highway project T-4189(24). Comments made by USDA, HEW, EPA, East-West Coordinating Council, various State of Missouri agencies. (ELR Order No. 943, 17 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-200 389-F) 10/4.

Route BB: Rolla, Missouri. Construction of road from 10th St.-Elm St. to Iowa St. providing a direct route to Rte. 63. Highway project US-USG-1176(4). Comments made by HEW, DOI, DOT, USDA, EPA, State of Missouri. (ELR Order No. 981, 18 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-203 252-F) 10/5.

Route 50: Cole County, Missouri. About 5.7 miles of highway will be upgraded to a dual lane facility, from Moreau River to west of Osage River. Present route has poor alignment and is overloaded. Comments made by DOI, USDA, EPA, State of Missouri. (ELR Order #974, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PBX 203 250-F) 10/7.

Route 61: Lincoln County, Missouri. Construction of 24 ft. lane along the west side of the present road between Bowling Green and Troy (6.5 miles). Job no. 3-P-61-1. Comments made by DOT, DOI, EPA, Mo. State Clearinghouse. (ELR Order #1019, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 586-F) 10/13.

Route E: Newton County, Missouri. Relocation of route adjacent to north city limits of Granby, Missouri (4 miles). Involves replacing a 1-lane bridge over Shoal Creek, constructing new roadbed and bridge approaches and providing a grade separation between highway and St. Louis and San Francisco railroad. Job No. 7-S-E-8. Comments made by DOT, HUD, DOI, USDA, EPA, Mo. Dept. of Community Affairs and Ozark Gateway Regional Planning Comm. (ELR Order #1033, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 483-F) 10/18.

Route 61-54: Pike County, Missouri. Involves upgrading 8.1 miles of road to dual lane, controlled access facility on new location from north of Bowling Green to south of Bowling Green. Highway project CO2-61(6). Comments made by DOI, USDA, EPA. (ELR Order #1039, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 505-F) 10/18.

Route 61: Lincoln County, Missouri. Widening 8.5 miles of the present road (from 2 to 4 lanes) between Bowling Green and Troy, ends just north of the Culver River crossing. Highway project F-61-4(17). Comments made by DOI, EPA, various State and local agencies in Missouri. (ELR Order #1053, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 506-F) 10/19.

Route 13 (Crane Bypass): Stone County, Missouri. Construction/upgrading of highway from just north of Rte. 248 southerly to 1.2 miles south of Bailey Creek. Involves replacement of 3 bridges. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, HUD, State Clearinghouse, Lakes Country Regional Planning Comm. (ELR Order #1080, 7 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 246-F) 10/26.

Scottsbluff-Gering Bridge: Scotts Bluff County, Nebraska. New 2-lane structure for southbound traffic on Nebraska 71 across the

North Platte River, Nebraska project F-520 (5). Comments made by DOI, EPA, various State of Nebraska agencies, City of Scottsbluff. (ELR Order #973, 19 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 142-F) 10/7.

SR-22: Westchester County, New York. Widening route from 4- to 6-lanes between Katonah and Croton Falls (6.1 miles). Highway project PIN 8061.00. Comments made by DOI, USDA. (ELR Order #1016, 27 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 582-F) 10/13.

SH-12: Jefferson and Lewis County, New York. Reconstruction and resurfacing 3 segments of route, encompassing SH-147, SH-626, SH-1129 and SH-937. Highway project 7197.00. Comments made by USDA, FPC. (ELR Order #1018, 25 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 215-F) 10/13.

US-17: Chowan County, North Carolina. Relocation of highway to bypass Edenton, North Carolina (6.6 miles). Will displace 22 families and 1 business. Highway project F-75(9). Comments made by USDA, Army COE, GSA, HUD, DOI, OEO, Chowan County, Town of Edenton. (ELR Order #1028, 43 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 484-F) 10/18.

Licking Country Road 311: Heath, Ohio. Involves 1.8 miles of highway construction on new location. Consists of a new bridge over the South Fork of the Licking River, at-grade crossings, etc. Highway project S-SU-229(2). Comments made by DOI, Army COE, various State of Ohio agencies. (ELR Order #1017, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 684-F) 10/13.

SH-63, SR-123: Warren County, Ohio. Construction begins on SR-63 at the West Corp. in Lebanon continuing to intersection with US-42 and SR-123. From this point the project continues along SR-123 to a point near interchange of SR-123 and I-71. Length of project (divided into urban and rural portion) is 3.5 miles. Comments made by DOI, HUD, DOT, City of Lebanon and Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Planning Authority. (ELR Order #1020, 20 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 387-D) 10/13.

SH-51: Payne County, Oklahoma. Addition of 2-lanes to existing highway beginning at Western Ave. in Stillwater continuing westerly 5.5 miles. Will result in loss of 100 acres of mixed pasture and cultivated land. Highway project F-176. Comments made by DOT, DOI and various State of Oklahoma agencies. (ELR Order #920, 12 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 590-F) 9/30.

US-169: Tulsa and Rogers Counties, Oklahoma. Upgrading of road on new alignment between Owasso and Collinsville (7.4 miles). Will require use of 270 acres of land. Highway project F-267. Comments made by DOI, various State of Oklahoma agencies, City of Tulsa, Town of Owasso, City of Collinsville, City of Claremore, Indian Nations Council of Government, NECO. (ELR Order #940, 38 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 214-F) 10/4.

Fairpark Blvd.: Stephens County, Oklahoma. Construction of highway on new alignment from a point east of 13th St., 0.6 mile to just east of East Rd. in Duncan. Highway project SU-6919 (100)c. Comments made by DOT, various State of Oklahoma agencies. (ELR Order #1034, 36 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 785-F) 10/18.

Snake River (Adrian) Bridge Section, Sycor Creek Highway (Parma Spur): Malheur County, Oregon. Proposed project is to replace a bridge over the Snake River. Associated work such as approach construction, grading and paving will also be accomplished. Highway project S-23-015(1). Comments made by DOT, DOI, EPA, Army COE, City of Ontario, various State of Oregon agencies. (ELR Order 1054, 28 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 247-F) 10/19.

Legislative Route 14014, Section A01 (Whitehall Rd.): College Township and State College Borough, Pennsylvania. Relocation of 1.2 miles of 2-lane roadway. This study con-

siders 2 alternate alignments. Comments made by USDA, DOT, Commerce, EPA, various Commonwealth of Pennsylvania agencies. (ELR Order #945, 35 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 919-F) 9/30.

Legislative Route 03013, Section 2, L.R. 10036, Section 1, L.R. 10037, Section 1: Armstrong and Butler Counties, Pennsylvania. Road construction on new location (3.7 miles). Purpose: to join the two plants of the Butler County Mushroom Farm. About 30 acres of farm land and 40 acres of woodland will be lost. Comments made by USDA, various Commonwealth of Pennsylvania agencies and local agencies. (ELR Order #919, 40 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 674-F) 9/30.

Legislative Route 10063, Section 2; L.R. 10068, Section 2; L.R. 60005, Section 2: Butler and Venango Counties, Pennsylvania. Project crosses large swamp. This relocation of Traffic Rte. 308 is 8.1 miles long. Comments made by various Commonwealth of Pennsylvania agencies, Supervisors of Venango, Marion and Clinton, Butler County Planning Comm. (ELR Order #1087, 52 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 681-F) 10/26.

US-377: Denton, Texas. Rerouting of about a mile from existing US-377 north along Carroll St. to Hickory St. Highway project F-143. Comments made by Commerce, North Central Texas Council of Governments. (ELR Order #939, 13 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 241-F) 10/4.

US-287: Hardeman County, Texas. Construction of 2 additional lanes from the Childress County line, southeast to a mile west of Acme (10.7 miles). Texas Highway project F 533. Comments made by Commerce and Nortex Regional Planning Commission. (ELR Order #982, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 245-F) 10/5.

TOPICS Street 11: in Laredo on Washington St. between Santa Rita Ave. and Pinder Ave., Texas. Construction of a railroad overpass and approaches to serve as entrance to the old Fort McIntosh area (.3 mile). Highway project T-T6 9012(2). Comments made by Commerce, DOT, EPA, Texas Development Council. (ELR Order #1081, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 625-F) 10/26.

US-340: construction of a bypass of Luray, Virginia along the existing Secondary Rte. 615. Project begins at intersection of US-340 and ends at Rte. 211. Length of project appears to be about 3 miles. Highway project F-010-(). Comments made by HUD, EPA, various Commonwealth of Virginia agencies. (ELR Order #916, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 317-F) 9/30.

Route 33: Green County, Virginia. Relocation of route to provide a 4-lane bypass of Stanardsville. The project requires 10.2 acres belong to the School Board; 4(f) approval has been given. Highway project F-016-1(). Comments made by HUD, EPA, various Commonwealth of Virginia agencies. (ELR Order #942, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 361-F) 10/1.

Rtes. 13, 58 and 460: Nansemond County and City of Chesapeake, Virginia. Widening existing section to 6-lanes. Project extends about 3 miles west and 1.6 miles east of the west corporate limits of Chesapeake. Project runs through Dismal Swamp (one of the largest swamp lands on east coast). Virginia projects F-024-3() and U-131-1(). Comments made by DOT, EPA. (ELR Order #976, 15 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 249-F) 10/4.

Route 640 (Appomattox Bypass): construction on new location of route around Appomattox, Virginia (2.9 miles). Highway project F-04-1(x). Comments made by DOI, HUD, HEW, EPA, Commonwealth of Virginia. (ELR Order #970, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-199 261-F) 10/7.

S.R. 515: King County (Renton City), Washington. Reconstruction and realignment of route from 196th St. to Grady Way. High-

way project S-0228. Comments made by DOT, HUD, Army COE, DOI, USDA, EPA, various State of Washington agencies. (ELR Order #1027, 62 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-198 920-F) 10/18.

FHWA 4(f) statements

The following are not 102 statements. They are explanations of the Secretary of Transportation's approval of projects to be implemented under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. 49, U.S.C. Section 1653(f).*

FAP-100 (Route 244): Sacramento, California. Highway requires about 2/3 acre of land from the Del Paso Park. (ELR Order #893, 4 pages) 9/29.

SR-37: Solano County, California. Highway project requires use of 3 acres from the Vallejo Municipal Golf Course. (ELR Order #994, 3 pages) 10/1.

I-75: Charlotte County, Florida. Project, located between Punta Gorda and Fort Myers, requires use of land belonging to the C. M. Webb Wildlife Management Area. (ELR Order #892, 4 pages) 9/22.

US-51 and 66: Bloomington, Illinois. Project requires the taking of 1.3 acres of land from the Highland Park Golf Course. (Does not have ELR Order #—order by title, date and Department—6 pages) 10/22.

US-422: Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Highway project requires use of 3.31 acres of the Bedford-South Chagrin Parkway. Highway project U-468(8). (ELR Order #894, 3 pages) 9/29.

U.S. WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Ohio River Basin Commission

Contact: Fred E. Morr, Chairman, ORBC, 1427 4th and Walnut Building, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (513) 684-3831.

NOTE.—The Ohio River Basin Commission along with other River Basin Commissions in the United States are under the aegis of the U.S. Water Resources Council.

Draft

Title, Description, and Date

Wabash River Comprehensive Report, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The report is of a general nature describing the conceptual basis for developing the plan, the alternate courses of action evaluated during the formulation period, and briefly the special project proposals. (Individual environmental impact statements will be prepared on each project.) Some of the projects recommended include: 13 major multipurpose reservoirs, 147 small watershed projects for flood control, 2 coal mine drainage pollution abatement projects, etc. These proposals are divided into early action and long range plans. (ELR Order #1066, 39 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 615-D) 10/18.

Kanawha River Comprehensive Report, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia. Early action programs recommended include: 21 multipurpose reservoirs, 17 upstream watershed projects, a land stabilization and resource development special study, etc. Statement in general describes the basin area, its economy, the needs as relate to development of the water and land resources, etc. (ELR Order #1067, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 616-D) 10/18.

REGIONAL FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATORS

Region 1 (Conn., N.H., R.I., Mass., Puerto Rico, Me., N.J., Vt., N.Y.)

Administrator: Gerald D. Love, 4 Norman-skill Blvd., Delmar, N.Y. 12054 Tel: (518) 472-6476

Region 2 (Del., Ohio, Md., W.V., D.C., Penna., Va.)

Administrator: August Schofer, Rm. 1633, George H. Fallon Federal Office Bldg., 31 Hop-

*These statements cannot be ordered through NTIS.

kings Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201 Tel: (301) 962-2361

Region 3 (Alabama, S.C., Georgia, N.C., Fla., Tenn., Miss.)

Administrator: Harry E. Stark, Suite 200, 1720 Peachtree Rd, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Tel: (404) 526-5078

Region 4 (Ill., Ky., Wisc., Indiana, Mich.)

Administrator: Fred B. Farrell, 18209 Dixie Hwy., Homewood, Ill. 60430 Tel: (312) 799-6300

Region 5 (Iowa, Neb., Minn., Mo., Ka., N.D., S.D.)

Administrator: John B. Kemp, P.O. Box 7186, Country Club Station, Kansas City, Missouri 64113 Tel: (816) 361-7563

Region 6 (Ark., Oklahoma, La., Texas)

Administrator: James W. White, 819 Taylor St., Ft. Worth, Texas 76102 Tel: (817) 334-3232

Region 7 (Arizona, Hawaii, Calif., Nevada)

Administrator: Sheridan E. Farin, 450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36096, San Francisco, Calif. 94102 Tel: (415) 556-3951

Region 8 (Alaska, Montana, Wash., Idaho, Oregon)

Administrator: Ralph M. Phillips, Rm. 412, Mohawk Bldg., 222 Southwest Morrison St., Portland, Ore. 97204 Tel: (503) 226-3454

Region 9 (Col., Utah, N.M., Wyoming)

Administrator: William H. Baugh, Bldg. 40, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225 Tel: (303) 233-6721

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE C Q THROUGH OCT. 31, 1970

BY AGENCY

	Draft ¹	Final ²	Total ³
Agriculture, Department of	40	87	128
Appalachian Regional Commission	0	0	0
Atomic Energy Commission	7	4	11
Commerce, Department of	0	7	7
Defense, Department of	3	2	5
Air Force	4	0	4
Army	5	5	10
Army Corps of Engineers	153	249	402
Navy	5	4	9
Delaware River Basin Commission	3	0	3
Environmental Protection Agency	4	8	12
Federal Power Commission	15	4	19
General Services Administration	14	16	30
HEW, Department of	1	0	1
HUD, Department of	8	9	17
Interior, Department of	48	34	82
International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico	3	2	5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	6	22
National Science Foundation	2	0	2
Office of Science and Technology	0	1	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	12	1	13
Transportation, Department of	820	388	1,208
Treasury, Department of	1	3	4
U.S. Water Resources Council	4	0	4
Total	1,190	850	2,040

¹ 102's for actions on which no final 102's have yet been received.

² 102's on legislation and actions.

³ Actions on which final or draft 102 statements for Federal actions have been received.

Note: Separate 4(f) statements not incorporated in 102 statements received from DOT are not included.

BY PROJECT TYPE

	Draft	Final ²	Total ³
AEC nuclear development	8	7	15
Aircraft, ships and vehicles	2	3	5
Airports	27	109	136
Buildings	1	4	5
Bridge permits	14	4	18
Defense systems	1	2	3
Forestry	2	4	6

	Draft ¹	Final ²	Total ³
Housing, urban problems, new communities	7	5	12
International boundary	4	2	6
Land acquisition, disposal	10	21	31
Mass transit	3	1	4
Mining	5	1	6
Military installations	10	2	12
Natural gas and oil: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drilling and exploration Transportation, pipeline 	3	5	8
Parks, wildlife refuges, recreation facilities	9	12	21
Pesticides, herbicides	6	10	16
Power: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydroelectric Nuclear Other Transmission 	18	4	22
Railroads	24	16	40
Roads	15	1	16
Plus roads through parks	7	5	12
Space programs	1	0	1
Waste disposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detoxification of toxic substances Munition disposal Radioactive waste disposal Recycling Sewage facilities Solid wastes 	660	256	916
Water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beach erosion, hurricane protection Irrigation Navigation Municipal and industrial supply Permit (Refuse Act, dredge and fill) Watershed protection and flood control Weather modification Research and development Miscellaneous 	114	16	130
Total	1,190	850	2,040

¹ Draft statements for actions on which no final statements have yet been filed.

² Final statements on legislation and actions.

³ Total actions on which final or draft statements for federal actions have been received.

MAYOR LINDSAY'S POLITICAL BELIEFS AND MOTIVATIONS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial and a column, both from the Indianapolis Star. These statements provide information on Mayor John Lindsay's political beliefs and motivations. I urge my colleagues to examine these entries in the analysis is worthy of our consideration.

SIMMERING IN HIS OWN JUICE

An old political rule is: "If your own constituency, which knows you well, can't stomach you, seek a larger constituency, which knows you less."

New York Mayor John V. Lindsay is following that rule. The last time he ran for reelection, more New Yorkers voted for others than for him. Only because his opposition divided behind two mayoralty candidates did Lindsay manage to squeak through, under the Liberal Party banner, for another term. Unable to marshal the majority of New Yorkers behind him, he now seeks a larger constituency—the majority of Americans. Lindsay. It is all too apparent, wants to be President.

A Republican—at least in name—most of his life, Lindsay two months ago quit the GOP and joined the Democratic Party. This

led one comedian to remark, "It was a brilliant move. Having ruined New York as a Republican, Lindsay became a Democrat so he can criticize what the other party did to the city."

But Lindsay is having troubles in his role as Democrat, mainly because the regular Democrats now regard him in the same way many Republicans always did—as an opportunist.

Further, Lindsay is in hot water even with the liberals, whose leader he always wanted to be, and often was. The liberals, too, are beginning to distrust him. Evidence of this was revealed in a letter to him from the New Democratic Coalition (NDC), which helped re-elect him in 1969. The letter expressed "deep disappointment" in what the NDC charged was the mayor's failure to work for a coalition of Democrats from "the liberal, progressive and reform elements in our party." The NDC looks with disdain upon some of the people Lindsay cozied up to in recent political jaunts out of New York.

The letter, written by NDC's New York State chairman Dan Collins, said, "We are quite distressed with your indorsements and accolades for persons like Mayor Joseph Alloto of San Francisco, Mayor Frank Sedita of Buffalo and various politicians in Indiana, including Controller Bob Pastrick of East Chicago, Ind."

The NDC was formed after the 1968 Democratic National Convention, largely from the ranks of those who had campaigned for the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy or Eugene McCarthy, former senator from Minnesota.

The letter puts Lindsay in a bind from which even a Houdini would have difficulty escaping. As a new Democrat, Lindsay is expected to earn his membership by displaying a certain amount of party loyalty, such as indorsing regular Democratic nominees for public office. But by such regularity Lindsay could alienate the very people he hoped to lead. Lindsay's hopes in this direction are based on his having taken Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) at his word that he will not be a presidential candidate in 1972.

It will be interesting to see how Lindsay tries to get himself out of his dilemma. If he doesn't indorse regular Democrats, he'll increase their distrust of him. If he does keep on indorsing them, he'll get more scathing letters from the liberals. This is one of those cases where the chameleon is caught on a Scotch plaid and doesn't know which color to turn.

LINDSAY IS WRONG IN VIEW OF UNITED STATES

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Trying to form a national political constituency of what he describes as "street people" or "outsiders," Mayor John Lindsay of New York City went to Laurel, Miss., to make one of the most outrageously demagogic, divisive and rabble-rousing speeches in recent American history. What he said was untrue and an insult to our country.

Mayor Lindsay had a right to reply to the charge of his being an "outsider" in his campaigning for a local candidate in Mississippi. But the mayor had absolutely no right to go on and define as outsiders "all the people who this country has closed the door on, people without power, and people who are poor, white people who have lost their jobs."

To say that our country has closed the door on all elderly shut-ins, on poor people and unemployed people is to impute a deliberate policy of calculated hard-heartedness to the United States government. That our country has such a policy is a downright lie and the official figures for the U.S. Budget for fiscal 1970 (see World Almanac 1971) prove

it as a lie. In fact, no other country in the world does so much for its people as we do, including the young and old, the shut-ins and itinerants, the working people and jobless people.

Here are just a few of the U.S. Budget statistics for fiscal 1970:

Appalachian development program (for poor mining families), \$191,986,000.
Disaster relief, \$144,909,000.

Office of Economic Opportunity (for poor people), \$1,807,607,000.

Family housing, \$619,902,000.

Health, Education and Welfare, \$52,286,856,000.

Housing and Urban Development (for lower income people), \$3,027,536,000.

Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions, \$14,494,000.

As every American can see, the foregoing U.S. budget items make a total for 1970 of \$58,093,317,000 which our country opened its Federal heart to pour out to young and old people, poor people and sick people, disabled people and people without power enough to help themselves.

To form an idea of how very much money that total is, perhaps it is helpful to take note that for fiscal 1951—just 20 years ago—the total of all U.S. Government receipts was \$47,567,613,000. That 1951 total is approximately \$10.5 billion less than our country spent in fiscal 1970 only to aid people!

When John Lindsay harangues prospective voters about "all the people who this country has closed the door on," he knows that nowhere in the entire world is there a country which has done nearly so much, either relatively or actually, to open the door of opportunity and good living to its people. Lindsay pictures Uncle Sam as a cold hearted skinflint; actually, Uncle Sam is the most generous world leader and the softest touch in the whole wide world.

NATIONALIST CHINA OUSTER OF U.N.

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the seating of Red China in the United Nations is history, but the world's inheritance is the memory of a Nationalist China that was ousted after a laudable record as a charter member. This act is discussed in a recent column by Newsday's Dick Thimmesch, and I offer it in the RECORD as one who deplores the action that was taken.

Following is the full text of Mr. Thimmesch's commentary:

[From Newsday, Oct. 30, 1971]

NATIONALISTS DON'T DESERVE THUMBS DOWN (By Dick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—Kicking the Republic of China out of the United Nations is a disgrace. It's done now, but those who had a part of it win no salutes for goodwill. Red, whoops! mainland China was rightfully admitted, but the Republic of, whoops! Nationalist China deserved better treatment. This island sanctuary government has been a good citizen in the U.N. and in the world as well.

The Nixon Administration struggled to do the decent thing here, but it didn't work. The stored-up mean, petty feelings residing in the opulent U.N. body were vented on the

beaten but still dignified Taiwan delegation. If anybody looked good in this sorry episode it was this delegation, heads high, as it walked out of the U.N. building from whence it rightfully entered a generation ago.

It seemed as if the world itself had succumbed to the relentless, exhausting barrage of anti-American propaganda Communist regimes have fired at us all these years. All that stuff about old (84) Chiang Kai-shek and his "bandits," straining to be unleashed for an attack on the mainland. Baloney.

In terms of deportment, the Republic of China was a charter member of the U.N. in good standing. It actively participated in the "good works" of the U.N., was a sponsor of the World Health Organization and through its "Vanguard" program quietly provided selfless aid to 30 African nations for several years.

Unlike many noisy members, the Republic of China played a role in such uplift work as UNICEF, telecommunication and meteorological studies beneficial to the whole world. Like many other U.N. members, this government was behind in its dues.

Moreover, whatever belligerence the Taiwan government manifested, it was mostly words. The debates over Matsu and Quemoy are well behind us. The Red Chinese and Nationalists haven't shelled each other in years. The Republic of China is infinitely better behaved than Red China which recorded some violent innings against United Nations forces in Korea and against U.N. consensus in India.

That seemed to matter little to the vast majority of U.N. members who also seemed to have forgotten the origins of this peace organization. The United Nations got started because the great nations which fought the two great aggressors of our time—Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan—called all "peace-loving" nations together at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and others.

China was awarded one of the five seats on the Security Council because China had fought off Japanese invaders since 1931. This is the same China which was cruelly thrown out of that same United Nations this week.

The same kind of brutality, the same kind of Roman circus atmosphere which characterized the Nazi and Japanese Imperialist regimes was expressed in the U.N. General Assembly hall when the Republic of China was beaten down. It was death, not decency, for the loser.

"It was unbelievable," U.S. Ambassador George Bush told me. "The Chinese delegates took this massive punishment with great dignity. It was body punch after body punch, a thirst for blood like the gladiator was finishing his man. People jeering and shouting insults. I put my arm around Chow Shu-kal (foreign minister) when he left and told him it was just awful."

There they were, the great paragons of virtue, the delegates who live fat-cat lives in New York, thanks largely to the lavish contributions the United States makes to the U.N. There was sanctimonious Sweden, host to the Nazis in World War II, the pious nation which allowed our ambassador, a black man, to be assaulted with rocks and called "nigger"; the hypocrite which forgets its dalliance with Nazism and cries about blood on our hands in Vietnam. Sanctimonious Sweden jeered plenty.

Strong as my feelings are about the brutal handling of the Republic of China, reason dictates that mainland China must be recognized. What is, is. But the facts of life must also call for recognition of the reality of 14 million people on Taiwan, a country larger than 60% of the members of the U.N.

If Red China has any class, it will look down the road and one day, from the seat it got from the Republic of China, show some

goodwill, sportsmanship perhaps, in moving to admit the Taiwan government to the U.N. Chiang and his old Nationalists will fade away and die.

When Sukarno misgoverned Indonesia it left the U.N. In 1966, when Suharto took over Indonesia, that troubled country re-entered. This is not analogy but precedent. Peking should one day give its blessing to Taiwan. There must be a way if there are men of goodwill. Isn't that what the United Nations is all about?

WHITHER VIETNAM?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Peter Kann of the Wall Street Journal has written a penetrating article on the future of South Vietnam. The November 11 article offers a realistic assessment of the situation that balances the unceasing optimism coming from the administration.

I urge my colleagues to read this fine piece, which follows:

WHITHER VIETNAM?—U.S. AIDES IN SAIGON ARE MORE PESSIMISTIC AS AMERICAN ROLE EBBS

(By Peter R. Kann)

SAIGON.—"There will be no debacle here before the '72 election in the States. But in the longer term? My computer says: 'Do not compute.'"

"I'm not saying Thieu won't be around four years from now, but I'm sure not betting that he will."

"A degree of military stability to 1974."

"1965 by 1973."

The quotes are from recent conversations with four old Vietnam hands—U.S. officials with a total of nearly 40 years of Vietnam service. Obviously, they aren't in complete agreement on what the future holds for this country to which they have devoted much of their adult lives. But, if there is a mood common to these men—and others like them—it seems to be one of growing uncertainty and, among many, of gathering gloom.

In the last nine months or so it seems that the "new optimists" have become tired optimists and that traditionally cautious in-house critics are turning into outright, though not public, pessimists. The reasons have less to do with any specific setbacks than with a somewhat fuzzy feeling that security has slipped, that political opportunities have been lost and that the time for new starts has passed.

ANOTHER BLUE PERIOD

Moods are by nature vague and, on the basis of experience here, exaggerated and transitory. But perhaps the present one is different. During earlier blue periods (after the 1968 Tet offensive for example) Americans at least could go out and try to do something about it: chalk up higher body counts, start a new pacification program, stop bombing, start bombing again, invade a neighboring nation or two.

But not these days. A large part of the current low mood may simply be the realization that America's active role in Vietnam is pretty much over. The American military, with just under 200,000 men still in this country, has all but ceased ground combat. Indeed, sapped by problems of drugs, race, discipline and morale, the U.S. mili-

tary's very ability to fight if called upon to do so is increasingly in question. And America's influence with its Saigon client appears to be at its nadir—as demonstrated by President Nguyen Van Thieu's victory last month in a one-candidate electoral charade that embarrassed and angered the U.S. Embassy.

America, of course, continues to perform important, perhaps vital, military and other functions for the Vietnamese. But how much longer and at what level America will aid the Vietnamese are in doubt. American and Vietnamese officials generally have been assuming that a U.S. "residual force" of about 40,000 men will be stationed in Vietnam for years to come. But wide disagreement has existed here as to what sort of functions that force should perform and how vital such a force really would be. Of late, there has been considerable concern as to whether there will be a residual force at all.

CONFUSING THE ENEMY—AND ALLIES

Some of these questions may be answered by President Nixon in a Vietnam policy speech, expected within the next few days. But for some time, the President's policy has seemed to have his officials and his allies confused along with the enemy. Thus, the whole residual-force issue is adding to the mood of uncertainty and unease. The defeat by the U.S. Congress of the foreign-aid bill compounds this problem. Also adding to the mood is the President's planned visit to China. The White House says Vietnam won't be discussed in Peking. But many here still think (some hope, others fear) that the trip could influence Vietnam's future.

In Washington, the view on Vietnam is more optimistic than that held by many U.S. officials here. In fact, the Washington estimate is described as one of only slightly bounded optimism. A cross section of Washington officials believes that the security situation in Vietnam is improving. Saigon's army is fighting more efficiently, the economy is doing well and the political scene is at least tolerable.

Analysts in Washington say the pessimism often heard in Saigon comes from aides overly influenced by transitory or localized developments. They don't reflect the big picture, Washington's big-picture experts contend.

THE FACTOR OF TIME

One reason for the differences of viewpoints in the two capitals may be a time factor. Many here in Saigon are concerned with the longer-term prospects of the Vietnam government and how well it will ultimately deal with its many problems. In Washington, officials put more emphasis on the short term; this results in an optimism that officials feel justifies continued troop withdrawals and slow political disengagement from the current Saigon government.

As ever, the question looming over all scenarios is what the aims and the capabilities of the Communists are. Hanoi, no less than Saigon, is worried over President Nixon's Peking visit and the possibility of some deal being made at its expense. Hanoi also has been indulging in increasing self-criticism over economic problems, poor public morale, crime and corruption. In June, North Vietnam was struck by its worst flood of the century. It may have left 10,000 dead and a third of the nation's rice crop destroyed. And Hanoi's manpower pool continues to be drained on the battlefields of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

"I think South Vietnam has a pretty good chance of surviving because I just don't see how the North Vietnamese can keep going," a senior U.S. official says. But another analyst puts it differently: "I would be optimistic about South Vietnam's future if it weren't for the dreadful ebullience of the enemy."

How North Vietnam—which President Johnson is once said to have called "a raggedy-ass little country of 17 million people"—has been able to keep fighting this long against America's military might has confounded waves of U.S. war planners. The betting by most veteran analysts here seems to be that Hanoi will keep on fighting and thus confound some more.

The South Vietnamese, meanwhile, seem increasingly embittered by American policy. President Nixon's Vietnamization program will—sooner or later—get Americans out of the war. But no one has any indication that the President has a "game plan" for getting the Vietnamese out of it. The toll of combat deaths announced last week was down to two Americans, but the toll of South Vietnamese was 269. Indeed, South Vietnamese casualties this year are running ahead of 1968. Americans may view this as a success of the Vietnamization program, but that's little consolation to the Vietnamese.

As usual, the Vietnamese attitude is ambivalent and, at least to Western eyes, contradictory. On the one hand, there is resentment at America for "bugging out" and leaving Vietnam to cope with a continuing war. And among the Vietnamese the suspicion is growing that all the U.S. really cares about by now is a "decent interval" between withdrawal and collapse. "The stability here will last long enough to show that if the Vietnamese fall, it will be their own fault," says one ranking American official, who seems to confirm what the Vietnamese suspect.

On the other hand, the Vietnamese are increasingly open in their criticisms of the U.S. presence here; "Americans go home" is a fashionable non-Communist slogan these days. More and more Vietnamese are talking, in vague terms, about a "Vietnamese solution to a Vietnamese war" once the American presence—and U.S. backing for President Thieu—is withdrawn. In this view the American presence postpones peace. The view may be naive, but it is significant that even some traditionally staunch anti-Communist Catholic priests are talking in this vein, and so are some younger South Vietnamese army officers.

Few Americans, of course, are talking about outright collapse here—at least not for some time. Pacification statistics still show more than 95% of the people living under government control. The economy continues to display a remarkable degree of stability, and President Thieu's reelection at least demonstrated the ubiquity and even efficiency of the government's administrative apparatus on an issue that counts to its leader.

The South Vietnamese army (ARVN) has been assuming more combat and other responsibilities as Americans withdrew. While the army has suffered some reverses in Laos and Cambodia, the Communists right now don't seem capable of inflicting a major military defeat on ARVN forces within South Vietnam. Main-force Communist units are mostly operating near the Cambodian and Laotian borders and are generally avoiding sustained contact.

In short, compared with two years ago, the present South Vietnamese position seems stronger in almost every respect.

But, compared with about nine months ago the present situation shows signs of slippage. Some observers believe that a military high point may have been reached at the beginning of 1971 and that security has been on a very gradual decline ever since. Veteran officials speak of an increase in enemy attacks on Mekong Delta militia outposts, of roads being a bit less safe to travel, of enemy units appearing closer to Saigon, of an increase in enemy infiltration and activity in the northern I Corps, of enemy inroads in formerly pacified hamlets in the key coastal province of Binh Dinh, and of ARVN forces being

stretched too thin to defend the Central Highlands against a slowly mounting enemy threat there.

Much of this slippage may be an inevitable effect of American withdrawal. It is hard to see how even an improved South Vietnamese military force of 1.1 million plus about 200,000 American noncombatants can be as potent a military power as 1.1 million South Vietnamese soldiers and a half-million American combatants.

Moreover, the grace periods purchased by the June 1970 invasion of Cambodia and the April 1971 invasion of Laos are about up. Both operations, whatever their failings, certainly bought some precious time for South Vietnam, but that time was never claimed to be unlimited.

And the chances of another dramatic time-buying foray seem nil. For one thing, South Vietnam has no more neighbors (except North Vietnam) left to invade. Mainly, however, the declining American presence and logistical support seem to rule out a repetition of the drive against the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex or even a major ARVN assault deep inside Cambodia. U.S. military sources, however, are talking about ARVN launching some far smaller, briefer and less ambitious cross-border operations in coming months, and the South Vietnamese still do have about 19,000 troops occupying Cambodian territory along the border.

Optimistic scenarios for South Vietnam's future aren't bolstered by retrospective assessments of that Ho Chi Minh Trail operation or of ARVN's performance at Snoul, in Cambodia, four months later. In the Laotian trail operations, despite massive American air support of all sorts, ARVN was forced to pull out of Laos well before planned, and the most favorable assessment that anyone now makes of the operation is to call it a standoff. It may have demonstrated that ARVN with U.S. air power is roughly equal to the enemy, but how long will ARVN have even a fraction of that level of air support? The combat, of course, took place on enemy turf, and that may be to ARVN's credit. But the set-pieces of 1972 or 1973 combat may have to be fought closer to home.

If that foray was in some sense a standoff, Snoul was more of a rout. There, with less U.S. air support but on much more favorable terrain, the ARVN Fifth Division withdrew in panic, abandoning at least 50 vehicles and three artillery batteries to the enemy and losing at least 450 men killed and another 300 listed as missing.

Last month's confrontation between the North and South Vietnamese armies near the Cambodian town of Krek turned out more favorably for ARVN, which managed to reinforce and thus cause the enemy to back off. But again there was heavy American air support and the ARVN division commander in charge stated: "American air power turned the tide; it was decisive, all-important." Once again, how long and at what level will ARVN have available to it American air power—helicopters for troop lift and resupply, Cobra gunships, tactical bombers and B52s? No one is sure.

The future test for ARVN, whatever its level of U.S. support, could well come in the Central Highlands of II Corps. The present Vietnamese strategy (approved, if not devised, by American advisers) is to concentrate most ARVN forces in that corps along the narrow coastal plain in which more than 90% of that area's population lives. American advisers express confidence that Saigon forces can hold the coast. "To get the willing cooperation of those people is a very difficult, very long-term objective, but to get their forced cooperation is easy because of the geography," a high-ranking American says. Meanwhile, he adds, "there will be no more stomping the Central Highland boondocks;

now the aim in the five Highland provinces is to just survive." He thinks that American bombing plus a few mobile ARVN units can prevent the Communists from overrunning Highland towns.

Other veteran American analysis question that strategy. One recalls that enemy inroads in the Highlands in 1965 nearly forced ARVN to withdraw from the Highland centers of Kontum and Pleiku. It was only the arrival of American forces that forestalled abandonment and prevented South Vietnam from being cut in two—in the view, among others, of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the current Army chief of staff and former U.S. commander in Vietnam.

"If you control the Highlands, you eventually get the coast," one longtime analyst says. He sees a repetition of 1965 but without any Americans to ride in to the rescue—thus, "1965 by 1973." He and others suggest that enemy forces will try to consolidate control of the Highlands, adding the area to contiguous territory in southern Laos and north-east Cambodia that they already control. The Communists could then lay formal claim to a tri-country "liberated zone" in future peace talks. Or they could use the zone as a vast base for attacks on the central coast of Vietnam, the Mekong River towns of south Laos and the heartland of Cambodia.

Most experts questioned tend to believe that within two to three years Saigon will have abandoned to the enemy large chunks of territory, if not towns, in the Central Highlands and the western part of I Corps in the north. "There will be a northeast-southwest line along which two-thirds of the regular South Vietnamese army will be fighting in conventional format," a ranking official says. He thinks ARVN could hold that line, at least to 1974.

Others wonder if Saigon could ever get two-thirds of its regular army into sustained combat. The ARVN high command recently had to abandon efforts to send the Ninth Division north from its safer stomping grounds in the Mekong Delta; the division simply refused to go. In most ARVN units desertion rise dramatically when units are about to be shifted or sent into combat.

President Thieu frequently talks about a climactic showdown with the Communists in the dry season of 1973, but not all U.S. officials are confident that Mr. Thieu will be around by then. For public consumption the U.S. has tried to put the best possible face on his reelection, sending California Gov. Ronald Reagan and Treasury Secretary John Connally to congratulate him, stressing the dearth of democracy in most parts of the world, taking some solace from the Saigon government's election-day efficiency, telling the ARVN generals that President Thieu is still Washington's man and warning them against any thought of coups.

But, privately, U.S. officials' reactions to the election ranged from disappointment to dismay. Some believed democracy could be made meaningful here and thus see the Oct. 3 exercise in population control as a lost opportunity. Others are less concerned about Vietnamese democracy than about American leverage and thus see Mr. Thieu's election shenanigans as a kind of intramural contest between Mr. Thieu's palace and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker's embassy, and, of course, the embassy lost.

There is a general American concern that the Vietnamese electorate, at least in urban areas, knows it was somehow cheated on Oct. 3 and that, as a result, Vietnam's numerous political factions may henceforth find more fertile ground for sowing seeds of political ferment. Officials also worry that an increasingly unpopular President Thieu will henceforth isolate himself further from his people and from social and political realities and that he will be more suspicious, more repressive, more reliant on vested interests,

less reformist, less willing or able to deal with the moral malaise that infects almost every aspect of this society.

(One interesting indication of President Thieu's state of mind is the manner in which he has surrounded himself, politically and geographically, with members of a single trusted family. Le Van Tu, one of the president's closest cronies, is the chief of Gia Dinh Province, which surrounds Saigon. Tu's brother, his brother-in-law and two of his cousins are all chiefs in other provinces near Saigon—gateways for past military coups.)

While Mr. Thieu is markedly unamenable to U.S. influence, his fate ultimately remains tied to American aims. So long as America's paramount concern is stability under which orderly U.S. withdrawal can proceed, Mr. Thieu can presumably count on American backing. But if President Nixon chose rapid, complete withdrawal (or if a new American administration wanted to dump Mr. Thieu in hopes of achieving a political settlement with the Communists), President Thieu might be hard pressed to hang on. Even without any abrupt change in U.S. policy Mr. Thieu's position may get shakier. American influence with the ARVN generals is mostly based on American aid to fuel their patriotism and fatten their pocketbooks. And as U.S. aid inevitably declines, so may ARVN loyalty to American's man—Nguyen Van Thieu.

Pacification planners no longer seem to be bubbling with enthusiasm and new ideas. They find satisfaction in various developments of the last few years: improved performance by local militiamen, village and hamlet elections and land reform in the Mekong Delta. But public-works programs are being hurt by reduced American assets, a new program for "people's organizations" seems to have flopped, and the Phoenix program to attack the Vietcong infrastructure now is widely viewed as a failure. The program has been partly "Vietnamized," and, perhaps as a result, it is increasingly ineffectual and corrupted. There is also a feeling that the regional and popular forces that provide "territorial security" have gotten about as big and as good as they are going to get and that efforts to make them more mobile will probably fail.

An awareness is growing that Vietnam is an increasingly urbanized society (largely as a result of the war), that urban problems will worsen as American spending and employment decline and that the more politically sophisticated urban citizenry cannot be pacified with sheets of tin roofing or demonstration pigpens.

The expert who talks of gaining the "forced cooperation" of the people of the central coast is at least implying the crucial catch in pacification: Controlling people by military occupation or even pleasing them with increased prosperity is still some distance from really winning their hearts and minds. "These people are still Vietcong in their hearts," said an ARVN general recently of the people in some officially pacified hamlets of Binh Dinh Province.

Finally, pacification—whatever its failures and accomplishments—has always been a heavily American-motivated concept, and, as the American role in Vietnam diminishes, so probably will pacification.

Vietnam's economy, after years of inflationary crisis, now is something of a success story. At least galloping inflation has been checked. Economic controls are being relaxed. Rural prosperity is a reality in much of the Mekong Delta. A new round of economic reforms is expected to further stabilize and stimulate the economy.

But the longer-term outlook is gloomier. Vietnam's exports this year will total less than \$15 million. Its imports, which keep inflation in check, total about \$750 million a year, mostly financed by the U.S. Long-

range plans for economic development remain hazy, and the most optimistic forecast one hears is \$100 million in exports by 1975. Foreign private investment remains leery of Vietnam. There is talk of possible oil deposits off Vietnam's coasts, but so far it's only talk.

America is leaving behind here a vast complex of ports, airfields, bases and communications, but these aren't the kind of assets an underdeveloped economy can make good use of. For as far as anyone here is willing to peer into the future, Vietnam will be a beggar nation, overwhelmingly dependent on U.S. aid. And that aid is dependent on the whim of the American Congress.

The general view here is that without continued U.S. economic assistance at roughly the present level, the Vietnamese economy would collapse. Similarly, even the most critical or pessimistic U.S. officials seem to agree that to give the Saigon government even a fair chance of survival, America must continue providing military aid and material. A frequently mentioned figure for future military and economic assistance is \$2.5 billion a year.

Another consensus is that some continued U.S. air power will be required, but no agreement exists on how much and what sort. Some analysts believe that the minimum requirements can be provided by planes based in Thailand and on aircraft carriers off Vietnam's coasts. Others see a need for at least a few Vietnam-based tactical air squadrons plus helicopters.

All sorts of "ideal" residual-force mixes are being mentioned these days. One, which assumes a residual force of about 40,000 men, breaks down like this: 500 helicopters with crews and maintenance and support units requiring about 10,000 men, three tactical air squadrons totaling about 4,000 men, four artillery battalions requiring a total of 5,000 men, a few thousand advisers, and another 20,000 logistics personnel with a small combat force to help protect their bases. The U.S. now has in Vietnam about 2,000 helicopters, a dozen artillery battalions, nine tactical air squadrons, 19 combat maneuver battalions and about 100,000 logistics personnel.

Other officials argue against any residual presence in Vietnam itself. Their reasons vary. One ranking official thinks the only way to assure the continuance of vital economic and military aid is to get all American soldiers out of Vietnam; this, he believes, might make a continued aid program more palatable to the U.S. public and its Congress.

Others fear for the safety of a residual force that would be largely dependent on ARVN troops for protection. Even enemy sapper attacks and mortar barrages could take a toll of American helicopter maintenance men or logistics units. An alternative would be to try to leave enough U.S. combat troops here to provide the protection.

However, the way the U.S. Army works it takes four or five support soldiers to back each combatant. Thus, the U.S. would wind up with a fat logistical structure to support the combat troops who would be protecting the logistical units that would be supporting the ARVN combat forces. And that would all add up to a very large residual force indeed.

Some officials see a residual force having adverse psychological effect on the Vietnamese. U.S. troops would be living in relative (to the Vietnamese) comfort in several big enclave bases. Their presence would continue to fuel various Vietnamese resentments (Americans living too well, warping their society, prostituting their women and so on) and there would no longer be the cogent counterargument that Americans are also out in the jungles dying for the Vietnamese. Rather, it would be a case of Vietnamese boys living in mud bunkers on the outskirts of U.S.

bases, protecting (or failing to protect) the Americans.

Some officers further fear that even with a compact, all-volunteer residual force, there would continue to be problems of drugs, discipline and morale.

And then there are those analysts who just don't see a residual force making much difference—except for delaying the inevitable. They figure that the only long-term hope for Vietnam is a political settlement with the Communists and that a U.S. residual presence only encourages the Saigon government to keep postponing that settlement.

In all the uncertainty and disagreement over residual forces, there is one thing that the old Vietnam hands seem to agree on: much of the current U.S. presence here could and should be reduced forthwith. One senior official says the mission council—the working committee of top U.S. officials in Vietnam—spends most of its time these days dealing with problems of the American presence in Vietnam rather than with the problems of Vietnam.

"We've just got to get leaner faster," another ranking officer says. And a third tells the story of discovering two adjacent military units on the sprawling U.S. logistics base at Cam Ranh. One was a signal unit and the other a base-support unit. The sole function of the signal unit, he says, was providing communications for the support unit, while the sole function of the support unit was providing services for the signal unit.

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES SERIES: A SUCCESS STORY

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while the American people must read weekly kill statistics, must watch violence in the streets, must hear daily about drug addiction and domestic security problems, a Government funded experiment in public education and enrichment goes quietly into its third year of operation.

The National Humanities Series, a unique learning-by-entertainment venture, was established in June 1969, by the National Endowment for the Humanities in Washington, D.C. Administered by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation of Princeton, N.J., the series was fortunate in having access to the foundations' vast network of more than 18,000 outstanding young scholars plus over 2,000 established college professors and administrators all across the Nation.

Since those early days my vote in the House counted toward the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities, I have followed its progress with special interest. The National Humanities Series is one of its most original and successful experiments. In it, an idea became a reality as teams of professors, performers, and creative artists traveled throughout the country, visiting small remote communities where they presented public humanities programs to nonacademic audiences. They sought out the local people in their clubs, churches, busi-

nesses, schools, and homes, and offered presentations which indicated the connections between the world of the humanities and the life of America today. By drawing upon history, philosophy, literature, and the arts, they demonstrated it is proper and desirable to place high value on the individual and his powers to reason and to see himself within the historical framework of the human race. I for one am pleased with the experiment, for, in an age of polarization, approaching our problems without partisanship, stressing what we have in common rather than what divides us, represents a significant step in the direction of national unity.

The aims of the National Humanities Series are set forth concisely by Dr. Barnaby Keeney, the first permanent chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities:

[It] will afford a wide variety of local and regional groups throughout the country an opportunity to hear humanists who are particularly effective in conveying humanistic knowledge in terms relevant for persons outside the academic community. It is hoped that public audiences will be encouraged to consider current issues in their broader historical and conceptual contexts, and that professors and other humanists will be encouraged to engage in meaningful discourse with people whose interests are not primarily scholarly. It is also hoped we will learn something about what formats and arrangements are most productive in pursuing these goals.

The National Humanities Series went into production in September of 1969 under the direction of Bill Fegan, managing director of the State Theatre of New Mexico at Raton. Since finishing college in his native Pennsylvania, Fegan, a deeply dedicated and talented producer and director, founded a succession of regional theaters, worked as a concert booking representative, created a series of successful literary-theatrical tours, and served as chairman of the department of drama at Stillman College in Alabama. In my view his achievements during the first 2 years of the National Humanities Series are truly remarkable.

Once Fegan has picked a possible community, he seeks a local person enthused enough by the idea of the series to gather together a group of influential citizens. A staff member from Princeton then meets with them, explains the series in detail, and arranges for the formation of a local humanities council. These committees, without whose working support the humanities teams could not succeed, served the role of involving as many townspeople as possible and also relieved the small Princeton staff of some of the routine chores of planning and arranging the scheduling, promotion, and transportation. Soon a chairman, known and active in the community, would be selected; he or she might be a minister, teacher, postmaster, storeowner, or housewife.

By October 1969 the first six "humanists" had been selected from some 75 candidates, and long weeks of planning, recruiting, performing, and rehearsing

ensued. Planning sessions between professors and actors and singers were half rehearsal, half seminar; the professors outlined their programs and their expectations of the performers, and while they were at it might explain the difference between romanticism and neoclassicism or between Sophocles and Aeschylus. The actors suggested scenes, poems, readings and songs, and explained "upstage" and "downstage" to the scholars.

A word of caution to the humanist-chairman was sounded early by Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation:

We realize . . . a college professor is not used to receiving advice on his performance as a teacher or as a scholar. It is important from the beginning that you prepare yourself mentally to accept advice . . . Put yourself in the shoes of the hardware store owner in Liberal, Kansas. . . . What could you possibly say that would first of all make him want to hear you out, and secondly be of value to him?" He also suggested to the performers who asked "what is a humanist?" that . . . a humanist is to the arts what a scientist is to nature.

The "travelling intellectual circusses" set out early in 1970, headed for 41 communities in 19 States, from New England to the Rockies, and ranging in population from 1,500 to 70,000. Over the next 3 months, the series presented a total of 1076 programs. By the time the humanist-led team arrived, a series of appearances had been arranged, according to the needs and interests of that particular town or area, culminating in the major performance by the whole team on the last evening of the visit. Every effort was made to reach as wide an audience as possible, and there has never been a charge for admission of any sort.

The end of the first year of the National Humanities Series saw ever increasing requests for visits, both to the same towns and new ones, and requests to join the teams by both scholars and performers. Reports were coming in from all parts of the country. From Smethport, Pa.:

The enthusiasm and response—exceeded all expectations—pages could be written providing testimonial evidence—Smethport has become more unified in this cooperative action than it has been in some time.

From Webster, S. Dak., where cumulative total attendance exceeded the population of the town:

It seems to me that nothing greater could happen to this country than for the National Humanities Series to be so expanded until the spirit of it permeated the whole of the country.

From Toms River, N.J., a lady was overheard saying:

They are marvelous performers. It really makes you stop and think; so many people doing so many creative things and all I worry about is getting to work on time.

A letter from the Institute for American Indian Art in Santa Fe said in part:

The programs were absolutely terrific and the team which gave them exceptional.

In its second year, 1970-71, the National Humanities Series, continuing the

theme, "Time Out For Man," grew in scope and reputation. For the fiscal year beginning July 1970, the National Endowment for the Humanities more than doubled last year's grant by providing for \$420,000 outright, and \$40,000 in matching funds for gifts. It was the hope of the endowment that the series would continue to "provide an exemplary pattern for conveying humanistic knowledge and insight to general public audiences." The series was to continue the pattern of visits by scholars and artists to audiences throughout the United States. Supplementary programs, including senior professors as lecturers, participants, and consultants, were made available. Furthermore, series communities were encouraged in the development of locally initiated humanistic programs and activities.

The summer of 1970 was devoted to the preparation of four major presentations of the fall tour and the organization of new series communities, "Face to Face"—"How and Why People Create"—incorporated the music of Bach, Bernstein, Simon and Garfunkle, and the Beatles; the poetry of T. S. Elliot, Dylan Thomas, Robert Frost, Langston Hughes, and Shakespeare. "Justice, Trial and Error," incorporated scenes from Anouilh's "Antigone," and Lerner and Lowe's "Camelot" with material from Locke, Plato, Judge Roy Bean, Thoreau, the "Ten Commandments," and A. E. Housman. "Poetry in Black" was a one-man show created by black actor Nat Simmons, who acted and read poetry and prose from Langston Hughes to Kahlil Gibran. This was to be one of the series' favorite performances with almost universal appeal especially among the younger audiences. One youngster wrote to Simmons, "Man, you just kept me in school." "Stop, Look, and Listen," a program on "The Good Life," dealt with the attempt to distinguish between illusion and reality and used folk music, scenes from Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman," and Shakespeare's "The Tempest," poetry of Hart Crane, readings from Plato's "Republic," films from the turn of the century as well as from new and experimental directors. These were some of the presentations for which scripts were created, supporting programs put together, team chairmen and members selected and rehearsed. Twenty-two of the first year communities were revisited, and another 22 were added to bring the initial total of communities to 44 in 28 States, all the way from Oregon to Georgia, and from Maine to Texas.

A planning conference was held in September 1970 for all participants in the National Humanities Series, as guests of the Johnson Foundation at Wingspread, Racine, Wis. Among those taking part were Wallace B. Edgerton, acting chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, whose address gave participants a firsthand account of the Endowment's objectives; others of his staff; program chairmen and performers; representatives from 35 series communities and the Princeton staff. This

conference proved valuable in preparing for the second series year, for it cleared up ambiguities of purpose which arose during the first experimental season. Teams could compare notes and local chairmen could exchange ideas. Most important, local chairmen had a chance to meet some of the humanists and performers who would visit their communities.

By the second year of the series, any doubts about the Endowment's belief that "Humanities could be taken to the grass roots of America" must surely have evaporated. To be sure, only the surface had been scratched, but the yearning and even starvation for intellectual stimulus exceeded all expectations.

Eventually, an audience of approximately 225,000 was reached with over 1,648 presentations in 69 communities. But, far more impressive than sheer numbers were the results of series activities. Professors went out to instruct and learned from their audiences things they had never experienced in the classroom. People in small towns saw portrayed slices of life they had hitherto only imagined. Students, teachers, foresters, farmers, professional men, housewives, the young and the retired came together, and, in the discussions which grew out of each performance, found a new level of communication. In an exciting and unusual partnership of scholarship and "show biz," the generation gap, credibility gap, and people-gap were bridged here.

What happened in Waldwick, N.J., is typical of the kind of local initiative generated during the second series year. In this New Jersey town of 17,500, the public school administrators announced plans to integrate next year's humanities curriculum into the themes to be presented there by the series. Several communities expressed an interest in developing local versions of the series format; in Bartlesville, Okla., a high school sponsored humanities series is in formation. In Luverne, Minn., the series sparked monthly town meetings in which residents discuss community concerns; in the words of the local committee chairman—

The Humanities Series taught us that we can enjoy discussing ideas.

Twenty of the series communities have begun to function as regional humanities centers, farming series programs out to neighboring towns or drawing audiences from a radius of up to 60 miles. Some Western communities have adopted the idea of bringing outlying audiences into a central location by using school buses.

Unsolicited reactions on many levels from all corners of the country arrived daily at the Princeton headquarters. They varied all the way from "your series stinks" to highest praise—negative opinions accounting for less than 1 percent. A presentation before a women's church group in Dalhart, Tex., drew the comment:

Best thing to come out of it was the realization on the part of the white women who were there that the black women were more

intelligent and informed than they had dreamed. Also, we discovered that the library didn't subscribe to any Negro periodicals, and the librarian, who were there, vowed to see that *Ebony*, *Black World*, etc. would be made available to the community.

At an Indian school in Stephen, S. Dak., Nat Simmons "Poetry in Black" produced an inspired, but perhaps not so unexpected, result—the children decided to put together a program of their own, a kind of "poetry in red" using American Indian material. A recent letter from Poplar Bluff, Mo., alluded to a social function of the humanities. After a brief description of previous attempts to make social changes in the community, the writer of the letter went on to describe the way in which the series may have induced change not directly through persuasion, but indirectly through its dramatic form—

There was a dimension of sympathy and understanding achieved through this artistic and dramatic medium. I haven't seen this demonstrated before. I've been trying to work through social action myself, in the NAACP, but it hasn't worked. There were a lot of young people who expressed ideas and ideals last night who have never thought any adult would listen to them—The team acted as catalysts.

The response to "Poetry in Black" by actor Simmons who became—

An absolute genius at getting people to open their mouths and hearts about racial tensions—broke down barriers to communication between parents and children, whites and blacks.

It would be impossible to list all the ideas and possibilities, the optimism and plans, generated by the series. But for the record, I should note that there were also misjudgments and even failures. At one evening performance in a southern town, only six persons showed up. Some of the communities were unable to draw an audience other than the "intellectual elite," who had no real need for what the series would give them. But how does one measure success and failure? Has a program really failed if only one person was reached?

The Cherokee, Iowa, Times editorialized aptly the meaning of series visits—

Get off the treadmill long enough to gain perspective. Perhaps you are on your particular treadmill because you have never known anything else. Perhaps circumstances put you there. Or maybe unrealistic dreams. But have you taken time to consider that life goes around only once and that there might be more joy if you took another approach? Have you made your vocation your life because, in the beginning, you had to struggle—and now you are still struggling and have forgotten why, and in that forgetting not stopped long enough to look out into the broad world from your narrow, confined tunnel?

More eloquently than anything I could say of this valiant experiment, perhaps a new art form, in bringing Michelangelo and Shakespeare, Bach, and Robert Frost to our neighbors beyond the urban sprawls, is this tribute from the Webster, S. Dak. postmaster;

The committee joins me in expressing hearty thanks . . . for a magnificent expe-

rience. I have lived in this community almost constantly all of my life and I can say unequivocally that nothing heretofore has struck this community which brought it so much joy as did the National Humanities Series. Joy which comes from something that is readily recognizable as being of lasting value. There remains so much to remember, to think about, and to guide. Thank you.

Here surely is recompense for this exciting and imaginative undertaking, for the time, the work and the funds used to bring time out for man to our fellow citizens throughout this country.

KENNEDY AND IRELAND

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it is not the responsibility and it is a dubious right of any individual American, particularly a political spokesman, to make emotional and shortsighted demands on a foreign government's internal policy. I speak specifically of Senator KENNEDY's recent remarks on what Britain's role should be concerning the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials from the Dallas News, the Christian Science Monitor, the Memphis Press Scimitar, the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Omaha World Herald.

The articles follow:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Oct. 23 1971]

KENNEDY AND IRELAND

Sen. Edward Kennedy has invaded the affairs of another nation by taking sides in the Northern Ireland conflict. He demands that British troops stop persecuting Irish Catholics and go home.

The North Irish government accuses him of playing American politics with Irish lives—which is exactly what this unheard-of meddling amounts to.

If any world situation defies the power of anybody to short its rights and wrongs, it is the Irish one. Yet Kennedy ignores both history and reality in siding, perhaps emotionally, with one religious element while making the political demand that the North Irish government be dissolved and all Ireland united.

Protestants rule North Ireland, which is by no means an all-Irish country and one less than eager to unite with Eire. North Ireland, moreover, is British—a product of history too ancient to be undone in the name of one Ireland or even one religion.

British troops are there to keep warring Catholics and Protestants from one another's throats. Whatever the wrongs done the Catholic minority, it is no doing of the British troops. They die almost daily trying to control the immemorial prejudices of both sides.

Kennedy, as the North Irish government has retorted, reveals both prejudice and ignorance by treating the tragedy as an all-Irish question and the British troops as colonial dragoons.

The U.S. Government has rejected his interference. Most Americans will wonder how much of it is blind emotion and how much of it sense.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 23, 1971]

UNWARRANTED INTRUSION

Sen. Edward Kennedy's demand in Congress for the withdrawal of British troops from Ulster and the unification of Ireland can only be described as a totally unwarranted intrusion into British internal affairs.

It portrays a dismaying lack of sensitivity to the complexity of the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. It ignores the fact that Ulster is an integral part of the United Kingdom and that two-thirds of its population are ardently committed to preserving that relationship.

By urging the immediate withdrawal of British troops, Mr. Kennedy is doing just what the Irish Republic Army terrorists want. Their priority goal is to force the British Army out of Ulster as a first step to unification of the island.

But moderate opinion in Ireland, both north and south of the border, knows perfectly well that a solution to the Ulster problem is just not that simple. Both the British Government and the provincial government in Ulster are moving toward a broader concept of the political structure in the north, which would open the door to participation by the Roman Catholic minority in the administration.

But this can only come when terrorism in the north has been stamped out, and as of now the presence of British troops is essential to combat that terrorism. For the British this is a painful but unavoidable assignment. For them to throw in the sponge and quit would very probably lead to civil war in the north.

British newspapers justifiably point out that Senator Kennedy made no condemnation of the terrorists and are shocked at his calling the Ulster situation "Britain's Vietnam."

Politics apart—and the motive was, of course, purely political—Senator Kennedy's gesture hardly enhances his reputation on foreign policy matters.

Happily the Nixon administration was quick to disassociate itself from the Kennedy statement in Congress and from the resolution presented jointly by him and Sen. Abraham Ribicoff to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Reassurances by American officials both in Washington and London that the demands made in the resolution in no way reflect American policy should help to soothe the ruffled feelings of the British.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Scimitar, Oct. 25, 1971]

ADVICE OF IRELAND

Senator Edward M. Kennedy is the prime mover of a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland and the joining of that province to the Irish Republic.

The move has stirred accusations in the internal affairs of another country and, moreover, playing ethnic politics.

Such charges take the matter too seriously. It is characteristic of ambitious senators that they stick their noses in people's business all over the world. And Kennedy's special interest in Ireland is no more surprising, say, than those of Senators Jacob K. Javits in Israel, Edmund S. Muskie in Poland and John O. Pastore in Italy, or Vice President Agnew in Greece.

What is striking in Kennedy's intervention is that it carries such bad advice. A rapid withdrawal of British troops from Ulster would lead to bloodshed, perhaps civil war, in which the worst victims would be the Catholic minority.

People tend to forget that the British army

was sent to Ulster in 1669 to protect the Catholics from attack by Protestant extremists. Its presence has made possible the disarming of Protestant police and auxiliary forces that were regarded as dangers by the Catholics.

Since then, the threat to peace has come from gunmen and bombers of the outlawed Irish Republican Army, who have infiltrated Ulster from the South.

They dream that their wave of terror will cause Britain to tire of its losses in Northern Ireland and withdraw its army. Then the IRA could count on undoing the partition of 1920 and unifying the six counties of Ulster with the Irish Republic.

In any event, such a trial at arms would be cruel, tragic and bloody. And that is precisely what politicians are risking when they say pull the 13,000 British soldiers out.

Quite sensibly, Prime Ministers Edward Heath of Britain and John Lynch of Ireland know that a political solution is essential. Heath is pressing Ulster's Protestant officials to give the Catholics fair play in voting, jobs and housing—which they have been deprived of for 50 years.

The hope is that equal treatment will undercut Catholic support for the IRA and that Ulster will be able to work out its future in peace. After so much hatred and violence, what Heath is trying is difficult and, in the end, may fail. But his chances are not helped by uninformed advice from abroad.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch Oct. 25, 1971]

KENNEDY AND THE IRISH

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., stirred a hornet's nest in the United Kingdom last week when he presumptuously demanded that all British troops be immediately withdrawn from embattled Northern Ireland and that predominantly-Protestant Ulster and predominantly-Catholic Eire be reunited as one Ireland.

"What Sen. Kennedy's remarks may do is to give support to the Belfast gunmen, for which he is likely to face criticism," the British Press Association roared. "As a Catholic of Irish descent himself, there will be an inevitable suspicion that he has political motives."

Sixth Conservative Party members of the British Parliament signed a motion stating, "This house deeply resents the quite unwarranted incursion of Sen. Kennedy into the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, but is confident that it does not reflect the views of responsible American leaders."

Brian Faulkner, prime minister of Northern Ireland, observed that Kennedy "has shown himself willing to swallow the hoary old propaganda line that IRA (Irish Republican Army) atrocities are on behalf of the Irish people and the British army is here as a colonial power."

Since the IRA terrorists are currently trying to accomplish the two objectives Kennedy commends by force, and since they seem to have no compunction about murdering innocent men, women, and children in the process, and since the prime ministers of Britain, Ulster, and the Republic of Ireland, meeting jointly, have not solicited American advice on solving their problems, it does seem slightly incredible that Kennedy chooses at this moment in history to poke his nose into this explosive affair.

Ah ha, there is an explanation! Sen. Kennedy declared on the Senate floor that America cannot remain silent because "Britain has lost its way" and "Ulster is becoming Britain's Vietnam." But the Senator perhaps forgets (or fails to realize or admit) that America crossed the Rubicon into its own massive Vietnam involvement when the

Kennedy Administration, in 1963, meddled in another nation's internal affairs by supporting the overthrow of the established government of South Vietnam. The British may be forgiven for not exactly falling over backward, then, to take an American liberal's advice on how to "avoid a Vietnam," especially when the politician's name is Kennedy.

[From Omaha World Herald, Oct. 26, 1971]
TED POINTS THE FINGER

Sen. Edward Kennedy's intervention in the troubles of Northern Ireland and his finger-pointing at the British government are not completely explained by the obvious fact that his words will sound sweet to the ears of some Irish-American voters.

In the first place, not all American Irish are sold on the virtues of the rebel cause in Northern Ireland. The extremism of Bernadette Devlin and her links with Communists have raised a caution flag in the minds of many who are sympathetic to the rebels.

It is not easy to sort out "good guys" and "bad guys" in this complicated struggle, but Sen. Kennedy's attitude suggests that he finds it easy: Simply blame the British. We expected a little better from Kennedy.

THE PUZZLE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing a crisis in the disposal of solid waste. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the results of an extremely valuable Solid Waste Symposium that was organized by the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce, the editors of Pollution Engineering, and my office:

THE PUZZLE

Like every other county in the U.S., Montgomery County, Maryland, has environmental control problems. But, here solid waste disposal has reached a crisis stage. A new 1,300-ton-per-day incinerator does not meet state pollution control regulations and is not operating at maximum capacity. The county's landfill, which was supposed to be finished off level with the surrounding grade, is now a 5-acre mountain more than 50 ft. above grade, and growing. The site is far from sanitary and is plagued with sea gulls, rodents and blowing debris. Each time county officials have attempted to buy a new landfill site, they have met with strong opposition. It's the same old story—no one wants someone else's garbage. So, the county has had to continue using its existing facilities.

Montgomery County forms the northwest boundary of the District of Columbia and is the headquarters of many federal offices including the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; U.S. Bureau of Standards; Atomic Energy Commission; National Institute of Health; Army Map Service; Naval Ordnance Laboratory and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The county also has 7,600 other businesses and industries as well as many branch offices of other federal agencies. It is a highly professional community, with more than 30 percent of the residents being college graduates. It is the richest county per capita in the country; the average family income is in excess of \$19,000. The population has tripled since 1950 to its present total of 522,000, and is expected to grow to over one million by the year 2000.

The editors of Pollution Engineering were already involved in the county assisting businesses in a self-evaluation pollution control program when the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce decided to undertake a project to solve the county's most pressing problem. A. S. Damiani, facilities manager of Fairchild Industries and a vice president of the county chamber of commerce, joined by R. D. Wooten for the University of Maryland, set about creating a problem-solving program. Pollution Engineering's editors were asked to help provide technical support.

U.S. Congressman Gilbert Gude agreed to be honorary chairman. His office personally invited a key representative of every business, organization and association in the entire county to attend and participate in the program. Because of the large audience anticipated, it was decided to hold the program in the main auditorium of the National Bureau of Standards. Ultimately some 300 individuals from 7 states and one foreign country attended this unique symposium.

The two-day program was designed for total audience participation and education. On the first day a panel would present the problem, and then a panel of technical experts would discuss specific solutions and answer questions from the audience. On the following day the audience would be divided into small discussion groups to deliberate the problem and arrive at answers using information from the technical panel, while providing the necessary input of what was acceptable to the residents of the county.

Upon arriving at a consensus of all of the discussion groups, another panel would present the county officials with recommendations, as well as transcripts and tape recordings of the proceedings. Thus, the symposium was designed to provide the county government—without charge—expertise to resolve its problems, and to determine what the community leaders considered an acceptable solution.

The solid waste disposal problem of Montgomery County was presented to those attending the symposium by a panel of representatives from the county government and board, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, State of Maryland's solid waste control office, and an individual representing the many citizens' organizations. Each panel member described the problem from his viewpoint, providing the audience with a total picture of the problem.

THE SOLVERS

As explained by the county officials, the problem was simple—plenty of refuse and no place to put it. The quantity of solid waste received at the county incinerator and landfill during fiscal year 1969-70 amounted to 282,000 tons of incinerable refuse (an average of 906 tons per working day) and approximately 69,000 tons of non-incinerable bulky refuse (an average of 222 tons per working day.) County officials estimate that these figures will increase to 920,000 tons per year of incinerables and 262,000 tons per year of non-incinerables by 1995—an increase of over 200 percent between 1971 and 1995. Adding to the difficulty, the state of Maryland adopted air pollution control regulations which will force shutdown of the incinerator facility by July 1973, if costly major redesign considerations are not carried out.

The State of Maryland and the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency are sympathetic and understanding of the problems involved, but to them the solution is clear-cut—just comply with the law. As viewed by the citizens, the problem becomes involved with personalities. The residents would like the county officials to be more open about the problem and what is being done to solve it.

Once the problem had been fully aired, Pollution Engineering's technical panel of solid waste disposal experts sat down to pro-

vide data on solving it. Extreme care had been taken in selecting the technical panel. It was important that all sides were represented including government, consultants, researchers and manufacturers. This also enabled the panel to discuss legislation, financing and projects in the development stage. To ensure that prejudice would not creep into the discussions, the panel was structured to include at least two individuals who could speak with authority on a specific facet of solid waste disposal, such as compacting.

However, the technical panel did deviate from what might be considered normal practice in its analysis. Most of the audience knew the many advantages of incineration, landfilling, pyrolysis, shredding, high temperature incineration, compacting and recycling. However, probably very few of them fully understood the limitations of the various processes. Since official recommendations from the symposium would be determined by the general audience, it was imperative that everyone be provided with a total unbiased picture of the methods and equipment available. Therefore, in its analysis of the problem, the panel stressed the limitations of the solid waste handling and disposal processes from equipment to economics.

Several weeks prior to the start of the symposium, each panel member reviewed the technical data furnished by the county and submitted in writing a detailed statement on how he proposed to solve the problem viewed only from his immediate field of expertise. This was done without collaborating with fellow panel members.

Then just before the symposium started, all panel members were given copies of the statements made by one another. This immediately provided a base for discussion between panel members with differing viewpoints. It also demonstrated to the audience how methods could be logically combined to form a complete solid waste disposal system.

During this discussion among panel members, the audience submitted questions for clarification and elaboration. For example, questions were directed to the federal government representatives asking about funding to relieve the cost burden. And, why are shredding demonstration programs being re-evaluated? The panel was asked to discuss the problem of increased decomposition time in a landfill created by compaction and baling of refuse. Panel members were asked to discuss the use of ultraviolet radiation to increase the decomposition rate.

Industry's contribution to the solid waste problem was also dealt with at great length. It had been suggested before the symposium, that industries using the county's disposal services should be forced to carry a greater portion of the cost or find their own places for disposal. It had also been suggested in the press that industry should be required to perform some type of processing of refuse before it left the plants. This might range from separation of incinerables and non-incinerables all the way to required compaction and baling.

The panel members did not feel the problem was sufficient to require industry to find its own disposal sites. They did, however, feel that manufacturers should be investigating on-site preparation or disposal systems for the economic benefit to be derived. Many examples were presented detailing the cost advantages of on-site compaction, shredding, baling and incineration.

Legislation requiring homeowners to perform some type of refuse preparation were also thoroughly discussed. For example, it was requested that the panel consider possible legislation requiring home incineration. The panel determined that, considering the number of residences in the county and the operating efficiency of most home incinerators, required residential incineration would

be prohibited by the air pollution control regulations of Maryland.

Advocates of recycling asked the technical panel to discuss required on-site segregation of materials. Though all the panel members were in favor of recycling, they felt that a sufficient, stable market for recycling paper did not exist in the immediate area, and therefore did not feel that requiring legislation to separate this material from refuse was justified.

However, the panel felt that possibilities for additional processing of the ash from the county incinerator showed promise for savings in operating costs. In addition, while the incinerator is not presently designed or equipped to capture heat and generate steam for sale, it was agreed that, if major modifications are required to meet state pollution standards, incorporation of this capability should be considered.

The technical panel then presented several workable solutions for the audience to consider. These recommendations encompassed the whole problem including collection, processing and disposal. It was stressed by one of the panel members, however, that several new disposal techniques are nearing completion of tests by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Therefore, any final recommendations for long-range disposal planning should leave the door open for the county officials to investigate and incorporate newer and possibly more economical methods.

The audience left the first day's proceedings to personally consider the problems, solutions and limitations brought out by the panel. They were, however, requested to return the following day to deliberate this material in small discussion groups. In turn, these groups were to arrive at a series of guidelines that county officials could follow in proceeding to solve the problem.

THE RESULTS

The success of any program should be measured by the results achieved.

Generally, people were unhappy with the amount of money they were paying for services received. Therefore, no one was in favor of additional costs to the homeowner and business for improving service.

One hot item which drew much discussion, but no results, was the question of imposing limitations on packaging materials. The discussion groups were made up of individuals with strong attitudes on both sides of the problem. Though people understood that plastic would not decompose in a landfill, some were willing to accept this environmental contaminant for the opportunity of see-through packaging materials when purchasing groceries such as meats.

Of major significance, however, was the consensus reached on the question of separating materials at their source for collection and possible recycling. The majority of people agreed that they did not want to be inconvenienced by this task and would do so only if compelled by law. This feeling also answered the question about the need to have pickup collection stations strategically located in the county to which individuals could voluntarily bring recyclable materials. Although these depositories would be used by a few people, the reduction in the overall amount of waste to be handled would be insignificant.

This question has extreme national importance. Practically every community in the country is considering the operation of some type of recycling program. Many cities have operated a one- or two-day collection project with great success. However, if the vast majority of community residents will not continually support and supply a recycling station, its impact will be negligible in terms of alleviating the solid waste problem. Americans must be educated about the problem

and realize the necessity of some personal inconvenience.

The greatest benefit to the county officials came from the recommendations of the discussion groups to the question: "What do you feel would be the most feasible disposal system—present and future?" To solve the immediate situation the group consensus was that the present incinerator must be upgraded to comply with state pollution standards. Since a small landfill is required for incinerator residue, the county should take immediate steps to acquire property for that purpose only.

Also, since a vast number of individuals with solid waste interest and expertise live and work in the county, it was recommended that the government should immediately create a task force to continually investigate problems and techniques and report to the officials and the public.

Finally, the symposium recommended that the county government embark on a long-range education program to keep the public informed of the solid waste problem and attempt to change attitudes about recycling. This would be combined with a long-range program investigating high-temperature incineration, improved collection and operation of a processing/recycling facility.

We, the editors of Pollution Engineering, feel that the symposium accomplished far more than appears on the surface. For the first time all sides were able to unemotionally discuss the difficulties each was having with the other—citizens with the county, other governments with the county government, and Montgomery County officials with the residents. This did much to further the education of the people and to resolve many differences in understanding.

Additionally, county officials were provided with a fantastic amount of free expertise on their specific problem by the technical panel. The experts put the problem in its true perspective, and set out to educate the government and citizens alike. It was an outstanding display of dedicated men believing that pollution can be controlled through reason and understanding, giving of their time and abilities to meet that end.

Solid waste in Montgomery County is still of concern. But now county officials know what citizens consider acceptable to alleviate the situation. In turn, the people understand that there is not one easy, quick solution to the problem. As long as communication continues to exist between all parties, the problem will be controlled and soon solved.

GROUP PRACTICE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the growth of group medical practice in this country has been quite steady for a number of years. As a physician, I find that the American Medical Association is often accused of opposing a group practice. I believe a recent editorial from the American Medical News states the position of the AMA on this topic and I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the American Medical News, Sept. 13, 1971]

GROUP PRACTICE

Group practice has become a favorite topic in the continuing debate over America's health care system.

Some participants in the debate claim that group practice is the answer to many problems of health care delivery. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would provide financial subsidies for the development of group practice, a move which the American Medical Association has opposed because it favors the development of one type of practice over all others. This opposition has led to rebirth of the oft-repeated myth that the AMA always has opposed group practice.

This is not true.

The AMA in the 1930s questioned so-called "contract" practice, in which entrepreneurs hired willing physicians and sold their services in such a way that both the physicians and the patients were exploited. This, however, is not group practice; it is "contract practice."

In 1933, the AMA House of Delegates said: "Those forming a group should be guided by the same principles regarding professional qualifications for practice, ethical relations to fellow practitioners, and consideration for the economic position of these whom they serve as should guide the individual practitioner."

In 1957, the House said: "It is within the limits of ethical propriety for physicians to join together as partnerships, associations, or other lawful groups provided that the ownership and management of the affairs thereof remain in the hands of licensed physicians."

In 1970, AMA recognized "the need for multiple methods of delivering medical services," and pledged to encourage and participate in efforts to develop them. It called for maintenance and creation of incentives in medical practice, and pointed out that "Among these incentives are a multiplicity of practice options, maximum professional independence, and freedom of choice for both physicians and patients."

Group practice has enjoyed a steady growth in the past few decades. Since physicians comprise those group practices, and since 82% of MDs involved in office-based patient care belong to the AMA, the continued charge of AMA opposition to group practice is difficult to uphold. Furthermore, two members of the AMA Board of Trustees are in group practice, and since 1962, the AMA has made available to MDs a book, *Group Practice—Guidelines to Joining or Forming a Medical Group*.

The AMA has stated on many occasions its belief that a pluralistic system of medical care, utilizing solo practice, group practice, group practice prepayment, and other mechanisms, is the best way to assure that the public will receive quality health care, with each patient and physician having the right to choose the type he prefers. What the AMA opposes is coercion—through legislative, financial, or other methods—to force physicians to practice in any setting, or to force patients to receive care from any one type of practice.

PHILLIPS PETROLEUM TAKES TOP HONORS IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL DEVELOPMENT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Phillips Petroleum has won first place recognition for its innovations in resource utilization optimization of Petroleum

Engineer's environmental control program. Phillips was cited for its technique developed to utilize an off-gas produced at its Toledo, Ohio, carbon black plant.

Not only is the petroleum industry seeking new ways to prevent pollution, but as Phillips Petroleum has ably shown, they are developing positive uses for what was up to this time seen only as industrial waste. America salutes the petroleum industry as one of the leaders in her increasingly important program of environmental control.

The award to Phillips Petroleum stated:

Industry has been spurred to seek imaginative ways of utilizing processing byproducts once regarded as "waste." Prime example of Phillips Petroleum Co.'s efforts in this area is a newly developed system to utilize an off-gas produced at its Toledo, Ohio, carbon black plant.

The plant produces about 60 million lb of carbon black every year, made in a reactor by the partial combustion and thermal decomposition of oil in an atmosphere of limited oxygen. After reaction, carbon black-laden gases flow from the reactor through a water quench, where they're cooled and into a complex filter system where the carbon black particles are separated from the gas.

The remaining gas is roughly 50% water vapor formed during the cooling process and nitrogen, smaller amounts of carbon monoxide, hydrogen, carbon dioxide, unburned hydrocarbons, sulfur compounds, and a trace of carbon black. Normally produced at a rate of about 2.5 million cu ft/hr. this "off-gas" under many industrial situations would be vented to the atmosphere after filtration.

To further protect the environment, however, as well as utilize the energy value of the gas, Phillips devised a method whereby the gas could be burned and the resulting heat put to a useful purpose.

Oxidization of this off-gas is more difficult than that of conventional fuels because of its low concentration of combustible materials and high concentration of water vapor. Off-gas heating value is extremely low—only 35 to 50 Btus/cu ft. By contrast, natural gas has a heating value of about 1000 Btus/cu ft, 60 times greater.

The off-gas is used as fuel for the plant's two carbon black dryers as well as two boilers which supply steam for various processes. Because of the low Btu value, it was necessary to design these units with larger fire boxes than would be required had a conventional fuel been used. Technical problems also had to be overcome to accommodate the rapid fluctuation in the fuel's heating value. Extensive instrumentation was installed to constantly monitor and make automatic adjustments for these fluctuations.

During partial plant shutdowns or other occasions where the off-gas output may be reduced, natural gas is introduced into the fire boxes to sustain adequate heat level. Should operating conditions result in more off-gas than can be consumed, the excess gas is sent to an incinerator, where it is burned.

Although off-gas utilization at the Toledo plant has involved higher investment costs and closer operating supervision than would be required by conventional heat generating systems, Phillips believes the savings in fuel costs and the environment advantages outweigh these drawbacks. From a maintenance standpoint, the system has performed without major difficulty since its installation in June 1970, Phillips said.

DEFEAT OF PRAYER AMENDMENT CREATES SNEAKY PRAYING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I thought our colleagues would enjoy a bit of satire which appeared in the local paper following defeat of the prayer bill. There might well be more truth than humor in it.

The news clipping follows:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 12, 1971]

THOSE SLY KIDS WILL PRAY ANYWAY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Is Congress out of its mind? Killing the constitutional amendment that would have allowed our little children to pray in school?

It is obvious these venal politicians care more for the votes of their godless Communist constituents than they do for the needs and desires of our American youth.

True, the amendment was not without its faults. While it would have guaranteed the right of children to pray in school, it said nothing about their right, for example, to pray on school buses.

As anyone who has been aboard a brakeless school bus careening down a mountain road will testify, one right is surely the equal of the other.

The school bus section of the prayer amendment was reportedly dropped as a sop to anti-busing forces. More mysterious was the failure of the amendment to say a word about the people's right to pray in other public structures such as libraries, football stadiums and the offices of the Internal Revenue Service.

But wishy-washy as the amendment was, it was at least a start. And what a boon it would have been to our little children! For, after all, as long as they're going to do it anyway, we might as well let them do it openly and legally.

The way it is now, of course, our little children in public school have to sneak their prayers when the authorities aren't looking. This not only creates a disciplinary problem for the teachers, but it instills in our young a disrespect for rules and regulations.

Take a typical classroom scene these days. Take the scene in Miss Penelope Prudence's fifth grade class at the Garret A. Hobart Elementary School.

Miss Prudence: All right, class. Let's open our Sex Education books to the center fold and . . . Just a minute! Herman, what are you mumbling under your breath?

Herman (nervously): Just the Gettysburg Address, honest, Miss Prudence.

Miss Prudence (frowning): Are you certain it wasn't the Lord's Prayer, Herman? I distinctly heard you say, "Our Father."

Herman (quickly): Oh, no, Miss Prudence. "Our forefathers." You know, "who brought forth . . ."

Miss Prudence: Hmm. I needn't remind you, Herman, that you're on probation since the principal caught you in the boiler room with those sixth graders sneaking Hall Marys. All right, now, we'll . . . Martha Lynx, I saw Sparky pass you that note! Bring it up here this instant.

Martha (blanching): It's just a mash note, Miss Prudence.

Miss Prudence (grabbing it): Aha! Just as I thought. The Twenty-Third Psalm! Passing prayers in class again, eh? And what's that you've got hidden behind your sex education text? Ah, the Book of Common Prayer!

Martha (in tears): I'm sorry, Miss Prudence. I was praying for a B-minus in sex education.

That's no excuse, Martha. I'll have to send a note to your poor parents. This illegal praying in school has got to stop!

But keep the faith, fellow Americans. The prayer amendment is bound to be revived next year. Let us pray.

Miss Prudence (sternly): It will be stronger, more inclusive and less wishy-washy. And let us pray it will be speedily passed. But let's not rely on the efficacy of prayer.

After all, our congressmen begin each day's session by praying for divine wisdom. And look where that's got them.

EUPHORIA ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S COMING VISIT TO RUSSIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, euphoria automatically develops when a U.S. President makes the predictable announcement that he will visit Moscow, and President Nixon's proposed trip next spring is no exception.

Therefore, it was with special interest that I studied and restudied the very penetrating column by Crosby Noyes in the October 24 Washington Sunday Star which, I believe, is well worth reviewing, especially among White House staffers.

DOUBTS ON COMMUNITY OF INTEREST WITH
RUSSIA

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The makings of a sharp disagreement between the White House and the Pentagon over a reading of Russian military and political intentions could seriously affect the prospects for President Nixon's projected summit meeting in Moscow next May.

The White House at this stage is uncharacteristically optimistic. In announcing his plan for the Moscow trip, Nixon is holding out the promise of "significant progress" in various areas of East-West negotiation and most especially in the area of armaments limitation.

In the President's hopeful view, Moscow and Washington "can both agree that neither major power can get a decisive advantage over the other, an advantage which would enable it to launch a preemptive strike which might enable it to engage in international blackmail."

This, in itself, is quite an assumption. If one buys it on the basis of what has gone on so far in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) at Helsinki and Vienna, then indeed a great deal may be possible. But there is fairly good evidence that Nixon's optimism is not shared by all of the top administration leadership.

It was hardly coincidental that at the same time the President was explaining why the Russians would negotiate seriously on armaments limitations, the Pentagon broke out with a rash of announcements on Soviet activities that point toward considerably grimmer conclusions.

First, the Air Force reported that the Russians had deployed operationally a new and potentially deadly nuclear delivery system

known as FOBS (Fractional Orbital Bombardment System). According to a spokesman, the new device represents a weapon "which can approach us from virtually any direction and without detection."

Next, it was disclosed that the Russians are continuing rapid construction of three different new types of missile silos. Although Soviet land-based missiles already outclass the American strategic arsenal in numbers (1,550 to 1,054) and size (up to 25 times the megatonnage of the largest American missiles), they are busily forging ahead on more than 90 large new placements.

And finally, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird warned that the Soviet Union is doubling its production facilities for nuclear missile-firing submarines. At the present rate of building, said Laird, the Soviets would match the American fleet of Polaris submarines by 1973 and possibly pull rapidly ahead thereafter. President Nixon's coming talks with the Soviet leaders, the secretary said, were "indeed very important."

It is possible to be cynical about these markedly different appraisals of what the Russians are really up to. Around appropriation time, it is not unusual for the Pentagon to come along with alarming data on Russian efforts in the field of weaponry. It is not surprising, either, that the President chooses to accentuate the positive in his analysis of the Russians' willingness to resolve major differences with the West.

But it also is possible to see in the various negotiations that have been going on a pattern which suggests that the Russians have a very clear concept of their own interests and objectives. And which suggests further that these interests and objectives may not coincide as closely with our own as Nixon apparently hopes.

The Russians, for example, have negotiated an agreement on Berlin which everyone accepts as being very much in the interests of the West. In return, however, they are confident of getting ratification of a treaty with West Germany which consecrates the division of Germany and the status quo in Eastern Europe for the foreseeable future. The Berlin agreement, furthermore, could clear the way for a negotiation on troop reductions in Europe, leading to substantial cuts in American forces assigned to NATO.

Again, in the area of arms limitation, the Russians seem to be having things so far very much their own way. From the beginning of the SALT talks, they have shown considerable interest in limiting defensive nuclear weapons systems and very little interest in putting a ceiling on the deployment of offensive weapons.

The United States, which entered the talks with the firm resolve to keep defensive and offensive systems linked in an inseparable package, apparently has abandoned that resolve in the hope of reaching at least an interim agreement at an early date. Last May, it was agreed to concentrate on a formula for limiting defense weapons by the end of this year "and on certain measures to limit offensive weapons."

Whether this vague phrase justifies Nixon's assertion that neither of the major powers will try to "get a decisive advantage over the other" remains to be seen. Apparently there are still a number of skeptics who believe that in the coming era of negotiation, the Russians may try very hard to do just that.

WAR ON WILDLIFE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, a number of bills are now before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, chaired by Mr. DINGELL, and I am confident that some valuable, meaningful legislation will be the result.

I had the opportunity to submit testimony before this subcommittee on behalf of my own bills, H.R. 6804 and H.R. 7240. I pointed out the need to do away with such cruel and dangerous means of trapping and killing as steel jaw traps, coyote getters, and Compound 1080. Let me commend to my colleagues the following article by Faith McNulty, which has been reprinted from the National Parks and Conservation magazine. I regret that the RECORD cannot also reproduce the pictures which accompany it, because they are further testimony to the tragic effects of the encroachment of what we like to call civilization.

The article follows:

WAR ON WILDLIFE

(By Faith McNulty)

Imagine you are standing and looking over the rolling grassland somewhere out West. The hill on which you stand is dotted with the small, earthen mounds of burrowing rodents called prairie dogs. Nearby is a little stream, its banks green with tall grass and brush. It is ideal wildlife habitat. The country is home to coyotes, badgers, foxes, raccoons, skunks, various rodents, and many birds. We will say that this is public land. (A third of the continent is still in the public domain.) Theoretically you, a citizen, own an interest in it no matter where you live.

A pick-up truck drives over the hill and stops. A man gets out carrying a shovel and walks toward the stream. You decide to accompany him. He pokes around in the shrubbery until he uncovers a trap. A badger, caught by the leg, snarls and cowers. The man hits the badger on the head with the shovel. Momentarily stunned, it lies still and he releases it. He resets the trap. The injured badger crawls away. Moving a little farther downstream, the man comes across the corpse of a coyote but continues until he finds an unusual object sticking up out of the ground. It looks like a piece of pipe some 6 inches tall. The man examines it briefly and turns away. He then goes to the pickup truck where he takes out a sack and slings it over his shoulder. He starts walking from one prairie dog hole to another, and at each he drops a tiny gift—a few grains of oats.

Imagine further that you question the man about what he is doing. You learn that he set the trap for bobcats, but caught the badger accidentally. The pipe device is called a coyote getter. It fires a dose of cyanide into the mouth of any animal that tugs at its scented wick. The oats dropped at the doorsteps of the prairie dogs are also lethal—they will kill 90 per cent of the dog town's population. Survivors will later be "cleaned-up" with cyanide cartridges thrown down the holes. This will also "clean up" any other denizens of the holes—burrowing owls, snakes, toads, rodents, and so on.) If it is winter, the man

is likely to have set up a bait station somewhere in the vicinity. A bait station is a hunk of poisoned horsemeat—50 or 100 pounds—staked to the ground. It is designed to kill coyotes, but it is also capable of killing various other animals and birds. At some other location the man may have broadcast hundreds of small baits of poisoned tallow or distributed dozens of poisoned eggs.

Thus you have been introduced to the main weapons in a continuing war on wildlife carried on throughout the West under various names such as "husbandry," "conservation," and "multiple use."

Imagine that you continue your conversation with the man while he is poisoning the prairie dogs:

Q. "Why are you killing all these animals?"

A. "We don't call it killing. We call it 'animal damage control.'"

Q. "How do you control animal damage?"

A. "By killing the animal."

Q. "What damage do animals do?"

A. "Coyotes eat sheep. Prairie dogs eat grass. Bobcats kill game birds. The ranchers want to get rid of them. Then there are the 'nuisance' animals—skunks, badgers, 'coons. We kill them, too. And foxes."

Q. "But this is public land, isn't it? Doesn't the wildlife belong to the public?"

A. "We don't call predators and rodents 'wildlife.' The rancher who leases this land has the right to make the most possible profit out of it, and that means getting rid of the vermin."

Q. "How many animals do you kill?"

A. "Nobody really knows. We can't go around and count every dead body. We think we kill a couple of hundred thousand coyotes a year. We poison maybe a million acres for rodents. The small animals and the animals that are killed accidentally we can only guess at."

Q. "What does all this poison do to the ecosystem?"

A. "Nobody knows. Every location is different. But it isn't economically important so it hasn't been studied very much."

Q. "Doesn't anybody object to your poisoning wildlife?"

A. "It sure drives the Protectionists up the wall!"

Q. "What's a Protectionist?"

A. "Protectionists are people who think wild animals are more important than a man's right to make a profit. Out here we think they ought to mind their own damn business. They don't live here."

Q. "Who is *we*? Who is doing all this killing?"

A. "Please don't call it 'killing'! That gets the public upset. Call it 'control' or 'management.' That's the scientific term."

Q. "Who is doing all this 'managing'?"

A. "The United States government. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has overall responsibility for wild animals. The division that I work for that controls animals is called Wildlife Services. We think it sounds like something everybody can be in favor of."

The scene described may be imaginary, but the situation is real. It is one of the incongruities of our policy toward wildlife that the public agency charged with conserving it for all the people is also responsible for decimating large segments of it. It comes as a further shock to those of us who think of America as a nation of animal lovers to find that we do not in reality grant to wildlife the right to exist unless it pays its way. Game animals and birds are worth money—hunting is a billion-dollar business—so these species are fostered and fattened for the harvest. But species that have no dollar value—and this is a large group—have few rights and little protection. On the contrary, if they get

in someone's way or conflict with maximum profit from the land, they are destroyed.

The federal government's official policy was expressed in a statement issued in 1967. Though it recognized the right of the public to enjoy wildlife, it also defined "animal damage control" as "the management of damaging bird and mammal populations at levels consistent with the needs and activities of man." Obviously, with ever-expanding human activity, this level can sink to zero.

Unwanted animals are killed by landowners, by farm and livestock associations, and by state agencies, but far and away the most lavish destroyer is the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which is authorized by Congress to kill virtually any animal that can be accused of any damage. Funded by both state and federal money, the Bureau's "control" division spends over \$7 million a year and employs nearly a thousand men. The necessity for this killing, its justification in economic or any other terms, its benefits to individuals versus the detriment to the public, and its ecological results have been challenged and debated for 40 years. And while the debate continues, so does the killing.

The Federal Government got into the animal killing business by accident. In the early days the only federal agency that dealt with wildlife was the Biological Survey. Its main functions were to carry out research and to advise farmers and ranchers on problems of husbandry, problems that included damage by predators and rodents. During World War I efforts were made to increase beef production. Congress appropriated \$125,000 to kill the wolves that still sometimes harassed western herds. The money was given to the Biological Survey, which hired hunters and trappers.

Soon sheepmen wanted the same service to protect their flocks from coyotes. It was not long before western congressmen recognized the killing as a valuable subsidy for their constituents. The trappers and hunters were given more duties, and more and more money was appropriated for the Survey's animal-killing division, known then as Predator and Rodent Control (PARC). Bureaucratic prosperity set in. Supervisors in Washington mapped the west into districts, and a small army of field men was hired to shoot, trap, and poison everything from the lordly mountain lion to the lowly gopher. ("Gopher-choker" was the field man's unaffectionate nickname.)

Naturally, men hired to do a job want to make sure there is a continued demand for their services. PARC agents became propagandists against predators and rodents, searching out instances of alleged animal damage and working to convince landowners that "control" increased profits. They built an ever-widening constituency that brought pressure on Congress for more funds for PARC. More funds hired more field men, who in turn worked to increase demand, so that a circular system was established. PARC came to dominate the Survey's more benign and less profit-oriented activities. By 1930 PARC had a million-dollar budget.

The widespread killing so dismayed conservationists and scientists that the American Society of Mammalogists urged Congress to abolish PARC. Congress very nearly did so. But officials of the Biological Survey promised reform—less killing, less propagandizing and soliciting, more research. Their promises were accepted, and PARC made a new start. In 1940 the Biological Survey was transferred to the Department of the Interior and renamed the Fish and Wildlife Service. PARC became part of the Service's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

After World War II the sheep industry encountered financial troubles and labor

shortages. Owners began to employ fewer herdsmen and to run larger flocks. They demanded more federal control of coyotes. Once again PARC's appropriations, congressional support, labor force, and scope of killing began to increase. Its deadly work again dismayed conservationists, particularly when it killed wildlife on public land.

In the western states much of the sheep grazing and cattle raising, and consequently much of the poisoning, is carried out on public land. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service control nearly 700 million acres—a vast domain, three times the area of Texas. Congress has declared a policy of leasing the land under the concept of "multiple use"—including sheep, cattle, mining, logging, and so forth. When wildlife conflicts with these commercial interests, lessees demand that it be eliminated. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service employ the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to do the job.

Conservationists object. They declare that wildlife is public property of value to the nation as a whole and is a worthy use of the land. In the name of multiple use, they ask that holders of grazing leases coexist with wildlife even if this requires the sacrifice of a portion of their profit. Why, they ask, should the public sacrifice its irreplaceable heritage of wildlife in order to further subsidize leaseholders who in many cases are paying as little as a quarter of the open market value of the grazing they receive from the federal government?

The indignation of conservationists is further increased by PARC's use of a hideously lethal poison, sodium fluoroacetate, known as 1080, which was introduced in the mid-forties. From the point of view of those engaged in killing animals it is a great advance over earlier poisons. It is odorless and tasteless so animals cannot detect it, soluble in water, slow to deteriorate, and extremely cheap. A few cents worth of 1080 injected into meat or absorbed by grain can make enough bait to kill thousands of animals. Bait can be broadcast from airplanes to "treat" hundreds of thousands of square miles. Thanks to 1080 it is now possible to wipe out animal life on an enormous scale.

Another disastrous property of 1080 is its stability. It does not break down in the body of its victim. Any animal or bird that feeds on the carcass of a 1080 victim may be poisoned. Its body in turn may become another lethal bait. Dying animals may travel some distance, vomiting deadly doses of undigested meat, attractive to many animals and birds, along their trail. The possibilities of a chain reaction are great. A Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife biologist described 1080 as having "the potential of a biological high explosive."

In the fifties conservation organizations criticized PARC with increasing bitterness. In 1963 Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall responded by appointing a board to evaluate PARC's work. Its chairman was Dr. A. Starker Leopold of the University of California, and the other members were well known in wildlife circles: Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, an NPCA trustee and president of the Wildlife Management Institute; Dr. Clarence Cottam, NPCA board chairman and a former assistant director of the Fish and Wildlife Service; Thomas L. Kimball, now executive director of the National Wildlife Federation; and Dr. Stanley A. Cain of the University of Michigan. These men were by no means "hysterical protectionists," as PARC customarily termed its critics.

The Leopold board proceeded from the premise that "local population control" is essential where a species of animal causes "significant" damage to property. But it cou-

pled this with the relatively new concept that all native animals are resources of value to the people of the United States. This resource, it found, was being needlessly wasted by Bureau control. Its investigation of PARC revealed a situation every bit as ghastly as the conservationists had said it was. The board found that PARC men still pressed their services as though they were peddling vacuum cleaners. Killing was their business, dead animals their product. Field men competed to see who could kill the most animals. Killing, the board said, had become an end in itself.

The board found a number of factors accounting for this grisly situation. One is the psychological fact that hired killers can be expected to think of maximum killing as doing the "best" job. Another factor in overcontrol is the peculiar way the Bureau finances its killing. It gets money not only from Congress but also from those "benefiting" from the work. These may be other federal agencies (principally the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs), state and county agencies, livestock associations, commercial firms, or private ranchers. To keep money flowing, the Bureau must satisfy its customers. Thus those who want control have a strong voice in determining how much killing is "necessary." On the other hand, conservationists are unrepresented in the Bureau's councils. In fact, the board found, their complaints about too much killing were customarily stifled and evaded by Bureau officials. Thus the system puts the fate of wildlife in the hands of its enemies and excludes its friends.

The Leopold board also found that the Bureau justified needless killing with unwarranted biological assumptions. It is, for instance, unproven that coyotes do significant damage to cattle, but the Bureau kills coyotes for the supposed benefit of cattlemen as well as for sheepmen. Bobcats are on the Bureau's death list although the board found their depredations "insignificant." The board declared that killing predators to protect game animals is biologically unsound. In most cases predators keep prey populations balanced and healthy. The board also found that the Bureau leans heavily on the fact that rabies flares up in wild animals from time to time and is very frightening to the public (even though few human cases occur). In truth no one knows how best to suppress rabies in the wild, short of total extermination of furbearers, but the Bureau responds to rabies outbreaks among animals with carloads of poisoned eggs and often cites rabies "suppression" to justify its claim that it "promotes human health and safety."

In going about their animal killing, Bureau field men theoretically were bound by rules designed to minimize damage to nontarget wildlife. Poisoned horsemeat, for instance, was supposed to be used only in winter when many small furbearers are inactive, and the baits were supposed to be spaced a certain distance apart. The board found that such safety rules often were violated and that these violations greatly increased the death toll.

In appraising 1080 the board gave a split verdict. It declared that 1080 is probably the best available poison for coyotes in that it is highly effective and, if the safety rules are followed, no more damaging to other wildlife than such substitutes as arsenic, strychnine, or thallium. On the other hand, it attacked the Bureau's heavy use of 1080 for rodents, which results in the death of countless innocent coyotes, badgers, bears, foxes, raccoons, skunks, opossums, eagles, hawks, and owls. The board recommended that legal means be found to control the use of 1080 to prevent ecological abuse.

Although the board conceded that some animals damage some property, it found that the Bureau worked more from assumption of damage than from knowledge. No reliable figures have been collected to show the extent of loss of crops or livestock to predators and rodents, nor is there any evaluation of property protected. This failure, the board found, made it impossible to reach an objective determination of the need for control.

In short, the board thoroughly damned the way the Bureau operated. "The program," it said, "has become an end in itself. . . . For more animals are being killed than would be required to protect livestock. . . . crops, wild-land resources, and human health." It found "scant relationship to real need and even less to scientific management."

The Leopold board recommended a thorough overhauling of the system to end over-control. It conceded that in far western areas where large bands of sheep are the principal use of land, federally operated control may be the best system. But it found the federal program in the Midwest unnecessary. It recommended abolishing federal animal killing east of the 98th parallel (a line running through the eastern Dakotas and eastern Texas) and replacing it with the extension system that conservationists had long recommended.

This system is used in Missouri and Kansas, which never have subscribed to federal control. Instead, the state department of agriculture employs one or two specialists who are available to advise farmers or ranchers on how to protect their crops and livestock from animal damage or how to kill the offending animal without harming others. Experience in these states has shown that the system places animal control on a much more selective basis. Landowners who might casually subscribe to a federal program of wholesale killing are far less eager to do the work themselves unless the need is truly urgent. The net result is that fewer animals are killed.

In other recommendations, the board urged the creation of an advisory board to represent conservationists as well as economic interests; expanded research to find ways other than killing to prevent damage by animals; and a greater effort to determine the real economic need to kill animals, so that needless killing can be eliminated.

Secretary Udall accepted the Leopold Report in 1965, and conservationists waited hopefully for it to be implemented. PARC was rechristened with the soothing title Wildlife Services and put in the hands of a new director, Jack H. Berryman. He and the new Bureau director, John Gottschalk, promised vigorous reform. But soon it was clear that they planned to accomplish it not by any radical change in the system, as the Leopold Report had urged, but merely by trying to reeducate Bureau employees to the concept that wildlife has intrinsic value and only necessary control should be undertaken.

Berryman set to work to end such abuses as soliciting business, flouting rules, and killing without any economic need; but the system that had fostered these abuses went essentially unchanged. There is still no advisory board, no mechanism by which conservationists have equal representation with livestock men, no objective way to evaluate the need for control, no friend of wildlife present when a decision to kill is made. Killing remains the usual method for preventing damage by animals.

Although conservationists are bitter that the Leopold Report has been ignored, Bureau officials are equally angry that their reform efforts have not been appreciated. They claim that conservationists misrepresent them in order to appeal to the lunatic fringe of overwrought protectionists. In an effort to make their work more palatable, they at-

tempt to "educate" the public with almost Orwellian language. Killing animals is often referred to as a "management plan." A recent poster shows a Bureau employe against a background of birds and animals caught in the act of destroying property or endangering humans. Its message reads: "Wildlife resources are of interest and value to all people of the United States. Basic policy is one of husbandry. Local population control is an essential part of management where a species is causing significant damage to resources and crops, or where human health and safety is endangered. Good conservation today—more sport tomorrow." Surely these sentiments are all faultless, but strangely they seem intended to add up to the conclusion that killing animals is "good conservation" of animals, when in fact its aim is conservation of property. The casual reader could easily conclude that the Bureau is helping wildlife by killing it, and that the only value wildlife has is "sport."

Equally odd is the opening of a description of Wildlife Services work prepared for the Bureau of the Budget: "The objective of the Wildlife Services program is to cooperate with federal, state, and local agencies in the conservation and management of the nation's wildlife resources for the use and enjoyment of the entire citizenry." Who would ever guess that this means the destruction of countless thousands of animals for the benefit of ranchers and farmers?

Conservationists have continued to press for replacement of federal control with the extension system. Livestock interests, however, have mounted a powerful defense of their subsidy. At the moment it is considered unlikely that the Leopold Report will be implemented further. However, conservationists are considering a new approach. Both Defenders of Wildlife and the Environmental Defense Fund are preparing lawsuits to assert the right of the public to preserve and enjoy wildlife.

Such lawsuits pose a question more fundamental than whether the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife functions properly in killing unwanted wildlife, or whether the responsibility should lie elsewhere. The deeper question is of competition between man and animal for use of the land. To whom does wildlife belong? Who will share in the cost of supporting it? Can the landowner be forced to accept less than maximum profit in order to allow wildlife to co-exist? Or should the public reimburse him? Will ecological research show that such "pests" as coyotes and prairie dogs contribute more to our total well-being than would the lambs and the grass that these wild animals consume? Can our economic system respond to intangible values so that an animal that cannot be directly used can compete with marketable goods? The way these questions are answered will determine what level of wildlife, if any, will still exist a few years hence.

We are just now in the midst of redefining a number of our values, attempting belatedly to paste price tags on such "free" commodities as sunshine, air, and water. Wildlife is in the same category. Unless value is assigned to all wildlife—even to the most "useless" species—it will be no match for its prime competitor, the dollar.

In the long war on wildlife, man has steadily advanced and wildlife retreated. We are now in danger of achieving total victory. We have the capability to wipe out competing life on a tremendous scale. In such a victory we would surely find catastrophic defeat.

COMMISSION ON PENAL REFORM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) and I joined in introducing H.R. 11544, a bill to establish a Commission on Penal Reform.

In my remarks on the floor on that day I stated that we were fully cognizant of the fact that numerous commissions had been established in the past on a variety of issues only to have their findings and recommendations fade into oblivion.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that the subject of prison reform is so complex and riddled with problems, both substantive and procedural, that a Commission is essential.

Numerous proposals have been put forth in the House since Attica—all motivated by a sense of urgency. It is indeed commendable—and urgent—that Congress accept the responsibility for the reform of our Nation's penal system. And it is encouraging to note that Subcommittee 3 of the House Judiciary Committee is giving this matter its closest attention.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a copy of H.R. 11544 for insertion in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to study its provisions, as Congressman HUNGATE and I intend to seek cosponsors during the next week.

The bill follows:

H.R. 11544

A bill to establish a Commission on Penal Reform

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Commission on Penal Reform Act of 1971".

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Penal Reform (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

FINDING OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. The Congress finds that conditions in many American penal institutions are deplorable and a matter of national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. For its part, the Federal Government has a responsibility to mount a concerted legal attack on the unconstitutional forms of punishment which are inflicted upon those incarcerated in American correctional facilities. Confinement within an institution where conditions are so bad as to be shocking to the conscience of a civilized people calls forth the urgent need to redress present grievances and to make a prompt start toward eliminating such conditions for all time. The State and local governments share responsibility on their respective levels, and any attempts to penetrate the closed doors behind which the lives, safety, and health of human beings, to say nothing of their dignity, are at stake, should be a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a Com-

mission whose purpose shall be to recommend advisable, appropriate, effective, and constitutional reforms of the Nation's penal system.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) Three members appointed by the President from persons in private life, one of whom shall be an individual who has been incarcerated for a period in excess of one year in a State or Federal correctional institution and has assumed a rehabilitated place in society.

(2) Three Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and

(3) three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) CHAIRMAN.—One of the individuals appointed by the President under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be designated by him as Chairman of the Commission.

(c) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than two members of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be of the same political party. With respect to members of the Commission who are Members of Congress, not more than two Representatives and not more than two Senators shall be of the same political party.

(d) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made and subject to the same limitations with respect to party affiliations as applied to the original appointment.

(e) QUORUM.—Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) A member of the Commission from private life shall receive \$75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems necessary to carry out the Commission's functions. He is also authorized to procure services to the same extent as authorized for the executive departments by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may for the purposes of carrying out this Act hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission may deem advisable.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission, acting through its Chairman, is authorized to request from any executive department or agency any information and assistance deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(d) SUBPENA POWER.—(1) The Chairman of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(2) If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contempt, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Chairman of the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) The subpoenas issued by the Chairman of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(4) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established a committee of twenty-five members to be known as the Advisory Committee on Penal Reform (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee") to advise and consult with the Commission and otherwise assist the Commission in its work. The Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Commission from among lawyers, judges, penologists, criminologists, and other persons knowledgeable and experienced in disciplines related to the Commission's objectives.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee shall not be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States by virtue of such service and shall receive no compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by them by virtue of such service to the Commission.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION; TERMINATION

SEC. 9. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to each House of Congress an interim report not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall transmit a final report to the President and to each House of Congress not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislative, administrative, and other action as it deems appropriate. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after submitting its final report.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts, not to exceed a total of \$300,000, as many be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Authority is hereby granted for appropriated money to remain available until expended.

STUDY IN VALUES: PRAYERS IN SCHOOLS

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Herald Examiner for Sunday, November 14 carries an editorial which places the vote in the House of Representatives on the prayer amendment and the surrounding controversy in proper perspective. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I hereby include the report by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers which follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT—STUDY IN VALUES: PRAYERS IN SCHOOLS

(By William Randolph Hearst Jr.)

NEW YORK.—A curious aspect of our democracy, which is supposed to be government by the people, is that the Congress of the United States frequently ignores the will of the voters who elect its members as legislative proxies.

That is exactly what happened this week when the House, in a really classic disavowal of mandated responsibility, rejected a proposed constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayers or meditation in public schools.

What makes the rejection so flagrant is the overwhelming public sentiment it simultaneously spurned. National opinion polls had consistently shown that up to 90 per cent of Americans favored adoption of the amendment.

The only remotely encouraging fact about the House action was that a considerable majority—240 members—actually did vote affirmatively in line with the clear wish of the electorate.

It was not enough. The measure failed by 28 votes to get its required two-thirds support when 162 other members voted no. A total of 29 more didn't vote at all.

When our so-called House of Representatives fails to give two-thirds support to an amendment favored by over 85 per cent of the people it is supposed to represent—then you have a situation which surely deserves some close inspection.

Plus a lot of indignation, if you happen to feel as I do about this.

It is happens I went to a Dutch reform grammar school—collegiate by name—as a kid. We went to chapel every morning and read and learned a bit about the world's all-time best seller—the Bible. Offhand I don't recall experiencing any ill effects from this habit. As a matter of fact, most of the great institutes of learning were founded under religious auspices, starting with Harvard. The list is too long to note here.

Starting the day with a prayer is good for kids. If nothing else the humbling practice teaches them that they are parts and not masters of the awesome mystery called creation.

Our Founding Fathers certainly knew this, and they took it for granted. In their day, in fact, the Puritan traditions were still so strong that daily prayers in public schools were a major rather than minor event.

The point is that prayers by school children could hardly have been an issue when the Bill of Rights was written and the following words set down:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . ."

In those words is contained the basic principle of church and state separation which has resulted in so much confusion and misinterpretation in recent years. It is well to consider the original intent of the words.

When they were written, I submit, the idea was simply to stop the United States from ever setting up a state religion. Our forefathers had in mind the restrictions represented by the Holy Roman Empire and the Church of England. They wanted no part of that, yet religion itself should be free to flourish.

It was a sweeping, intelligent and foresighted concept. It was followed for more than 175 years—and in all that time no one came up with any serious challenge to prayers in public schools.

Then, suddenly, the nit-pickers and the trouble-makers got busy. Joined by atheists and others whose seeming desire is to tear down the finest traditions of American life, they made a Supreme Court case of the kiddies' prayers.

It was a terrible thing, they contended, for officially operated institutions to be mixed up with any kind of religious endeavor. School prayers, however innocuous in themselves, could lead to an eventual corruption of freedom itself.

This hogwash got a sympathetic hearing from the Supreme Court then headed by Earl Warren, the former California district attorney who had never sat in judgment on anything prior to his appointment to the Nation's highest tribunal.

In 1962 the court ruled that school prayers do, in fact, violate the Constitutional restrictions for separation of church and State. They were banned and have been banned ever since despite insistent public demand for a reversal.

To understand how Congress works, you have to realize that its members are subject to a wide variety of pressures—some legitimate, some questionable and others so vague yet powerful that resistance is difficult if not impossible.

In the first category, of course, is the pressure to do what the electorate back home wants done. In the second is the pressure from wealthy lobbies and special interest groups. The third is much more complicated.

It can and often does consist of fashionable ideas, usually backed by the liberal intellectual establishment and press, which are advanced with such force that common sense itself becomes the victim.

This is what happened in the latest school prayer defeat. It lost because enough members of Congress and even a sizeable number of church spokesmen, were sold on the notion that the principal of church-State separation was being dangerously threatened.

Following the vote, we were regaled with liberal press editorials hailing it as a triumphant reaffirmation of the Bill of Rights. Congressmen who voted against the amendment were congratulated for their "courage" in defying possible voter retaliation at the polls.

What the House did, in actual fact, was succumb to the pressure drive of the nit-pickers, trouble-makers, atheists and the kind of niggling legal mind that attacks the issuance of Christmas stamps as a threat to freedom.

In so doing it not only surrendered common sense—it acted with an irrationality which is almost beyond belief.

Consider this. When the House convened for the showdown vote its members, as first order of business, listened to their chaplain, The Rev. Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, intoning as follows:

"Lord, teach us to pray . . ."

In other words it's all right and no violation of the Constitution for the nation's

lawmakers to start off with a prayer—but when little children do the same thing it might destroy the fabric of democracy.

How can any sensible person justify this double standard?

If a harmless, non-partisan prayer in public school violates the principle of church and state separation, why doesn't a similar prayer in the halls of Congress?

If a church and state are to be totally separate, how come our officials take their oaths of office on the Bible?

And if the division is to be really complete, how come the teardown legal beagles haven't succeeded in purifying our very state-issued money by expunging the words: "In God We Trust?"

Non-sectarian prayers by school children are not a threat to our freedom.

That real threat comes from those who go about attacking and weakening our finest traditions in the name of spurious idealism.

And from those stupid enough to be duped by them.

MEYER KAHN TO RECEIVE "SHALOM AWARD"

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Wednesday, November 17, at Temple Beth Zion of Buffalo, N.Y., the National Israel Bond Organization will bestow its distinguished "Shalom Award" upon a constituent of mine who is well deserving of the honor. Mr. Meyer A. Kahn has shown himself to be an outstanding citizen of western New York, always displaying an unselfish dedication to his community and his country.

A graduate of the University of Buffalo Law School—1927, Mr. Kahn saw the need to do more than merely reflect upon the issues and concerns of the day. His willingness to participate and use his talents for the betterment of others is the finest example of good citizenship.

The award cites Mr. Kahn for his "deep devotion to . . . the land of Israel". As well as his efforts in Israel Bond Drives, Mr. Kahn has over the years served as president of the Montefiore Club, the Rosa Coplon Old Folks Home, advance gifts chairman of the United Jewish Fund, chairman of the board of the Anti-Defamation League of western New York, and he has been involved in numerous other campaigns whenever he felt his assistance could be of use. Currently, Mr. Kahn is the first vice president of Temple Beth Zion and serves as president of the Duo-Temp Corp., which makes him the largest employer in Depew, N.Y.

As a noted industrialist, humanitarian, and civic leader, Mr. Kahn has given a great deal of his time and energies in service to others, and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record excerpts from "Invest In A Growing Democracy" issued by the Development Corp. for Israel. Their words demonstrate quite clearly the successful ef-

forts made by people such as Meyer A. Kahn. The article follows:

INVEST IN A GROWING DEMOCRACY

The dramatic history of the State of Israel since its establishment in May, 1948 has provided a remarkable example of dedication to human freedom and the principles of democracy. It is no less remarkable that Israel has been able to make enormous progress in developing a modern and stable economy without compromising the rights of its citizens and despite almost constant siege and crisis on its borders.

Israel as a dynamic and growing democracy owes much of its success to the friendship and support of the United States. From the very first days of the proclamation of Israel's independence, the American people have welcomed the birth of the new nation as a significant addition to the community of the free world. To this very day the common interests and identity of national purpose shared by the United States and Israel have been reflected in an ever closer relationship and a continuing flow of material support.

One of the most important channels of financial aid for economic development has been the Israel Bond Organization (Development Corporation for Israel) which (as of the end of 1970) sold a total of \$1.64 billion in Israel Bonds since May, 1951. The proceeds from the sale of Israel Bonds have been a decisive factor in stimulating the steady growth of the country's economy.

The confidence produced by the unusually impressive progress of Israel's economy has created a very favorable climate for the sale of State of Israel Bonds. For the past twenty years they have been a major source of capital for the development of agriculture, commerce, industry, mining and other branches of Israel's economy. They have also promoted trade between Israel and the U.S.

Various institutions have purchased Israel Bonds as an indication of their faith in Israel's future and in recognition of its achievements in building an economically sound democracy.

A special issue of Israel Bonds, with interest of 5½% per year, payable semi-annually, is offered for sale to banks, insurance companies, labor unions and employee benefit funds (pension funds, retirement and welfare plans, profit-sharing plans, etc.).

Credit unions, endowment funds, community funds (public funds of charitable, religious and educational organizations set up on a community-wide basis), city and state governmental pension and welfare funds, and building funds, including cemetery and perpetual care funds, are also eligible to subscribe to this security.

The \$250 million issue of Dollar Bonds, known as the Third Development Investment Issue, consists of 20-year Coupon Bonds.

Within ninety days after written demand, the State of Israel will repurchase Bonds of the Third Development Investment Issue, as stated in the prospectus.

There has been a rising rate of Israel Bond purchases by both national and state banks. It is worth noting that 60% of the three hundred largest banks in the United States have added Israel Bonds to their portfolios. In all some 1900 banks have purchased Israel Bonds in amounts up to \$2 million each.

The Controller of the Currency has ruled that Israel Bonds are a proper investment for national banks and banks which are part of the Federal Reserve System.

Israel Bond sales to trade unions have also shown a substantial increase. A total of 2100 pension funds have been enrolled as investors in Israel Bonds in the past six years.

A large proportion of the funds provided through Israel Bonds remains in the United

States, paying for the purchase of machinery and equipment which Israel needs. Israel's imports from the United States in 1970 amounted to \$684 million. Its exports to this country last year totalled \$298 million, thereby reflecting a trade balance substantially in favor of the United States.

The extent of Israel's economic reconstruction since the inception of the Israel Bond program in 1951 can be seen in the growth of its gross national product, which has increased at an average rate of 10% a year. The country's population has increased from 1,577,000 to 3,000,000 and its standard of living has risen steadily during the twenty-year period.

Since 1951 exports of goods and services have increased from \$70 million to \$1.315 billion in 1970. Industrial production in the same period jumped from \$383 million to \$3.050 billion and agricultural production climbed from \$83 to \$545 million.

Important basic development projects financed in part by Israel Bonds include the construction of the new deepwater harbor at Ashdod; the expansion of port facilities at Haifa and Elath; the exploitation of mineral resources, including the copper deposits at Timna and the construction of its refinery; the completion of the National Water Carrier, which is now irrigating much of the Negev; the extension of highways and railroads; the expansion of the merchant marine and development of El Al Israel Air lines.

Early in 1970 work was completed on a 163-mile-long 42-inch pipeline carrying 20 million tons of oil a year in its initial stage from Elath and Ashkelon on the Mediterranean coast. A new refinery is being built at Ashdod to process some of the oil from the new pipeline. Israel Bonds have also financed the expansion of the Dead Sea Works at S'dom and the construction of over 690,000 permanent housing units.

Israel Bonds are helping to expand industrial production for export through a shift to highly sophisticated industries such as electronics and chemicals to improve the country's balance of trade.

Through its accomplishments in human redemption and economic progress, Israel has shown the world what a small democracy can accomplish in the face of critical challenges. Many developing countries in Asia and Africa have drawn upon the example and know-how of Israel to improve their own economy as a foundation for progress under freedom.

SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, last week, Members of the House of Representatives failed to approve by two-thirds a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which would have provided for the offering of voluntary prayer or meditation in public schools and other public buildings. The vote was 240 for to 162 against, just 28 votes shy of passing.

I voted for the amendment.

In my judgment, the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 imposed a restriction on Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools.

The decisions have been interpreted to be an infringement on a citizen's right to free religious exercise, as was guaranteed by the first amendment, before the Supreme Court ruling took that right from him.

The prayer amendment clearly would have reinstated the rights of those who wished to take part in a religious exercise of prayer and meditation in public places.

Those of us who believe in the sovereignty of the people should have had no hesitancy in submitting to them a proposed constitutional amendment in which there is great public interest. In fact, the Congress has an obligation to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are a religious people. Religion is closely identified with our history and government. The Constitution never intended to forbid the recitation of voluntary prayers in public schools.

I subscribe to the language of the dissenting opinion written by Mr. Justice Stewart, which reads:

To deny the wish of these school children to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our nation.

I wish to restate the reasons for my vote.

The resolution to propose an amendment to the constitution would have made prayer permissible in public buildings. It would have allowed children to use school buildings for voluntary prayer.

The resolution would have given the American people the opportunity to decide through their elected State legislative members if, in fact, a basic constitutional right was being taken away.

The opponents of the resolution, for whom I have the greatest respect, contended that such an amendment would violate the long-established principle of separation of church and state. I just do not share their apprehensions nor agree with their conclusions.

The first amendment directs that:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This means that Congress and State legislatures are prohibited from establishing a state church. As far as government is concerned, there is to be no single "official" church or creed.

There is to be no religious examination as a prerequisite for citizenship, for voting, or holding office.

The first amendment did not mean, however, that there is to be no religion, or no religious prayer or expression in public places.

While we must forever respect and diligently protect the rights of all who disagree and must never require the minority to embrace the opinion of the majority, the fact remains that this Nation in solemn truth does believe in God.

This amendment seems in accordance with the wishes and desires of most of the people, certainly in my district. It seems harmonious with the doctrine of separation as most have understood it for 171 years.

After debate and just prior to the question of the joint resolution, House Members agreed to strike the term "non-denominational" and substitute "voluntary prayer or meditation." But that was not enough to gain the required two-thirds vote.

And after all was said, I draw the conclusion that not one of my colleagues is against prayer or a person praying in a public building.

Even though the proposed constitutional amendment failed to win two-thirds approval of the House, I do not believe the issue is dead.

SPEECH AND HEARING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WEEK

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine recently proclaimed the week of October 17-23 "Speech and Hearing Handicapped Children Week" in the State of Maine. The Governor has taken this action in recognition of the outstanding work done by the speech and hearing profession in meeting the tremendous needs of speech and hearing handicapped children in the State.

For the benefit of my colleagues and in recognition of the work being done by members of the speech and hearing profession in Maine, I would like at this time to include in my remarks for the RECORD an article from the newsletter of the Maine Speech and Hearing Association, September 1971, describing the Governor's action, the progress that has been made by speech and hearing professionals in the last several years, and the needs still existing in this area:

SPEECH AND HEARING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WEEK—OCTOBER 17-23, 1971

Governor Curtis will again recognize the special assistance being provided to Maine children with speech and hearing problems, and call attention to our goals with reference to these children.

It is appropriate to recognize the progress that has been made in the delivery of speech and hearing therapy to our school age population. Looking back at the level of services just three years ago in the 1968-69 school year provides a very significant contrast with the level of services available during the current 1971-72 school year. Here is the picture, based on information provided by the Maine Department of Education:

1. School age pop. Grades K-12: 1968-69, 235,000; 1971-72,¹ 250,000.
2. Est. no. of child, with spch. and hear. problems²: 1968-69, 11,500; 1971-72,¹ 12,500.
3. Number of children receiving therapy in schools and clinics: 1968-69, 1,900; 1971-72,¹ 4,000.
4. Percentage of estimated number needing therapy act. receiving therapy (item No. 3/item No. 2): 1968-69, 16 percent; 1971-72,¹ 32 percent.
5. Number of in-school special-hearing therapy programs: 1968-69, 16; 1971-72,¹ 40.

¹ Based on best estimates 9/15/71.

² Based on 5% prevalence in school age population.

An examination of the information indicates that the reported school age population three year period. However, the number of children receiving speech and hearing therapy has increased by approximately 110% in this same period of time—more than twice as many children are receiving speech and hearing therapy this year than received help in the 1968-69 school year.

It is important to note that since the 1968-69 school year, 24 new in-school speech and hearing therapy programs have been established. This is a 150% improvement in the number of school programs for these handicapped children.

It appears that a very substantial gain has been made with reference to that portion of this special group of children now receiving therapy. In 1968-69, only 16% of the estimated number of speech and hearing impaired children were receiving therapy. It appears that in the current school year approximately 32% of this group of 12,500 children will be receiving services.

These very dramatic improvements must be attributed to the increasing awareness of school committees and school administrators throughout the State of Maine. Making use of Maine's excellent reimbursement provisions for the education of handicapped children, in-school programs have been instituted. The benefits derived from the programs have been apparent to the children involved, their parents, and their teachers.

A share of the responsibility for these improved services belongs to two additional groups: the Maine Department of Education and the Maine Speech and Hearing Association. The Department of Education and the MSHA have worked cooperatively to bring the needs of these children to the attention of the public, school administrators, and school committees. Through workshops, consultative-advisory services, and a constant readiness to speak on behalf of those with impaired speech, the MSHA and the Department of Education deserve recognition.

And what of the future—the next three years? It is apparent that a significant leap has been made to narrow the gap in services to these children. However, it is equally obvious that there are still over 8,000 children in our schools now who are not receiving the special service they need for their speech or hearing impairments.

The answer is clear: more programs must be established; and existing programs must be expanded. It is well recognized that some established programs are necessarily limited in the number of children served. This limitation exists because the program is understaffed. While the maximum effective caseload for one speech and hearing clinician varies with a number of factors it is generally true that 50-70 children with impairments constitutes a maximum load for one clinician. This is an area that must not be neglected.

Furthermore, it seems necessary that speech and hearing clinicians within the state continually strive to improve their professional competencies. The MSHA has supported the principles expressed in the proposed revision in school certification standards for speech and hearing personnel. The members of the profession must individually continue to work to improve their competencies. We must take advantage of the workshops now being offered by the Department of Education. The meetings of our association provide other opportunities. Demands must be made on the two speech and hearing programs of the University for course offerings that are relevant to the professional needs within Maine. We do have the resources. We do have the means to make these resources work on behalf of the speech and hearing impaired person.

What will the picture be in October, 1975,

as we look back at the three years that have just elapsed? What you do today, tomorrow, and next week will determine a portion of that picture, because you own a piece of it right now.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the proclamation issued by Governor Curtis declaring the week of October 17 "Speech and Hearing Handicapped Children Week" at this point:

STATE OF MAINE PROCLAMATION

Whereas, over the past three years the number of children with speech and hearing impairments receiving speech therapy has more than doubled; and

Whereas, there are presently over 8,000 children in Maine with impaired speech and hearing who are not receiving the therapy they are entitled to receive; and

Whereas, during the past three years there has been a very substantial increase in services to speech and hearing impaired children in the State of Maine; and

Whereas, approximately 32% of the estimated 12,500 Maine school children with problems in speech and hearing are now receiving help, whereas in 1968-69 only 16% of these children were receiving the help they were entitled to under Maine law; and

Whereas, there is still a need for more in-school programs for these children, as well as the need to expand some existing programs;

"Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim the week of October 17, 1971, as Speech and Hearing Handicapped Children Week in the State of Maine and commend the Maine Speech and Hearing Association and the Maine State Department of Education for the outstanding job they have done in providing increased services to the school children in need of speech and hearing services.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Seventh day of October, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-sixth.

KENNETH M. CURTIS.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND INTERIOR

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1971

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House one of the most successful, yet unsung, youth programs that has ever been sponsored by the Congress of the United States. I refer to the Youth Conservation Corps, administered jointly by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

This program has completed the first of a 3-year pilot project. Operating under severe funding limitations imposed by the Office of Management and Budget, 2,800 young people lived and worked in 36 camps under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and 28 camps on lands operated by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. Under

this program young people from all backgrounds were brought together to engage in meaningful and valuable tasks to improve Federal park and forest lands and to gain a greater awareness and appreciation of our environment.

This program has received much and frequent praise from the President of the United States, Congress, and administering agencies. But none of us can give the more practical and down-to-earth evaluations which can be provided by the young people who took part in it. I am fortunate to have such an evaluation from Miss Laura Campbell of East Grand Forks, Minn., who worked at the Youth Conservation Corps camp located in the Chippewa National Forest of my district. I would like to share her letter to Mr. M. K. Lauritsen, supervisor of the Chippewa National Forest:

EAST GRAND FORKS, MINN.,

October 11, 1971.

DEAR MR. LAURITSEN, I'm not sure where to begin, but I'd just like to give a few afterthoughts about camp, after being away nearly two months.

Quite obviously, the hardest thing to get used to upon returning home was the absence of such a close-knit community. It's really rare to feel so close to kids and really feel like you've gotten to be a part of them, and they a part of you. Even more rare though, I think, is the fact that it didn't stop with kids. There seemed to be almost no generation gap. In fact, such total reasonableness and willingness to change in the interest for advancement seems almost unreal now. Authority was so flexible. Like some sort of Utopia gone forever, or until a much future time at least. Other campers have mentioned the fairyland type thing too. Some of us had more trouble returning to society than others, but living this kind of existence, if only for a month, left a lasting impression on almost everyone. I'll always be glad that we appreciated it even when we had it, not just in retrospect.

There are some things that I appreciate more in the absence of them. Like going on a picnic with people who found it more natural to pick up a few extra pop cans than throw out their own. Having everyone around me very, very interested, in a practical way, in conservation.

How lucky I was to be with people who were careful of forests and wildlife because they really loved it. They really cared.

Actually, it's not that I live in an uncooperative community. But that's the thing; they cooperate with, rather than initiate. I always seem to be in the position of one trying to convince.

Probably the best thing about Y.C.C. is that it gives kids a chance to taste a different kind of life. Not really a Thoreau-type existence, but something they can achieve if they want it bad enough. Because, without tasting it, you can't tell what you're looking for. You can take anything if you have a goal.

I've thought of reapplying for Y.C.C., but I don't really think it would be fair not to give someone else a chance. Just the chance to get to know some people in forestry and actually DO some of the work is really an experience. To work with adults who love their work and know the forest because they love it is really great.

Thank you for everything.

Sincerely,

LAURA CAMPBELL.

During this Congress, I am hopeful that we will have the opportunity to expand and extend this program by enact-

ing H.R. 10456 introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS). H.R. 10456 would expand the program to allow 100,000 young people to become part of the Youth Conservation Corps. It should be noted that an estimated 126,000 students applied for the program which only had room for 2,800

and that the only criticism that can be made of the program is that too many enthusiastic potential participants were turned away. H.R. 10456 would also allow cost sharing with State governments so they may sponsor similar programs on State-owned lands. In addition, during the times that YCC camps are not being

utilized for their primary purpose they would be made available to schools, colleges, and universities as centers for the study of our environment.

I fully endorse this project and I hope that every Member of the House of Representatives and Senate will give it their full support.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]