# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, November 18, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Be strong and of good courage, fear not, be not dismayed.*—1 Chronicles 22: 13.

Lord of our lives, whose light is truth and whose love is life, we thank Thee for the dawning of a new day, for this moment of prayer which makes us conscious of Thy presence and which calls us to a rededication of our talents as we seek to lead our Nation in these troubled times.

During the busy hours of this day help us to think clearly, to speak constructively, and to act courageously that we may prove ourselves worthy of the positions we hold in our national life.

Give us the steadfast faith to join all men of good will who follow the light which leads to an enduring peace and to the establishment of law and order where men of all colors and all creeds can live together safely and securely.

In the spirit of Him who is the light of the world we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On November 13, 1969:

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal year 1970 to $610,000,000.

On November 14, 1969:

H.J. Res. 966. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

## THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to announce to the House the death of the late Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, the distinguished former Ambassador to Great Britain as well as other trusts and positions, and one of the most dedicated Americans of our Nation's history. The life and career of the late Joseph P. Kennedy is an amazing one, starting out under difficulties and overcoming them and rising to the great heights that he did, as well as having one of his sons elected to the House of Representatives, then to the U.S. Senate, and finally to the office of President of the United States, as well as two other sons elected to the U.S. Senate. He had a remarkable life but one of great tragedy with which we are all familiar. Joe Kennedy was a very close and personal friend of mine for many years. I valued that friendship very much. He and I kept in close contact with each other throughout the years not only as friends but in connection with matters concerning the best interests of our people and the national interest of our country. He always maintained an active interest in public affairs, prior to the condition that arose some few years ago that incapacitated him. Joe Kennedy's name will always be recorded in American history as that of one who has always been a great contributor to the strength, the dignity, and the progress of our country. He leaves behind him his widow, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, who is a remarkable lady, just as young and vibrant and virile today as she was when she was a girl. Her outlook on life has also been an inspiration to countless millions of persons to follow. I am very saddened today on the passing of Joe Kennedy, but he leaves behind him a heritage that will always be an integral part of the history of the United States. I extend to Mrs. Kennedy and to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and the other loved ones the deep sympathy of both Mrs. McCormack and myself in their bereavement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was saddened upon receiving the news of the death of the late Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy.

Ambassador Kennedy was one of the great Americans of our time. He was a man of many talents, extraordinarily successful in many areas of human endeavor. His family was one of the greatest in the history of the Nation.

Mr. Kennedy was not only successful in the financial and business communities; he was also a great and distinguished public servant. He served as Chairman of the Securities Exchange Commission, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and Ambassador to the Court of St. James. He served during the years preceding World War II. He was a man of strong will and independent judgment. He was a great and good American.

I extend to Mrs. Kennedy and to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and his sisters, and to all loved ones of the Kennedy family, my deepest sympathy, and in this expression Mrs. Albert joins me.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those on our side of the aisle, we join you, Mr. Speaker, and the distinguished majority leader in expressing our sadness at the passing of Joseph Kennedy.

Although he was the father of sons who were outstanding public servants, he himself had an enviable record in the Government of the United States, having served as former Ambassador to Great Britain and one of the first Chairmen of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He was a man who had a wide variety of constructive interests in Government. He frequently expressed himself forthrightly on many controversial issues.

He, of course, was an inspiration to his three sons who served in the Congress, one of whom was President of the United States and one of whom served here in the House of Representatives and three in the U.S. Senate.

It was his inspiration I am sure that gave to these three men the challenge to serve their fellow men in the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we all applaud the accomplishments of Joseph Kennedy and were saddened by his passing. We express to Mrs. Kennedy and the family our deepest condolences.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing grief at the death of Joseph P. Kennedy, patriarch of one of the most celebrated families in American history. Mr. Kennedy was known to the general public as merely the venerable head of the Kennedy family—the father of President John F. Kennedy, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY. But he was much more than that. A brilliant financier who singlehandedly built a business empire rivaled by few others, a tough and canny SEC Chairman who helped revive public confidence in the stock market after the debacle of 1929, a U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain in the harrowing early years of World War II, Joseph Kennedy showed abilities that were legendary among his fellows. One quality, in particular, was his sons' hallmark as well as his own: a toughness of spirit and a strength of character that could weather virtually any crisis. John Kennedy—whose inauguration as President was his father's proudest moment—showed the same kind of coolheaded equanimity in keeping this country from the brink of war during the Cuban missile crisis. Even the stroke that left him partially paralyzed failed to dim Joseph Kennedy's mind or break his spirit. His death today, although not wholly unexpected, is nevertheless a blow to me and everyone else who admired him.

Joseph Kennedy shared amply in the kind of financial and personal success offered by American society, and he wanted his sons to serve in public life so that the Kennedys could give back to the United States some of that which the Nation had given them. He encouraged his sons—even at their youngest, just past the age of toddlers—to take part in the celebrated dining table discussions that brought a veritable "Who's Who" of political and business leaders to the Kennedy household. Trying to build his children's confidence and whet their already keen appetites for debate, Joseph Kennedy saw to it that their comments

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

were not stifled by the tolerant smiles or startled glares that usually greet a child's forays into the world of adult conversation. He demanded only a few things of his sons: independent thought, moral courage, consuming devotion to their own ideals. Unlike many famous fathers, he did not ask his children to truckle obsequiously to his own convictions nor to devotedly parrot his own views. He did not protest, for example, when young John Kennedy went to an economics school in London run by men whose views were virtually antithetical to his own. He gave each of his sons financial independence when they reached 21—just so they would not feel yoked to him.

Joseph Kennedy lived to see his years of fatherly encouragement and training bear fruit: one son elected President of the United States, two others elected to the U.S. Senate. Yet, in one of the cruelest ironies any family has encountered, he also saw three of his sons killed in the service of their country: Joseph, Jr., killed in an aircraft explosion during World War II; John, killed by an assassin's bullet in the streets of Dallas; Robert, murdered in the dingy serving pantry of a Los Angeles hotel at the height of his political career. It is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that no family has sacrificed more for their Nation in that Nation's history.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to Joseph Kennedy's widow, Rose, whose remarkable courage and faith, I am sure, will see her through this latest tragedy; to his son TED; to his daughters, Eunice, Jean, and Pat; and to his many grandchildren.

Joseph Kennedy is dead, yet his family name will remain prominent in U.S. history books as long as the United States survives.

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

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks that have been made and say to this House that I believe that Joseph Kennedy embodied the premise that was in the comment made by another great Speaker of this House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, when in speaking to a graduating class he said for many years American parents have encouraged their young people to prepare themselves for professions, for industry, and for commerce. It is desirable that we also encourage and direct some of the best of our young people into the paths of Government because if we do not love this country well enough to serve it, then it could well be there would come a time when we would have no country to love.

I believe, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, our Speaker, indicated, in Joseph Kennedy we had a man who understood the sense of the remarks made by the late Honorable Sam Rayburn, and he has certainly given us a heritage which many parents in America could well envy and could, with profit to our Republic, follow.

I extend my sympathy and that of my wife and family to the survivors of Mr. Kennedy.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing profound sorrow at the passing of Joseph P. Kennedy, father of our beloved former President, John; of the courageous former Attorney General and Senator from New York, Robert; and of our distinguished colleague and friend, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Like most men, Joseph Kennedy knew inherently that every human being must pay a price for the privilege of life. But this man knew more than most. He knew that a man who wants to live life to the fullest, who wants the most of life, must pay a greater price, must sacrifice more, must know how to give and must give more.

Joseph Kennedy took up the greater challenge of life early, learned its lessons well, and taught them to his children. Only today, after years of significant personal achievement and of loving devotion to his family and his country, having experienced sacrifices few men have had to make, has he put the challenge aside. It has not been met more successfully by many men.

Joseph Kennedy's legacy to this Nation is a family more beloved, more respected, and more admired than any other in the world. We shall forever be in his debt. It is my earnest hope that this great family will derive some consolation from the sure knowledge that the Nation shares their deep grief.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with a saddened heart that I learned of the passing of Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy today. I wish to join with our distinguished Speaker, our majority leader, our minority leader, and the many other colleagues here today in paying tribute to a great American.

Born in East Boston, September 6, 1888, Joseph P. Kennedy pursued a dynamic career on Wall Street, and later branched out into real estate, movies, and numerous other business ventures, always displaying "the Kennedy form," marked by a proud and optimistic attitude and an exuberant vitality.

Mr. Kennedy, in large measure, brought this vitality back into the Nation's bloodstream, as he served as President Roosevelt's Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission during the depression. No stranger to Wall Street, he managed to infuse a new confidence and spirit into the business world.

In a troubled time, Roosevelt utilized the Kennedy talent. Once, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and again in 1937, by naming Joseph P. Kennedy as Ambassador to England.

Father of a President and two U.S. Senators, Joseph P. Kennedy saw his dreams for his sons fulfilled, but ironically, and sadly, he also witnessed these destinies become tangled in the web of tragedy.

To his beloved wife, to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and the Kennedy family go my most heartfelt sympathy at their loss.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today I was serving under Ambassador Kennedy at the Embassy in London as assistant naval attaché, and I came to have great respect and affection for him and for the members of his family, which has continued down through the years.

I simply want to join in expressing my personal sorrow and to extend my condolences to his family.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Joe Kennedy. I remember when he set up the SEC. I remember when he set up the Maritime Commission. These were two great contributions to his Government. I talked with him many times about his Ambassadorship to the Court of St. James.

Mr. Speaker, this man served his country well and with great distinction, in addition to giving us his sons for service to their country.

We have lost a great American. We have lost a great patriot, and I want to join my Speaker in mourning the death of this great man.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing deep sympathy to the Kennedy family, in the loss of Ambassador Joseph Kennedy.

Without question Joseph P. Kennedy must be regarded as one of the Nation's most remarkable men—a distinguished and able public servant himself, he was father of four distinguished and remarkable sons who have each made great contributions in the public service, three of them in the Capital of the Nation.

The Kennedy spirit of public service has also been demonstrated by the daughters of the Ambassador, and by his lovely wife, who have all made significant contributions to the country.

No family in modern times has had greater impact upon the history of our country than the Kennedy family, and I am sure all Americans join in mourning the loss of this great father and great American.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, very sorry to learn of the passing of former U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, Joseph P. Kennedy, and wish to join with my colleagues here in paying tribute to this great American.

The life of Joseph P. Kennedy and his extraordinary accomplishments clearly reflect his renowned possession of an uncommon "will to win," together with

the most intensive application of all his concentrated intelligence, talent, and energy in every endeavor in which he engaged.

Through the projection of these disciplined qualities, he achieved substantial material success in the most competitive fields of this practical world. He was a man who sought success and exerted himself diligently and tirelessly to reach it. He was a hard competitor in the cold climate of worldly business but he was charitable, compassionate, warm and sentimental in human relationships.

He was deeply interested in retaining and strengthening the concepts and traditions of free government and he personally served his country very ably and devotedly as Chairman of the extremely important agencies of Securities Exchange and Maritime Commissions as well as Ambassador to Great Britain.

He transmitted his high sense of independence, moral courage and loyalty to personal conviction to his four sons by virtue of which each achieved very high distinction in the service of their country.

Three of them met tragic deaths in public service, Joseph Jr. killed during World War II; President John F. Kennedy, assassinated in office, and U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, also assassinated at the height of his political career.

The Joseph P. Kennedy family presents a unique record of public service in the history of this country and the guiding source and inspiration of this tremendous family contribution was the late and valiant Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr., whom we honor here today.

As we unite in our prayers for the eternal rest of his great soul, we extend our deepest sympathy to his courageous and gracious wife, Mrs. Rose Kennedy; his only surviving son, U.S. Senator TED KENNEDY; his lovely daughters, Eunice, Jean, and Pat, and his many grandchildren.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation mourns the passing of Joseph P. Kennedy, a distinguished American patriot and statesman.

A self-made man, Joseph P. Kennedy deeply loved his country and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts where he spent most of his life.

He was an extraordinary human being, both courageous and colorful. He was a financier of great renown, who served in England as Ambassador to the Court of St. James. Each of his triumphs, as well as the tragedies, he shared with his loving and devoted wife, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, to whom the Nation will extend deepest sympathies in this time of loss. And each of his experiences he also shared in full with his family. His was a colossal American success story.

But perhaps he achieved his greatest excellence in the art of being a father—a role requiring firmness and a commanding stature, frequent patience, and kindly counsel, and the imprinting of a lifetime of rich experience on his offspring. He was appropriately called "the founding father" of the Kennedy clan.

Joseph P. Kennedy fathered nine children. His rewards as a father were rich and notable, despite tragic moments of great pain. He fostered a President of the United States who left an indelible mark on our world. He inspired each of his children to the greatest heights of self-fulfillment.

Joseph P. Kennedy will live as a legend in a day and age when it is alleged that the structure of the family is disintegrating and when mothers and fathers alike are criticized for lack of attention to their own "clans."

Above all, he was a father and a great one. I commend this fact as I join in expressing my own sense of loss, my sorrow, and my warmest sympathy to the members of the Kennedy family.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker. today we have learned that former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy passed away at the age of 81. To Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and to his mother, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, and to the Kennedy family, I wish to extend my profound sympathy on their great loss.

Of all of his accomplishments, I think Joseph Kennedy felt that his most significant one was that of his family. He instilled in all of his children a sense of public service and deep concern for all their fellow man.

The service of this one family ranks along side that of the Adams and Roosevelt families. Joseph Kennedy gave his country four sons. All served in the military, three served as U.S. Senators, and one was our 35th President.

Ambassador Kennedy's own service to his country took place for the most part during the first two terms of President Franklin Roosevelt under whom he served with distinction as the first Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and later as Maritime Administrator. He then went on to represent our country at the Court of St. James for more than 2 years. After the war, he served as a member of the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization.

The influence of Joseph P. Kennedy and that of his family has been felt in a beneficial way by almost every American. On behalf of Mrs. Tiernan and myself, I offer our personal prayers for this good family on this sad occasion.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of loss that the news of the death of Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy was received here in Washington today. In my opinion, there is no one man who has contributed more to the United States and, in turn, been rewarded more by the United States.

Mr. Kennedy's record, both in private and public achievements, is unparalleled in the history of the United States—millionaire, financier, dedicated head of Government agencies, and finally Ambassador to the Court of St. James. His personal achievements constitute a Horatio Alger story, and he was the first to point out that it could only happen in the United States.

However, I firmly believe that he took more pride in the achievements of his beloved family, which include a President, two Senators, and a war hero who died before his exceptional potential could be realized. All have added to the luster of the very fabric of our governmental and national life.

I also know, in a very personal way, that the force of his personality, as well as the example of his life, was an inspiration not only to his children, but to intimate friends of the various members of the Kennedy family. I am honored to be able to state that I should be numbered among those whose life was directly influenced by this great American.

It would be impossible to estimate the number of people now serving not only within the formal framework of Government, but in other dedicated fields of endeavor, who owe the motivation of their career to the inspirational influence of Joseph P. Kennedy's words and deeds.

The great loss to his family is an equally great loss to his country, yet there is solace in the truism that "death is but the side of life which has momentarily turned away from us." May he rest in peace.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Joseph P. Kennedy, patriarch of the Kennedy family, created a dynasty and left a legacy unique in American political annals.

The senior Kennedy was Ambassador to Great Britain at the outbreak of World War II. He was the father of a President and two Senators. Another son died in the service of his country.

Joseph Kennedy died today at the age of 81. Incapacitated by a stroke since 1961, he nonetheless saw his sons rise to political peaks. oNt since the Adams family of Colonial America has one family so dominated the political mainstream.

For this, Joseph P. Kennedy richly deserves the title of a modern-day founding father. His loss, therefore, is the Nation's loss, and I extend my sincerest condolences to Mrs. Rose Kennedy, his indefatigable wife, in her moment of sorrow.

Joseph Kennedy, who amassed a fortune in Wall Street, was the first Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He presided over the revamping of the U.S. Maritime Commission, served as Ambassador, and then devoted all of his energies toward gaining the zenith of American power for his sons.

Though plagued by family tragedies, he lived to see his hopes realized when John F. Kennedy was elected President in 1960.

The following touching obituary on the patriarch of the ill-starred American dynasty appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

KENNEDY: PATRIARCH OF POLITICAL DYNASTY DIES AT 81

Joseph Patrick Kennedy, who wanted to put a son in the White House and did never forgot how it was to grow up as a Catholic in Boston's old-line Protestant society.

Even in the 1930s, when he had already amassed a fortune in Wall Street and New Deal prominence in Washington, Kennedy

once exploded with wrath when a newspaper referred to him as "Irish-American."

"I was born here," he protested. "My children were born here. What the hell do I have to do to be an American?"

He did everything he could.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

He won accolades as the first chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He turned author to help the reelection of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936. He presided over the revamping of the U.S. Maritime Commission. And he served as ambassador to Great Britain in the early years of World War II, until his outspoken isolationism appeared to doom any political hopes he had for himself.

From then on, his vindication was clearly to be in the hands of his four sons, and he devoted all his efforts toward providing them with the competitive spirit and bankroll that would put the name Kennedy—the "Irish-American" Catholic name—at the zenith of American power.

One of the nation's wealthiest men, Joseph Kennedy lived to see his hopes realized, although the family's triumphs were dogged by tragedies that rivaled the classics he studied as a boy in Boston Latin school.

He lost his first great hope, Joseph, Jr., in the war he had tried as ambassador to avert. That war also claimed a son-in-law and very nearly claimed his second son, John Fitzgerald.

SERIES OF TRAGEDIES

John won the presidency in 1960, but an assassin's bullet ended his career three years later. The third son, Robert Francis, met the same fate last year campaigning for the presidency.

And his youngest son, Edward Moore, survived a near-fatal plane crash in 1964 only to damage the family's last presidential hope by his involvement in the death of a woman passenger in an auto accident last summer.

It is believed that the ailing patriarch was never told of that accident and its repercussions.

An invalid since suffering a stroke in December 1961, Joe Kennedy watched the funerals of his two slain sons on television.

In addition to his indefatigable wife Rose and his surviving son, the Senate majority whip, Kennedy leaves four of his five daughters.

They are Rosemary, who is retarded and lives in a special institution in Wisconsin; Eunice, wife of Ambassador to France Sargeant Shriver; Patricia, the former wife of actor Peter Lawford, and Jean, wife of Stephen Smith, who manages the Kennedy family fortune.

FATHER A STATE SENATOR

"The Founding Father," as he was dubbed in Richard J. Whalen's 1964 biography, was born in East Boston on Sept. 6, 1888.

Contrary to widespread belief, his parents were second-generation Americans, not immigrants, and they were moderately well-to-do. His father, Patrick Joseph Kennedy, was a politically minded saloon-keeper who later served in the Massachusetts Senate, and his mother, Mary Hickey, was from a family "a notch or two" above the Kennedys.

The eldest of four children and the only one who survived past childhood, young Joe early exhibited his business acumen by organizing a church baseball team at the age of 15, hiring a ball park and charging admission to the games. Of course, the venture turned a profit.

He also peddled candy on the East Boston ferryboat, and felt a burning resentment at the newspaper help-wanted advertisements which read "Protestants Only" and "No Irish Need Apply."

An indifferent student except in mathematics, he was president of his class at the city's prestigious Latin public high school and won the citywide baseball batting championship.

The batting prize came from Mayor John F. (Honey Fitz) Fitzgerald, whose daughter Rose he met and courted in secret, since Fitzgerald felt the Kennedy's weren't quite socially acceptable.

The Kennedys, meanwhile, shocked their neighbors by enrolling Joe in Harvard College, the bastion of Boston's Protestant Brahmins, where he proceeded to be elected to the exclusive DU Club and the Hasty Pudding Institute of 1776. He and a college friend also began a sightseeing bus operation, which netted him $5,000 and a determination to become a millionaire.

Graduating with the Class of 1912, Kennedy became a bank examiner at $125 a week.

Two years later, at the age of 25, he became president of Columbia Trust Co., in which his father had an interest. At the time, he was believed to be the youngest bank president in America.

"I knew banking could lead a man anywhere," he later said, "as it played an important part in every business."

To those who raised eyebrows about his age, he retorted: "It's no crime to be young."

That same year he married Rose Fitzgerald in a private chapel in the residence of the archbishop of Boston. William Cardinal O'Connell officiated.

With the outbreak of World War I, Kennedy became assistant general manager of Bethlehem Steel's shipyard at Quincy, in charge of 22,000 men. Through this work he came to know a young assistant secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

MADE FORTUNE IN MARKET

After the war he became manager of the Boston office of Hayden, Stone & Co., the investment banking house, leaving it to freelance as a stock speculator in the unrestricted market of the Calvin Coolidge administration.

Described as "an angle shooter who likes to move around the table," he made a fortune in the market, then became board chairman of a series of motion picture distributing firms.

In 1926 he moved his family from Boston's Brookline suburb to New York City's fashionable Bronxville. He explained that he wanted his children to grow up in an atmosphere not dominated by Boston Yankees.

Kennedy realized his ambition of becoming a millionaire by age 30. In fact, he realized some $5 million from his movie dealings, switched back into Wall Street speculation and was hardly touched by the 1929 market crash.

His secret, he explained later with a smile, was that "with enough inside information and unlimited credit, you are sure to go broke."

WON PRAISE FROM CRITICS

His business insight led him to invest in Scotch whisky importation "for medicinal purposes" just before prohibition was repealed.

President Roosevelt, whom Kennedy gambled on by supporting, in 1932, stirred a storm of protest in 1934 by appointing him chairman of the new federal agency to regulate the stock market.

But the manipulative "wolf of Wall Street," as his critics sneeringly called him, soon won praise from both liberals and conservatives as he guided the SEC through its first three years.

In 1936 he turned author with a book entitled "I'm For Roosevelt," in which he made the ironic declaration: ". . . I have no political ambitions for myself or for my children. . . ."

After a brief retirement from Washington, Kennedy was recalled by Roosevelt to revitalize the Maritime Commission. His admiring colleague and successor in that post, Vice Adm. Emory Scott Land, once described Kennedy's head-butting with shipbuilders as "ruthless, yes, but essential to progress and efficiency. . . .

"As a consequence, the U.S. was far better prepared in logistics for World War II than it was for World War I."

NAMED ENVOY TO BRITAIN

In an era when tycoons were symbolized by Peter Arno's famous New Yorker cartoon ("Let's all go down to the Trans-Lux and hiss Roosevelt"), Joseph Kennedy in 1938 got the big reward for his loyal cheers—the ambassadorship to the Court of St. James's.

Columnists Joseph Alsop and Robert Kinter wrote of him later that year:

"His language is a cheerful torrent of profanity and picturesque expression. No one is better, or more ebullient company. Because he is rich, because he plays at being a rough diamond, because he is clever and because his brood of nine handsome children fascinate and astonish the British as the Dionne quintuplets might, he has been a vast success in England."

But his success rapidly dimmed as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, whose appeasement policy Kennedy backed, was discredited. The outspoken Kennedy continued to resist all-out arms aid to Britain, believing that America should in no case be dragged into the European war.

CLASHED WITH ROOSEVELT

He endured 244 air raids on London in 1940 but his clash with Roosevelt's lend-lease policy became unendurable.

Kennedy resigned as ambassador late that year amid criticism that seemed to preclude speculation that he might be a presidential candidate in 1944.

Back home, he plunged into real estate speculation, by 1945 acquiring sight unseen Chicago's Merchandise Mart—the world's largest commercial building—and amassing more money than he ever had before.

But his financial triumphs during the 1940s, and his receipt of the highest papal honor ever conferred upon an American (Grand Knight of the Order of Pope Pius XII), seemed to be overshadowed by family tragedies.

Navy Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. was killed when his plane exploded over the English Channel. A month later Daughter Kathleen's husband, the Marquis of Hartington, died in action in France, where Kathleen was killed in a 1948 plane crash.

As son John recuperated from a wartime back injury, the ambitious father urged him to run for a House seat in 1946.

"I told him it was his responsibility to run for Congress," Kennedy declared later. "He didn't want to do it."

Fearful that his own unpopular isolationist views would damage his son's chances, Kennedy quietly yet unashamedly put the weight of his wealth behind John's campaigns and watched with relish as he defeated a Brahmin, Henry Cabot Lodge, for a Senate seat in 1952.

In 1957, a Fortune magazine survey listed the senior Kennedy among the nation's 15 wealthiest men, and he saw to it that each child in the close-knit family had a trust fund of $1 million. The patriarch's own fortune was estimated at $300–$500 million by the early 1960s.

"None of my children has the slightest interest in making money, not the slightest," Kennedy once said in apparent pride at their interest in law, politics and the arts.

HIS OTHER AMBITIONS

"Joe's greatest ambition," Adm. Land once wrote in a Star book review, "was to have one

son in the White House and another on the Supreme Court of the United States."

In 1961, he had one son in the White House and another as attorney general.

In 1965, little more than a year after John's assassination, Joseph P. Kennedy became the only man in American history to have sired three U.S. senators.

Though he suffered a series of heart attacks after the initial stroke in 1961 and was confined to a wheelchair, the patriarch continued to be a rallying point for the close-knit family at his resort homes in Hyannis Port, Mass., and Palm Beach, Fla.

COULD SPEAK ONE WORD

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine in New York, who had treated Kennedy, says that the stroke left him able to speak only one word—"no." But with it, Rusk says, he was able to communicate to the extent of answering questions.

"When he replied, 'no, no, no, no,' he meant 'yes,'" Rusk said "When he replied much more emphatically, 'no, no, no, no,' he did mean 'no.'"

Whatever fate dished out to him—the religious prejudice in his youth, the infirmities of old age, the untimely deaths of his cherished sons—crusty Joe Kennedy endured it all with his massive will to conquer.

"He had the progenitor's sense," a Washington friend once said. "To him, his children were an extension of himself. What he did, he did with them always in mind."

His children will not be remembered as "Irish-Americans."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the glory, the suffering, the joy, and the pain have finally ended for Joseph Patrick Kennedy, for he is dead at 81 years of age.

But, death has no triumph over his life. Indeed, this final sleep may come as a blessed reward for a long period of anguish and suffering.

Death has no triumph, for life was complete. The man who began as a bank examiner in 1912 ended as a major national industrialist. The man who entered Government as a member of the SEC, served Government as Ambassador to the Court of St. James, and the man who married Rose Fitzgerald in 1914, fathered the 35th President of the United States.

But he did more. When we think of Joseph P. Kennedy, we think of a father, of a father who dedicated his life to his children, of a father who realized the greatest of moments from the work of his children, and of a father who suffered perhaps more than any other from the cruel tragedies which struck his children.

If there ever was an American who gave more for his country than Joseph P. Kennedy, then I do not know his name. Three of Joseph Kennedy's sons fell in service to America. Of what man has more ever been demanded?

Joseph P. Kennedy will live on. He will live on as we remember his son Joseph, Jr., his son John Fitzgerald, and his son Robert Francis. He will live on as we remember his own brilliant achievements in business and in Government. He will live on in the memory of his surviving beloved family members. And the record of national service which he began will live on in the distinguished work of his youngest son in the U.S. Senate.

So, to his wonderful wife, to his children, to his grandchildren, we express our heartfelt sympathies, and prayers that the Kennedy family will find the peace and happiness which they so richly deserve.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened to learn of the passing of former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy and wish to extend to his dear wife and all her family the Rooneys' deepest sympathy and prayers in their great loss. I knew Ambassador Kennedy long before President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent him to the Court of St. James. I was very happy to have been a guest in his home at Palm Beach, Fla., at Christmastime in 1960 after his son Jack was elected President of the United States.

There are many memories flowing through my mind at this moment, but I think the best tribute I can pay is that he was the fine father of a fine family. May God rest his soul.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, today in Hyannisport, Mass., Joseph P. Kennedy, patriarch of one of the most distinguished families in America's political history, died at the age of 81. He leaves behind a memorable legacy to the American people. His values were those that have given strength to our Nation—industry, perseverance, hard work and success. His life was a testimony to those values.

Joseph Kennedy served his country in many ways. During the troubled years of the late 1930's, he represented the United States at the Court of St. James. It was during that time that his second son, first became closely acquainted with the problems of international diplomacy and those of Europe especially, which later were to occupy so much of his energies as President of the United States.

Joseph Kennedy had a fine sense of the responsibility that his abilities required of him—he taught his children the value of human life and their own responsibility toward those less fortunate than they. More important, he taught them the value and importance of diligence in the pursuit of their goals.

The American people are indebted to this man who gave so much to his country and sacrificed so much for it. First, his son Joe, Jr., was killed during the Second World War. He enjoyed the culmination of every father's dreams when John Kennedy became President of the United States—and saw his dreams shattered by an assassin's bullet. His third son Robert, who served so ably as a courageous Attorney General, as a distinguished U.S. Senator, and who, as candidate for the Presidency, focused our attention on the needs of the poor, the hungry, the neglected in our national life—was killed also by a lone and misguided youth.

We have shared Joseph Kennedy's massive grief with him—and now, with the Kennedy family, we mourn his death. He was indeed a great American.

Mrs. Morse joins me in extending to Mrs. Kennedy, to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, and the other members of the Kennedy family, our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I add my voice to those who offer their condolences to the members of one of America's great families in the loss of their patriarch. The death of Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, unlike that of three of his sons, comes in its season and thereby does not come with the same impact of shock. But it is nonetheless sad because it marks the end of a colorful career on a muted rather than a triumphant note.

Ambassador Kennedy had many triumphs in his lifetime, however. His rewards were great in his day. And, in his day, his contributions to his Nation have been great. Others will recount these services more elaborately and with eloquence drawn from more personal knowledge than I. But I can testify to one area of contribution from personal familiarity, and that is the participation he had in the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government. He served on that body with my late father who authored the legislation which created both Commissions.

The two were good friends as a result of their mutual interest in the objectives of the Commission and their service thereon. Circumstances frequently found them in agreement because they often shared common views, not so surprising since both were self-made men in the classic American sense. And when they were in disagreement they were worthy adversaries because they shared mutual respect, but no fear of each other.

Only this past summer when my wife and I visited Paris, Ambassador Kennedy's daughter, now herself married to the American Ambassador to France, recalled her father's comments about service with my father on the Hoover Commission. She recalls Mr. Kennedy observing after an early meeting of the Commission:

At least there is one man on the Commission with commonsense, that Congressman from Ohio named Brown.

It was a flattering recollection and not dissimilar to comments I can recall my own father making about the Ambassador. The Congressman from Ohio held him in affection because Mr. Kennedy was a man of charm and candor and had that basic good sense and understanding of the common man which all of us wish to have and admire in others. It was these qualities which contributed to the building of a great fortune, a great career and an outstanding family. His kind is rare. He will be missed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I first came to admire Mr. Kennedy when he became Ambassador to Great Britain. He spoke out with courage and forthrightness about the impending world crisis.

Ambassador Kennedy was a great and good American. He was dedicated to those principles and ideals which made this Nation great. He was a rugged individualist, devoted to private enterprise as the best system to provide opportunity and improve the standards of living for the greatest number of our people. He was intensely patriotic and placed the welfare of the United States

above any other consideration. He reared an outstanding family. He instilled in his family the virtues of loyalty, discipline, courage, and integrity.

It has been the privilege of many of us here to know personally the members of his family who were so dedicated to public service. This Nation today is a greater country, and the cause of freedom throughout the world more secure because of the life and dedication of Ambassador Kennedy and that of his noble family.

Mrs. Dorn and my constituents join me in my prayers and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and each member of her distinguished and wonderful family.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Kennedy's death brings to an end one of the most remarkable careers in American history. Among many distinctions, Joseph Kennedy was the only man in history to father three U.S. Senators. He had a massive will to conquer. He overcame religious prejudice, he endured one staggering tragedy after another in his life. He battled his way to the top at whatever he did. He made one of the great fortunes of history. He made history himself as first Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and revitalized the Maritime Commission.

He fought old age and illness with spirit and tenacity, as he had tackled all other adversaries. He thus set an inspiring example to his family, his friends, and to his countrymen.

His death adds yet one more loss to the burden of loss borne by his widow, the valiant Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy.

To her, to Senator KENNEDY, and to all her family go our deepest sympathy.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the passing of the late Honorable Joseph Kennedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOLFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS DEVOTED TO VIETNAM

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, at the close of legislative business today the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN) will launch a series of 1-hour special orders devoted to Vietnam.

The purpose of these discussions, which will be held on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays with different Members in the well, is to have all our colleagues—no matter what their individual views on Vietnam—take part in a continuing debate of varying viewpoints.

I sincerely hope the Members will seize this opportunity to become an appropriate forum for discussion of Vietnam which is clearly the single most important issue facing the American people.

I urge all Members, no matter how they feel about American policy in Vietnam, to use this opportunity of continuing special orders to express their opinion and to discuss with other Members the vital question of Vietnam.

## IOWA DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION WELCOMES VISITORS

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body from Des Moines, Iowa, a week ago I welcomed some Republicans to Iowa to a powwow they were having in Des Moines.

It was on moratorium day.

Of course, their moratorium was different than the one we had here. Their interest is in a moratorium on the erosion of their membership in this body. Anyway, they came there and demonstrated and left. I want to thank them for coming. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Development Commission was especially thankful. They are always thankful for any wealthy foreigners who come in that have more money to spend than they know what to do with. We need the money to help our balance of payments out there in Iowa. I also extended the Vice President a special invitation and was pleased that the Vice President decided at the last minute to come to Iowa. I wanted him to receive some exposure in Iowa, and he got that all right. I was, however, disappointed that after inviting him there he did not invite the dean of our Iowa delegation to come out with him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that Hubert Humphrey never came to Iowa without inviting some member of the delegation to go out there with him.

While the Vice President was in Des Moines, Iowa, reporters could not get a copy of his speech. They said he was up in a room writing it at the time. It is interesting to note that 2 hours before that time a Member of the Senate put his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it appears on page 34042. Now the White House denies that they had anything to do with it, all of which makes me think that perhaps Nixon is trying to divorce himself from AGNEW, because it is now strongly rumored around Washington that in making up the ticket in 1972, AGNEW is going to dump Nixon.

## THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES W. HENNEY

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to call to the attention of the House the passing on Sunday, November 16, of a former colleague, Charles W. Henney. As the Representative of Wisconsin's Second District, he served in the 73d Congress, 1933–34, noted for the "hundred days" which passed much progressive legislation.

Funeral services for Mr. Henney were held this morning in Portage, Wis.

Throughout his 85 years, Charles Henney maintained a strong interest in public affairs and was quite active in his community of Portage, Wis., and the Democratic Party. At the same time, he continued his practice of medicine and, at the age of 70, was honored by being elected to fellowship in the International College of Surgeons.

Mr. Henney was the last Democrat to represent the Second District until my election in 1958. I always treasured my association with him and he gave me wise counsel on more than one occasion.

I extend my condolences to his family on their loss. I am certain those who knew him here in Congress and elsewhere will mourn the passing of this distinguished American.

## THE STUCK PIG SQUEALS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members who have been around here for awhile will remember how I stood up to McCarthy and McCarthyism in the day when it was rampant here, and they will remember the investigation of foundations which was authorized by the House, and which set out to prove that everybody connected with every foundation was a Communist. I got one of the anti-foundation people's leading witnesses to identify some of the papal encyclicals as Communist literature, which broke up the investigation.

So I do not think I need to do more to remind the House of my credentials against people trying to silence criticism, to silence opposition, and to silence the press, and to destroy dissent, as some tried to do in the McCarthy days.

But, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the press and the television commentators have gotten so exercised at a little criticism directed their way when they tend to be critical of everybody and everything, and the Congress especially. I think what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and if SPIRO, who is not one of my most favorite people, and I am not one of his greatest admirers, hit them where it hurt a little, I am reminded of the traditional Ohio hog, of which I have spoken previously, who squeals only when he gets stuck where it hurts. Apparently they got a little hurt about this.

## THE WEIGHT OF IMPORTED GOODS

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, within the last 2 weeks the Tariff Commission has ruled, for the first time since the Kennedy round procedure was set up, to pay damages to 600 workers in two small steel plants. The amount of money involved in payments to these 600 workers will be $3 million.

We now have 140,000 steelworkers whose jobs have been lost as a result of the difference between the export and import of steel. Based upon the same ratio of award that was given in the plants of which I have spoken, there will be 100,000 steelworkers eligible for this type of relief, which will cost the American taxpayer $2,500 million. There are 340,000 textile workers out of work. There are 65,000 lost jobs in the shoe industry. Fifty percent of all the glassworkers in the United States are out of work because of tariff reductions and import increases since 1959. This is documented before the Tariff Commission.

Altogether we figure from an incomplete tabulation that we will have about 940,000 Americans eligible for this type of relief.

Those of us who have gone out saying that imports result in a great saving for the consumer will soon see how much savings consumers will have when they start paying damages for the cheap Japanese goods they are buying.

## RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM WITH RESPECT TO LOBBYING IN CONNECTION WITH CONVERSION OF POST OFFICE TO GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATION

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in checking the RECORD of November 6, I noted the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) on page 33340. Although they are directed at me, he did not show me the courtesy of advising me of his intention to insert the remarks in the RECORD.

Be that as it may, I regret that he did not see fit to deliver the remarks in person and thus afford me the opportunity to respond at that time.

It apparently disturbed the gentleman that I had reported on the activities of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., the high-powered, well-heeled, lobbying outfit which is putting on the pressure for conversion of the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation.

Since I reported on the contributions to, and expenditures by the Citizens Committee, the gentleman expresses the belief that I now have an obligation to report on the expenditures of two postal unions. Frankly, I do not understand his logic and could only suggest that if he is interested in the lobbying activities of the two groups that he conduct his own investigation.

And if the gentleman is so concerned, as he seems to be, about the power of postal unions, I find it strange indeed that he would support a plan which could lead to compulsory unionism—with all postal employees required to join a union as a condition of employment.

## PREMIER GOLDA MEIR CONGRATULATES PRESIDENT NIXON ON HIS NOVEMBER 3 SPEECH

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the simplistic and myopic view of the struggle in South Vietnam which some strident critics of President Nixon's policy takes is sharply refuted by the Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir. Mrs. Meir, whose indomitable courage and independence of mind cannot be questioned, knows as do her countrymen that the fate of small and still-free nations everywhere is deeply involved. I commend to all Americans the bright vision of this country which Premier Meir expresses in her congratulatory message to President Nixon on his November 3 speech to the Nation. The text of Mrs. Meir's message is as follows:

The Prime Minister wishes to congratulate the President on his meaningful speech, and express her hope that he will speedily succeed in bringing about peace in Vietnam. The President's speech contains much that encourages and strengthens freedom-loving small nations the world over, which are striving to maintain their independent existence looking to that great democracy, the United States of America.

## WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7066) to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, in order to preserve public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or purchase with donated funds, such land and interests in land, together with buildings and improvements thereon and including scenic easements, at or in the vicinity of Auburn Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary for the establishment of a national historic site in commemoration of William Howard Taft. Such site shall be known as the William Howard Taft National Historic Site.

"SEC. 2. The administration, development, preservation, and maintenance of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', approved August 25, 1916, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes', approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

"SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $318,000 to provide for the restoration and development of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site."

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, if he will explain the amendments.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7066 as approved by the House authorized the use of donated or appropriated funds for the acquisition of needed lands at the proposed William Howard Taft National Historic Site. We understood, however, that all of the lands would be donated or purchased with donated funds, but in order to facilitate the needed acquisition the use of appropriated funds was authorized with the understanding that the Federal Government would be reimbursed if any land acquisition costs were incurred. As evidence of this understanding, it should be noted that the authorization ceiling was limited to the amount estimated to be needed for the restoration and development of the historic site.

The Senate amendment to H.R. 7066 goes one step further in that it requires that all of the lands be acquired by donation or by purchase with donated funds. I hasten to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this does not, in any way, impair the power of eminent domain. It is well established in law that the power of the Federal Government to exercise condemnation is assured whenever the procurement of real estate for public purposes is authorized—25 U.S.C. 275. Regardless of the source of the funds, the power of eminent domain may be utilized to acquire real property within the boundaries of an area authorized by law to be acquired. Since the power of the Government to acquire the needed lands, in this case, is not impaired and since it has been the understanding, from the beginning, that the lands to be acquired would be purchased with donated funds, it is appropriate that the House concur in this portion of the Senate amendment.

The amendment which is being offered at this time was included in the bill as originally approved by the House. It merely designates the boundaries of the proposed national historic site by reference to a map rather than granting the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to establish such boundaries as he deems appropriate. This is not an uncommon provision in legislation involving new authorizations for units of

the national park system. It makes the congressional intent absolutely clear with respect to the area being authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I make these brief comments to establish some legislative history on the points mentioned so that there will be no misunderstandings as to what was or was not intended by the Congress. I urge the Members of the House to concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment proposed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: Amend section 1 of the act as amended by the Senate to read as follows:

"That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or purchase with donated funds, such land and interests in land, together with buildings and improvements thereon and including scenic easements, at or in the vicinity of Auburn Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, as are depicted on the drawing entitled 'William Howard Taft National Historic Site Boundary Map,' numbered TAHO–20009, and dated August 1969. The drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. When acquired such site shall be known as the William Howard Taft National Historic Site."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## THE TRADE ACT OF 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–194)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

For the past 35 years, the United States has steadfastly pursued a policy of freer world trade. As a Nation, we have recognized that competition cannot stop at the ocean's edge. We have determined that American trade policies must advance the national interest—which means they must respond to the whole of our interests, and not be a device to favor the narrow interest.

This Administration has reviewed that policy and we find that its continuation is in our national interest. At the same time, however, it is clear that the trade problems of the 1970s will differ significantly from those of the past. New developments in the rapidly evolving world economy will require new responses and new initiatives.

As we look at the changing patterns of world trade, three factors stand out that require us to continue modernizing our own trade policies:

*First, world economic interdependence has become a fact.* Reductions in tariffs and in transportation costs have internationalized the world economy just as satellites and global television have internationalized the world communications network. The growth of multinational corporations provides a dramatic example of this development.

*Second, we must recognize that a number of foreign countries now compete fully with the United States in world markets.*

We have always welcomed such competition. It promotes the economic development of the entire world to the mutual benefit of all, including our own consumers. It provides an additional stimulus to our own industry, agriculture and labor force. At the same time, however, it requires us to insist on fair competition among all countries.

*Third, the traditional surplus in the U.S. balance of trade has disappeared.* This is largely due to our own internal inflation and is one more reason why we must bring that inflation under control.

The disappearance of the surplus has suggested to some that we should abandon our traditional approach toward freer trade. I reject this argument not only because I believe in the principle of freer trade, but also for a very simple and pragmatic reason: any reduction in our imports produced by U.S. restrictions not accepted by our trading partners would invite foreign reaction against our own exports—all quite legally. Reduced imports would thus be offset by reduced exports, and both sides would lose. In the longer term, such a policy of trade restriction would add to domestic inflation and jeopardize our competitiveness in world markets at the very time when tougher competition throughout the world requires us to improve our competitive capabilities in every way possible.

In fact, the need to restore our trade surplus heightens the need for further movement toward freer trade. It requires us to persuade other nations to lower barriers which deny us fair access to their markets. An environment of freer trade will permit the widest possible scope for the genius of American industry and agriculture to respond to the competitive challenge of the 1970s.

*Fourth, the less developed countries need improved access to the markets of the industrialized countries if their economic development is to proceed satisfactorily.* Public aid will never be sufficient to meet their needs, nor should it be. I recently announced that, as one step toward improving their market access, the United States would press in world trade forums for a liberal system of tariff preferences for all developing countries. International discussions are now in progress on the matter and I will not deal with it in the trade bill I am submitting today. At the appropriate time, I will submit legislation to the Congress to seek authorization for the United States to extend preferences and to take any other steps toward improving the market access of the less developed countries which might appear desirable and which would require legislation.

THE TRADE ACT OF 1969

The trade bill which I am submitting today addresses these new problems of the 1970s. It is modest in scope, but significant in its impact. It continues the general drive toward freer world trade. It also explicitly recognizes that, while seeking to advance world interests, U.S. trade policies must also respect legitimate U.S. interests, and that to be fair to our trading partners does not require us to be unfair to our own people. Specifically:

—It restores the authority needed by the President to make limited tariff reductions.

—It takes concrete steps toward the increasingly urgent goal of lowering non-tariff barriers to trade.

—It recognizes the very real plight of particular industries, companies and workers faced with import competition, and provides for readier relief in these special cases.

—It strengthens GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—by regularizing the funding of United States participation.

While asking enactment of these proposals now, the trade program I will outline in this message also includes setting preparations under way for the more ambitious initiatives that will later be needed for the long-term future.

TARIFF REDUCTION

*I recommend that the President be given authority to make modest reductions in U.S. tariffs.*

The President has been without such authority for over two years. This authority is not designed to be used for major tariff negotiations, but rather to make possible minor adjustments that individual circumstances from time to time require—as, for example, when it becomes necessary to raise the duty on an article as the result of an "escape clause" action or when a statutory change is made in tariff classification. Our trading partners are then entitled to reasonable compensation, just as we would be entitled to receive it from them in reverse cirmumstances. Lack of this authority exposes our exports to foreign retaliation. Therefore, the Bill would provide to the President, through June 30, 1973, the authority to reduce tariffs by limited amounts.

NON-TARIFF BARRIERS

The time has come for a serious and sustained effort to reduce non-tariff barriers to trade. These non-tariff barriers have become increasingly important with the decline in tariff protection and the growing interdependence of the world economy. Their elimination is vital to our efforts to increase U.S. exports.

*As a first step in this direction, I propose today that the United States eliminate the American Selling Price system of customs valuation.*

Although this system applies only to a very few American products—mainly

benzenoid chemicals—it is viewed by our principal trading partners as a major symbol of American protectionism. Its removal will bring reciprocal reductions in foreign tariffs on U.S. chemical exports, and a reduction in important foreign non-tariff barriers—including European road taxes, which discriminate against our larger automobiles, and the preferential treatment on tobacco extended by the United Kingdom to the countries of the Commonwealth. Beyond this, its removal will unlock the door to new negotiations on the entire range of non-tariff barriers. Because of the symbolic importance our trading partners attach to it, the American Selling Price system has itself become a major barrier to the removal of other barriers.

Essentially, the American Selling Price system is a device by which the value of imports for tariff purposes is set by the price of competitive American products instead of the actual price of the foreign product, which is the basis of tariff valuation for all other imports. The extraordinary protection it provides to these few products has outlived its original purposes. The special advantage it gives particular producers can no longer justify its heavy cost in terms of the obstacles it places in the way of opening foreign markets to American exports.

Reducing or eliminating other non-tariff barriers to world trade will require a great deal of detailed negotiating and hard bargaining.

Unlike tariffs, approaches to the reduction of non-tariff barriers are often difficult to embody in prior delegation of authority. Many—both here and abroad—have their roots in purely domestic concerns that are only indirectly related to foreign trade, and many arise from domestic laws.

Many would require specific legislative actions to accomplish their removal—but the nature of this action would not finally be clear until negotiation had shown what was possible.

This presents a special opportunity for Congress to be helpful in achieving international agreements in this vital area.

*I would welcome a clear statement of Congressional intent with regard to non-tariff barriers to assist in our efforts to obtain reciprocal lowering of such barriers.*

It is not my intention to use such a declaration as a "blank check." On the contrary, I pledge to maintain close consultation with the Congress during the course of any such negotiations, to keep the Congress fully informed on problems and progress, and to submit for Congressional consideration any agreements which would require new legislation. The purpose of seeking such an advance declaration is not to bypass Congress, but to strengthen our negotiating position.

In fact, it is precisely because ours is a system in which the Executive cannot commit the Legislative Branch that a general declaration of legislative intent would be important to those with whom we must negotiate.

*At the same time, I urge private interests to work closely with the government in seeking the removal of these barriers.* Close cooperation by the private sector is essential, because many non-tariff barriers are subtle, complex and difficult to appraise.

AID FOR AFFECTED INDUSTRIES

Freer trade brings benefits to the entire community, but it can also cause hardship for parts of the community. The price of trade policy from which we all receive benefits must not fall unfairly on the few—whether on particular industries, on individual firms or on groups of workers. As we have long recognized, there should be prompt and effective means of helping those faced with adversity because of increased imports.

*The Trade Act of 1969 provides significant improvements in the means by which U.S. industry, firms, and workers can receive assistance from their government to meet injury truly caused by imports.*

This relief falls into two broad categories: 1) the escape clause, which is industry-wide; and 2) adjustment assistance, which provides specific aid to particular firms or groups of workers.

These improvements are needed because the assistance programs provided in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 have simply not worked.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

The escape clause provisions of the 1962 Act have proved so stringent, so rigid, and so technical that in not a single case has the Tariff Commission been able to justify a recommendation for relief. This must be remedied. We must be able to provide, on a case-by-case basis, careful and expedited consideration of petitions for relief, and such relief must be available on a fair and reasonable basis.

*I recommend a liberalization of the escape clause to provide, for industries adversely affected by import competition, a test that will be simple and clear: relief should be available whenever increased imports are the primary cause of actual or potential serious injury.* The increase in imports should not—as it now is—have to be related to a prior tariff reduction.

While making these escape clause adjustments more readily obtainable, however, we must ensure that they remain what they are intended to be: temporary relief measures, not permanent features of the tariff landscape. An industry provided with temporary escape-clause relief must assume responsibility for improving its competitive position. The bill provides for regular reports on these efforts, to be taken into account in determining whether relief should be continued.

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

With regard to adjustment assistance for individual firms and groups of workers, the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 again have not worked adequately.

The Act provides for loans, technical assistance and tax relief for firms, and readjustment allowances, relocation and training for workers. This direct aid to those individually injured should be more readily available than tariff relief for entire industries. It can be more closely targeted; it matches the relief to the damage; and it has no harmful side effects on overall trade policy.

*I recommend that firms and workers be considered eligible for adjustment assistance when increased imports are found to be a substantial cause of actual or potential serious injury.*

Again, the increase in imports would not have to be related to a prior tariff reduction. The "substantial cause" criterion for adjustment assistance would be less stringent than the "primary cause" criterion for tariff relief.

I also recommend two further changes in existing adjustment provisions:

—That the Tariff Commission continue to gather and supply the needed factual information, but that determinations of eligibility to apply for assistance be made by the President.

—That adjustment assistance be made available to separate units of multi-plant companies and to groups of workers in them, when the injury is substantial to the unit but not to the entire parent firm.

With these modifications, plus improved administrative procedures, our program of assistance to import-injured firms and workers can and will be made to work. Taken together, they will remedy what has too long been a serious shortcoming in our trade programs.

These changes in our escape clause and adjustment assistance programs will provide an adequate basis for government help in cases where such help is justified in the overall national interest. They will thus help us move away from protectionist proposals, which would reverse the trend toward interdependence, and towards a constructive attack on the existing trade barriers of others.

The textile import problem, of course, is a special circumstance that requires special measures. We are not trying to persuade other countries to limit their textile shipments to the United States. In doing so, however, we are trying to work out with our trading partners a reasonable solution which will allow both domestic and foreign producers to share equitably in the development of the U.S. market.

Such measures should not be misconstrued, nor should they be allowed to turn us away from the basic direction of our progress toward freer exchange.

FAIR TREATMENT OF U.S. EXPORTS

By nature and by definition, trade is a two-way street. We must make every effort to ensure that American products are allowed to compete in world markets on equitable terms. These efforts will be more successful if we have the means to take effective action when confronted with illegal or unjust restrictions on American exports.

Section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 authorizes the President to impose duties or other import restrictions on the products of any nation that places unjustifiable restrictions on U.S. agricultural products. *I recommend that this authority be expanded in two ways:*

*—By extending the existing authority to cover unfair actions against all U.S. products, rather than only against U.S. agricultural products.*

*—By providing new authority to take appropriate action against nations that practice what amounts to subsidized competition in third-country markets,*

*when that subsidized competition unfairly affects U.S. exports.*

Any weapon is most effective if its presence makes its use unnecessary. With these new weapons in our negotiating arsenal, we should be better able to negotiate relief from the unfair restrictions to which American exports still are subject.

STRENGTHENING GATT

Ever since its beginning in 1947, U.S. participation in GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—has been financed through general contingency funds rather than through a specific appropriation.

GATT has proved its worth. It is the international organization we depend on for the enforcement of our trading rights, and toward which we look as a forum for the important new negotiations on non-tariff barriers which must now be undertaken.

*I recommend specific authorization for the funding of our participation in GATT,* thus both demonstrating our support and regularizing our procedures.

FOR THE LONG-TERM FUTURE

The trade bill I have submitted today is a necessary beginning. It corrects deficiencies in present policies; it enables us to begin the 1970's with a program geared to the start of that decade.

As we look further into the Seventies, it is clear that we must reexamine the entire range of our policies and objectives.

We must take into account the far-reaching changes which have occurred in investment abroad and in patterns of world trade. I have already outlined some of the problems which we will face in the 1970's. Many more will develop—and also new opportunities will emerge.

Intense international competition, new and growing markets, changes in cost levels, technological developments in both agriculture and industry, and large-scale exports of capital are having profound and continuing effects on international production and trade patterns. We can no longer afford to think of our trade policies in the old, simple terms of liberalism vs. protectionism. Rather, we must learn to treat investment, production, employment and trade as interrelated and interdependent.

We need a deeper understanding of the ways in which the major sectors of our economy are actually affected by international trade.

We have arrived at a point at which a careful review should also be made of our tariff structure itself—including such traditional aspects as its reliance upon specific duties, the relationships among tariff rates on various products, and adapting our system to conform more closely with that of the rest of the world.

To help prepare for these many future needs, I will appoint a Commission on World Trade to examine the entire range of our trade and related policies, to analyze the problems we are likely to face in the 1970's and to prepare recommendations on what we should do about them. It will be empowered to call upon the Tariff Commission and the agencies of the Executive Branch for advice, support and assistance, but its recommendations will be its own.

By expanding world markets, our trade policies have speeded the pace of our own economic progress and aided the development of others. As we look to the future, we must seek a continued expansion of world trade, even as we also seek the dismantling of those other barriers—political, social and ideological—that have stood in the way of a freer exchange of people and ideas, as well as of goods and technology.

Our goal is an open world. Trade is one of the doors to that open world. Its continued expansion requires that others move with us, and that we achieve reciprocity in fact as well as in spirit.

Armed with the recommendations and analyses of the new Commission on World Trade, we will work toward broad new policies for the 1970's that will encourage that reciprocity, and that will lead us, in growing and shared prosperity, toward a world both open and just.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 18, 1969.*

---

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE PRINCIPLES OF FREE TRADE

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has today sent the Congress a message which reaffirms this Nation's devotion to the principles of free trade. I am pleased that the President has outlined a course which will steer us toward the objectives of freer trade but at the same time shows an awareness of the shoals and sandbars along the way.

I believe the trade policies recommended by the President will be helpful in restoring our Nation to a position of trade surplus. There is no question that movement toward freer trade is necessary if we are to move toward the much-desired goal of a favorable balance of trade.

To that end, I fully support the President's request for authority to make limited tariff reductions. The President has quite accurately stated that lack of authority to make such reductions exposes our exports to foreign retaliation.

The Congress also should give serious consideration to the President's request for elimination of nontariff barriers to trade. As the President stated, a clear statement of congressional intent in this regard is needed to achieve the reciprocal lowering of nontariff trade obstacles.

The President's message on trade is a prime example of the balance that President Nixon has brought to our domestic and foreign affairs. I refer particularly to his realistic recommendations regarding aid for industries and individuals adversely affected by increased imports and the need to take effective action in cases where American exports are illegally or unjustly discriminated against.

By and large, the President's trade recommendations commend themselves to the Congress. Prompt action on these recommendations is vital to our Nation's future well-being.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on the initiative of President Nixon, the Congress once again has before it basic legislation on U.S. foreign trade policy.

As we proceed to what I am certain will be thorough consideration of every provision of this bill, let us not overlook the impressive foundations upon which the President's recommendations rest.

This bill calls for an extension into the 1970's of a policy of trade expansion that has served our Nation well since the 1930's.

It is a policy based on the principle that the expansion of world trade benefits all nations.

It is a policy that has been proven by a record of many years' duration.

It is a policy studied and upheld over many years by a series of distinguished committees.

It is a policy adhered to by both American political parties.

It is a policy embodied in many of our international agreements including the Charter of the United Nations.

In short, the President is asking us to enable him to carry out an up-to-date version of a tried and tested program.

I know there are many of us who are disappointed in certain provisions of our basic trade legislation. There can be no question about the need to improve procedures for assisting those workers and industries hurt by foreign competition. And we should all be concerned with strengthening our negotiating capacity to open wider world markets for American products. I believe the carefully drafted bill now before us fulfills these needs.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in his message on the proposed Trade Act of 1969, President Nixon has let it be known that the United States is going to insist on its reciprocal rights in the give and take of world trade. And he has asked for authority to back up his words.

The President has asked for a modest amount of tariff-cutting authority to end the dangerously weak position he occupies in dealing with unavoidable tariff adjustments. The President needs this authority to prevent other nations from threatening the United States with retaliation every time we make a minor change in a tariff.

The President also needs the support of the Congress in his campaign to convince other nations that the United States will no longer put up with nontariff barriers that make some of their tariff concessions next to worthless. To make this campaign credible he has asked for repeal of our best known nontariff barrier, the American selling price system. The President made it clear that in return for ending this outdated system, the United States will demand all the reciprocal concessions promised in the Kennedy round as well as an open door for negotiations on the nontariff barriers of other countries.

Finally, the President seeks extension of section 252, which gives him authority to raise existing duties, impose them where they don't exist or even put import quotas on any product of any nation that places unjustifiable restrictions on U.S. farm products.

What the President now wants is broad authority to use this weapon whenever

any American goods—agricultural or nonagricultural—are unfairly treated.

The new proposals also call for authority to penalize countries that use subsidies to undercut American exports to third countries.

Taken as a package, this trade bill continues and reaffirms the traditional U.S. policy of trade expansion through reciprocal reduction of barriers. But it makes it clear that there will be no more free rides and that, in nontariff barrier talks, the United States intends to get as much as it gives.

I suggest that we move as expeditiously as possible in consideration of these welcome proposals.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. 35-year campaign to reduce barriers to world trade takes another significant step forward with the introduction of the administration's foreign trade bill. Our goal continues to be a more prosperous America in a more prosperous world. Many Members of Congress here today remember when the "35-year campaign" to reduce tariffs started in the thirties when the value of world trade had dropped by two-thirds, strangled by the combined effects of worldwide depression. Under those circumstances, we assumed a leadership role in the program for reductions of tariffs on a reciprocal basis for as many countries as possible. Today excepting the free list, the average duty paid on imports has been reduced from around 60 percent in the early thirties to around 11 percent.

The liberalization of foreign trade over the past 35 years has meant more jobs and more markets for the products of American farmers and industries. No wonder this program has had the continued support of the last six administrations and enjoyed the support of both political parties in the Congress.

The international trade initiative of this bill is most welcomed and timely. New trends are developing in international trade patterns and we are experiencing real competition from our rapidly growing allies and trade partners across both oceans. We should not let our negotiating authority lapse, and we should take every measure to assure the world that the United States will continue to play a constructive leadership role.

At the same time, we must bear in mind that the "two-way street" we have long talked about in trade policy is kept clear of roadblocks. If we are to continue our dynamic internal growth, we must remain competitive internationally. This fact becomes more apparent and more important every year as an economical interdependence of the free world becomes more evident. We must go on expanding at home and abroad and develop policy in the next decade which will enable us to share fairly with others the growing benefits of the technological revolution in industry and agriculture.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the President's message.

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

There was no objection.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12307) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 17, 1969, p. 34371.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. When is the Private Calendar to be called?

The SPEAKER. Immediately following this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that the Private Calendar took precedence over other business in the House.

The SPEAKER. Not on the third Tuesday.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have some discussion before we adopt the conference report?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend from Iowa that I will try not to delay the proceedings for very long so the House can get to the matter that he discussed and in which he is interested.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I had only a short time to look at this conference report, but it seems to me that almost every item is increased over the House figure when the bill was originally passed. Do you not think that we ought to take a little time to find out why the House bill was increased?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I propose to explain the major items of the conference to my friend and to the House.

Mr. Speaker, we bring you the conference report on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for 1970.

The original appropriations bill was passed by the House on last June 24. The matter has languished in the other body for some months because of the necessity of enacting authorizing legislation on three items—National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the National Science Foundation.

These bills have recently been finalized, the conferees met and reached agreement.

Today we are bringing back to the House a conference report which we consider justified and prudent—a good report.

Some 50 items were in disagreement. As in all legislative matters, this report is a compromise—and we feel that satisfactory compromises were reached in this report.

The original budget which we considered was for $18,197,672,000. The revised Nixon budget, considered by the House, was $15,380,413,600.

As passed by the House the bill called for appropriations of $14,909,089,000. This represented a cut and reduction from the original budget of $3,288,583,000, and a cut and reduction of $471,324,600 from the revised budget.

The Senate increased items in the House bill by $482,934,000. The Senate made reductions in other items totaling $406,574,000. This leaves a net increase of $76,360,000 by the Senate over the House bill.

The Senate also considered $132,556,000 which was not submitted to the House for consideration.

We came out of the conference $401,099,100 under the amended budget, so while there is an increase in the Senate over the House figure we came out of conference $401 million under the amended budget.

This bill is $202,781,500 over the House bill because of Senate additions to the bill, and I should like to explain the additions.

The major increase was $125 million for diseaster relief—an essential and unavoidable expense because of Hurricane Camille. A budget amendment for $125,000,000 more was sent to the Senate after the House had acted on the bill, and the increased figure was added by the Senate. This $125 million for disaster relief was not considered by the House. The conference agreed to it because Hurricane Camille was a disaster of major proportions and the worst in the history of this Nation. The House conferees agreed to this necessary and essential increase.

There are two major titles in the bill.

Let me report first on title II. This provides funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Your conferees agreed to a $150 mil-

lion increase in the funding for urban renewal programs as passed by the Senate.

The Senate yielded to the House proposal of $50,000,000 annual contract authorization for the rent supplement program.

On some of the other items, such as annual contract authorization for section 235 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the home ownership assistance program; and section 236, the rental housing assistance program, the conferees reached a compromise agreement equally between the House and Senate amounts. The conference agreement provides $90,000,000 annual contract authorization for section 235 and $85,000,000 for section 236.

In addition to the disaster relief and housing programs, this conference report provides for the modernization and air conditioning of three veterans hospitals that were included in the House bill, but deleted by the Senate. The hospitals are located in Muskogee, Okla.; Tuskegee, Ala.; and Waco, Tex. This provision is urgently needed at this time for the care of veterans in those areas, and these modernizations should not be delayed.

This report also includes funding for nine public works projects included in the House bill.

All of these are projects that have been previously funded for construction and additional funding is needed to assure completion of the projects.

This funding is needed and necessary because of increased labor and material costs—and because of delays.

It is false economy to defer construction of needed public buildings, especially those with construction underway and partially completed.

The Senate added funds for construction of one project; namely, the FBI Academy—a total of $7,396,000.

This appropriation is necessary to aid and assist the Justice Department and police departments and law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation in their war on crime through training.

The conferees felt that this project should not be delayed further as the Nation's crime rate continues to mount.

For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the Senate increased the House figure by $18,544,000.

In conference we provided $3,006,000,000 for research and development for NASA, and $53,233,000 for construction of facilities as proposed in the House bill instead of the $58,200,000 as proposed in the Senate bill.

For administrative expenses—program management of NASA—we accepted the lower Senate figure of $637,400,000, a reduction of $6,350,000.

Overall reductions of $401,099,100 were made by the conferees under the revised Nixon budget.

We believe this is a good conference report—a product of compromise.

The report has been thoroughly considered and I urge its adoption.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary table of the conference action for the bill:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12307) COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

| Agency and item | New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date fiscal year 1969 [1] | Amended budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I | | | | | | | | |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | | | |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $500,000 | $524,000 | $500,000 | $524,000 | $500,000 | −$24,000 | | −$24,000 |
| OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 4,950,000 | 5,290,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | −290,000 | | |
| Salaries and expenses, telecommunications | 2,175,000 | 2,095,000 | 1,795,000 | 1,795,000 | 1,795,000 | −300,000 | | |
| Defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies | 3,130,000 | 3,260,000 | 3,200,000 | 3,200,000 | 3,200,000 | −60,000 | | |
| Total, Office of Emergency Preparedness | 10,255,000 | 10,645,000 | 9,995,000 | 9,995,000 | 9,995,000 | −650,000 | | |
| OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 1,800,000 | 1,958,000 | 1,875,000 | 1,958,000 | 1,958,000 | | +$83,000 | |
| Total, Executive Office of the President | 12,555,000 | 13,127,000 | 12,370,000 | 12,477,000 | 12,453,000 | −674,000 | +83,000 | −24,000 |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | | | | |
| Appalachian regional development programs | 173,600,000 | [2] 462,500,000 | 445,000,000 | 107,500,000 | 282,500,000 | −180,000,000 | −162,500,000 | +175,000,000 |
| Disaster relief | 45,000,000 | [3] 170,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 170,000,000 | 170,000,000 | | +125,000,000 | |
| Total, funds appropriated to the President | 218,600,000 | 632,500,000 | 490,000,000 | 277,500,000 | 452,500,000 | −180,000,000 | −37,500,000 | +175,000,000 |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | | | | | |
| APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 850,000 | 890,000 | 890,000 | 890,000 | 890,000 | | | |
| CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriation | 38,564,000 | [4] 41,830,000 | 40,000,000 | 41,397,000 | 40,778,500 | −1,051,500 | +778,500 | −618,500 |
| *By transfer* | *(6,460,000)* | *(7,364,000)* | *(7,364,000)* | *(7,364,000)* | *(7,364,000)* | | | |
| Annuities under special acts | 1,350,000 | 1,265,000 | 1,265,000 | 1,265,000 | 1,265,000 | | | |
| Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits | 40,478,000 | 41,185,000 | 41,185,000 | 41,185,000 | 41,185,000 | | | |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund | 72,000,000 | 73,000,000 | 73,000,000 | 73,000,000 | 73,000,000 | | | |
| Total, Civil Service Commission | 152,662,000 | 157,280,000 | 155,450,000 | 156,847,000 | 156,228,500 | −1,051,500 | +778,500 | −618,500 |

Footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12307) COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

| Agency and item | New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date fiscal year 1969 [1] | Amended budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Con. | | | | | | | | |
| COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $100,000 | | | | | | | |
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 20,720,000 | $23,950,000 | $21,600,000 | $22,850,000 | $22,225,000 | −$1,725,000 | +$625,000 | −$625,000 |
| FEDERAL POWER COMMISSOIN | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 15,878,000 | [5] 16,650,000 | 16,000,000 | 16,400,000 | 16,400,000 | −250,000 | +400,000 | |
| FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 16,900,000 | 19,940,000 | 19,500,000 | 19,500,000 | 19,500,000 | −440,000 | | |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service | 278,671,000 | [6] 309,119,000 | 301,500,000 | 309,119,000 | 307,000,000 | −2,119,000 | +5,500,000 | −2,119,000 |
| Repairs and improvement of public buildings | 80,000,000 | [7] 61,600,000 | 70,000,000 | 61,600,000 | 61,600,000 | | −8,400,000 | |
| Construction, public buildings projects | | [8] 12,748,600 | 19,137,000 | 13,248,000 | 26,533,000 | +13,784,400 | +7,396,000 | +13,285,000 |
| Construction, official residence of the Vice President | | 150,000 | | | | −150,000 | | |
| Sites and expenses, public buildings project | 10,995,000 | 11,000,000 | 11,000,000 | 11,000,000 | 11,000,000 | | | |
| Payments, public buildings purchase contracts | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | | | |
| Expenses, U.S. court facilities | 750,000 | 1,500,000 | 750,000 | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | −250,000 | +500,000 | |
| Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service | 72,500,000 | 78,873,000 | 77,515,000 | 77,515,000 | 77,515,000 | −1,358,000 | | |
| Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service | 19,348,000 | [9] 22,153,000 | 21,350,000 | 21,350,000 | 21,350,000 | −803,000 | | |
| National historical publication grants | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | | | |
| Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service | 6,150,000 | 6,150,000 | 6,150,000 | 6,150,000 | 6,150,000 | | | |
| Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service | 28,500,000 | 29,780,000 | 29,000,000 | 29,000,000 | 29,000,000 | −780,000 | | |
| Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator | 1,939,000 | 1,926,000 | 1,926,000 | 1,926,000 | 1,926,000 | | | |
| Allowances and office staff for former Presidents | 307,000 | 440,000 | 335,000 | 335,000 | 335,000 | −105,000 | | |
| Expenses, Presidential transition | 900,000 | | | | | | | |
| *Administrative operations fund (limitation on administrative expenses)* | *(13,700,000)* | *(13,833,000)* | *(13,800,000)* | *(13,800,000)* | *(13,800,000)* | *(−33,000)* | | |
| Total, General Services Administration | 502,810,000 | 538,189,600 | 541,413,000 | 535,243,000 | 546,409,000 | +8,219,400 | +4,996,000 | +11,166,000 |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | | | |
| Research and development | 3,370,300,000 | [10] 3,006,427,000 | 3,000,000,000 | 3,019,927,000 | 3,006,000,000 | −427,000 | +6,000,000 | −13,927,000 |
| Construction of facilities | 21,800,000 | 58,200,000 | 53,233,000 | 58,200,000 | 53,233,000 | −4,967,000 | | −4,967,000 |
| Research and program management | 603,173,000 | 650,900,000 | 643,750,000 | 637,400,000 | 637,400,000 | −13,500,000 | −6,350,000 | |
| Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 3,995,273,000 | 3,715,527,000 | 3,696,983,000 | 3,715,527,000 | 3,696,633,000 | −18,894,000 | −350,000 | −18,894,000 |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 400,000,000 | 497,000,000 | 418,000,000 | 458,000,000 | 438,000,000 | −59,000,000 | +20,000,000 | −20,000,000 |
| Scientific activities (special foreign currency program) | | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | −1,000,000 | | −1,000,000 |
| Total, National Science Foundation | 400,000,000 | 500,000,000 | 420,000,000 | 461,000,000 | 440,000,000 | −60,000,000 | +20,000,000 | −21,000,000 |
| RENEGOTIATION BOARD | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 3,140,000 | 4,140,000 | 3,640,000 | 4,140,000 | 4,000,000 | −140,000 | +360,000 | −140,000 |
| SECUTITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 18,624,000 | [11] 20,416,000 | 19,750,000 | 20,416,000 | 20,416,000 | | +666,000 | |
| SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 66,418,000 | [12] 69,321,000 | 67,375,000 | 69,321,000 | 68,348,000 | −973,000 | +973,000 | −973,000 |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | | | |
| Compensation and pensions | 4,930,936,000 | 5,041,355,000 | 5,041,355,000 | 5,041,355,000 | 5,041,355,000 | | | |
| Readjustment benefits | 701,200,000 | 742,200,000 | 742,200,000 | 742,200,000 | 742,200,000 | | | |
| Veterans insurance and indemnities | 9,350,000 | 7,253,000 | 7,253,000 | 7,253,000 | 7,253,000 | | | |
| Medical care | 1,474,064,000 | [13] 1,524,101,000 | 1,541,701,000 | 1,541,701,000 | 1,541,701,000 | +17,600,000 | | |
| Medical and prosthetic research | 48,018,000 | [14] 54,638,000 | 54,638,000 | 54,638,000 | 54,638,000 | | | |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses | 14,789,000 | [15] 16,994,000 | 16,950,000 | 16,950,000 | 16,950,000 | −44,000 | | |
| General operating expenses | 207,000,000 | [16] 220,865,000 | 220,865,000 | 220,865,000 | 220,865,000 | | | |
| Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities | 7,926,000 | [17] 55,217,000 | 69,152,000 | 55,217,000 | 69,152,000 | +13,935,000 | | +13,935,000 |
| Grants for construction of State nursing homes | 4,000,000 | [18] 1,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | +3,000,000 | | |
| Grants to the Republic of the Philippines | 1,776,000 | 1,362,000 | 1,362,000 | 1,362,000 | 1,362,000 | | | |
| Payment of participation sales insufficiencies | 9,505,000 | 5,716,000 | 5,716,000 | 5,716,000 | 5,716,000 | | | |

Footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12307) COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

| Agency and item | New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date fiscal year 1969 [1] | Amended budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Con. | | | | | | | | |
| VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—Con. | | | | | | | | |
| Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations | *($450,000,000)* | Language | *($425,000,000)* | *($425,000,000)* | *($425,000,000)* | | | |
| Total, Veterans Administration | 7,408,564,000 | $7,670,701,000 | 7,705,192,000 | 7,691,257,000 | 7,705,192,000 | +$34,491,000 | | +$13,935,000 |
| Total, independent offices | 12,601,939,000 | 12,737,004,600 | 12,667,793,000 | 12,713,391,000 | 12,696,241,500 | −40,763,100 | +$28,448,500 | −17,149,500 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | | | | | | |
| CIVIL DEFENSE | | | | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 48,040,000 | 50,700,000 | 47,700,000 | 50,700,000 | 49,200,000 | −1,500,000 | +1,500,000 | −1,500,000 |
| Research, shelter survey and marking | 12,500,000 | 24,600,000 | 16,500,000 | 21,800,000 | 20,050,000 | −4,550,000 | +3,550,000 | −1,750,000 |
| Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense | 60,540,000 | 75,300,000 | 64,200,000 | 72,500,000 | 69,250,000 | −6,050,000 | +5,050,000 | −3,250,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE | | | | | | | | |
| PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | | | | | | |
| Emergency health | | [19] 4,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | | −2,000,000 | |
| Total, Title I | 12,893,634,000 | 13,461,931,600 | 13,240,363,000 | 13,079,868,000 | 13,234,444,500 | −227,487,100 | −5,918,500 | +154,576,500 |
| TITLE II | | | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | | |
| RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE | | | | | | | | |
| Grants for neighborhood facilities | 35,000,000 | [20] 45,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | −5,000,000 | | |
| Alaska housing | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | | | |
| Urban renewal programs | [21] 750,000,000 | [22] 250,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | | +150,000,000 | |
| Rehabilitation loan fund | | [23] 50,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 45,000,000 | −5,000,000 | | |
| Low-rent public housing annual contributions | 366,000,000 | 473,500,000 | 473,500,000 | 473,500,000 | 473,500,000 | | | |
| Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund | 25,000,000 | | | | | | | |
| College housing: | | | | | | | | |
| *Increased limitation for annual contract authorization* | *(5,500,000)* | *(7,500,000)* | *(5,500,000)* | *(7,500,000)* | *(6,500,000)* | *(−1,000,000)* | *(+1,000,000)* | *(−1,000,000)* |
| *(Cumulative limitation for annual contract authorization)* | *(5,500,000)* | *(13,000,000)* | *(11,000,000)* | *(13,000,000)* | *(12,500,000)* | *(−1,000,000)* | *(+1,000,000)* | *(−1,000,000)* |
| Appropriation for payments | | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 35,907,000 | [24] 37,500,000 | 37,000,000 | 37,500,000 | 37,000,000 | −500,000 | | −500,000 |
| Total, renewal and housing assistance | 1,212,907,000 | 859,500,000 | 699,000,000 | 849,500,000 | 849,000,000 | −10,500,000 | +150,000,000 | −500,000 |
| METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | | |
| Comprehensive planning grants | 43,838,000 | [25] 60,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | −10,000,000 | | |
| Community development training programs | 3,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | −5,000,000 | | |
| Fellowships for city planning and urban studies | 500,000 | [26] 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | | | |
| New community assistance | | 5,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | −2,500,000 | | |
| Open space land programs: | | | | | | | | |
| *Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization* | *(75,000,000)* | | | | | | | |
| Appropriation | | [27] 85,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | −10,000,000 | | |
| Grants for basic water and sewer facilities | 165,000,000 | 135,000,000 | 135,000,000 | 135,000,000 | 135,000,000 | | | |
| Grants to aid advanced acquisition of land | | 5,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | −2,500,000 | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 7,280,000 | [28] 7,850,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | −350,000 | | |
| Total, metropolitan development | 219,618,000 | 306,350,000 | 276,000,000 | 276,000,000 | 276,000,000 | −30,350,000 | | |
| MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS | | | | | | | | |
| Model cities program | 625,000,000 | [29] 675,000,000 | 500,000,000 | 600,000,000 | 575,000,000 | −100,000,000 | +75,000,000 | −25,000,000 |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriations | 1,466,000 | [30] 550,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 | | | |
| *By transfer* | *(6,171,000)* | *(7,000,000)* | *(6,500,000)* | *(7,000,000)* | *(6,750,000)* | *(−250,000)* | *(+250,000)* | *(−250,000)* |
| Total, model cities and governmental relations | 626,466,000 | 675,550,000 | 500,550,000 | 600,550,000 | 575,550,000 | −100,000,000 | +75,000,000 | −25,000,000 |
| URBAN TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH | | | | | | | | |
| Urban research and technology | 11,000,000 | [31] 30,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | −5,000,000 | | |
| *Low-income housing demonstration programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)* | *(2,000,000)* | *(2,510,000)* | [32] *(2,000,000)* | [32] *(2,000,000)* | [32] *(2,000,000)* | *(−510,000)* | | |
| Total, urban technology and research | 11,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | −5,000,000 | | |

**Footnotes at end of table.**

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12307) COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

| Agency and item | New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date fiscal year 1969 [1] | Amended budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE II—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| MORTGAGE CREDIT | | | | | | | | |
| Homeownership and rental housing assistance: | | | | | | | | |
| *Homeownership assistance, increased limitation for annual contract authorization* | ($70,000,000) | ($100,000,000) | ($80,000,000) | ($100,000,000) | ($90,000,000) | (−$10,000,000) | (+$10,000,000) | (−$10,000,000) |
| *(Cumulative annual contract authorization)* | (70,000,000) | (170,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (170,000,000) | (160,000,000) | (−10,000,000) | (+10,000,000) | (−10,000,000) |
| *Rental housing assistance, increased limitation for annual contract authorization* | (70,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (70,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (85,000,000) | (−15,000,000) | (+15,000,000) | (−15,000,000) |
| *(Cumulative annual contract authorization)* | (70,000,000) | (170,000,000) | (140,000,000) | (170,000,000) | (155,000,000) | (−15,000,000) | (+15,000,000) | (−15,000,000) |
| Appropriation for payments | 7,000,000 | [33] 46,500,000 | 46,500,000 | 26,500,000 | 26,500,000 | −20,000,000 | −20,000,000 | |
| Rent supplement program: | | | | | | | | |
| *Increased limitation for annual contract authorization* | (30,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (−50,000,000) | | (−50,000,000) |
| *(Cumulative annual contract authorization)* | (72,000,000) | (172,000,000) | (122,000,000) | (172,000,000) | (122,000,000) | (−50,000,000) | | (−50,000,000) |
| Appropriation for payments | 12,000,000 | [34] 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 | | | |
| Low- and moderate-income sponsor fund | 500,000 | [35] 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | −1,000,000 | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 1,975,000 | [36] 4,100,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | −600,000 | | |
| Total, mortgage credit | 21,475,000 | 76,600,000 | 75,000,000 | 55,000,000 | 55,000,000 | −21,600,000 | −20,000,000 | |
| FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | | | |
| Flood insurance | 1,500,000 | [37] 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | | | |
| FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY | | | | | | | | |
| Fair housing and equal opportunity program | 2,000,000 | [38] 10,500,000 | 5,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 6,000,000 | −4,500,000 | +1,000,000 | −1,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| General administration | 6,230,000 | [39] 9,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | | +2,000,000 | |
| Regional management and services | 6,778,000 | [40] 10,500,000 | 9,800,000 | 11,905,000 | 10,500,000 | | +700,000 | −1,405,000 |
| Working capital fund | | 5,750,000 | 4,338,000 | 4,338,000 | 4,338,000 | −1,412,000 | | |
| Total, departmental management | 13,008,000 | 25,250,000 | 21,138,000 | 25,243,000 | 23,838,000 | −1,412,000 | +2,700,000 | −1,405,000 |
| PARTICIPATION SALES | | | | | | | | |
| Payment of participation sales insufficiencies | 47,638,000 | 56,238,000 | 56,238,000 | 56,238,000 | 56,238,000 | | | |
| SPECIAL INSTITUTION | | | | | | | | |
| National Homeownership Foundation | | [41] 250,000 | | 250,000 | | −250,000 | | −250,000 |
| Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Title II | 2,155,612,000 | [42] 2,042,638,000 | 1,660,326,000 | 1,897,181,000 | 1,869,026,000 | −173,612,000 | +208,700,000 | −28,155,000 |
| TITLE III | | | | | | | | |
| CORPORATIONS | | | | | | | | |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD | | | | | | | | |
| Construction of headquarters facility | | [43] 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | | | |
| Administrative and nonadministrative expenses (limitation on accounts of corporate funds to be expended) | | | | | | | | |
| *Federal Home Loan Bank Board:* | | | | | | | | |
| *Administrative expenses* | (5,115,000) | (5,325,000) | (5,300,000) | (5,300,000) | (5,300,000) | (−25,000) | | |
| *Nonadministrative expenses* | (14,396,000) | (13,800,000) | (13,800,000) | (13,800,000) | (13,800,000) | | | |
| *Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation* | (340,000) | (360,000) | (360,000) | (360,000) | (360,000) | | | |
| *Department of Housing and Urban Development:* | | | | | | | | |
| *Housing for the elderly or handicapped* | (1,272,000) | (1,200,000) | (1,200,000) | (1,200,000) | (1,200,000) | | | |
| *College housing loans* | (2,275,000) | (1,100,000) | (1,100,000) | (1,100,000) | (1,100,000) | | | |
| *Public facility loans* | (1,227,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | | | |
| *Revolving fund (liquidating programs)* | (100,000) | (100,000) | (100,000) | (100,000) | (100,000) | | | |
| *Federal Housing Administration:* | | | | | | | | |
| *Administrative expenses* | (12,490,000) | (12,525,000) | (12,500,000) | (12,500,000) | (12,500,000) | (−25,000) | | |
| *Nonadministrative expenses* | (97,500,000) | (108,825,000) | (105,000,000) | (105,000,000) | (105,000,000) | (−3,825,000) | | |
| *Government National Mortgage Association* | (10,000,000) | (5,000,000) | (5,000,000) | (5,000,000) | (5,000,000) | | | |
| *Total, administrative and nonadministrative expenses—title III* | (144,715,000) | (149,235,000) | (145,360,000) | (145,360,000) | (145,360,000) | (−3,875,000) | | |

Footnotes at end of article.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12307) COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

| Agency and item | New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date fiscal year 1969 [1] | Amended budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill | New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority | $15,049,246,000 | $15,512,969,600 | $14,909,089,000 | $14,985,449,000 | $15,111,870,500 | −$401,099,100 | +$202,781,500 | +$126,421,500 |
| *Consisting of—* | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriations: | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1969 | (14,299,246,000) | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1970 | (750,000,000) | (15,337,969,600) | (14,734,089,000) | (14,985,449,000) | (15,111,870,500) | (−226,099,100) | (+377,781,500) | (+126,421,500) |
| Fiscal year 1971 | | (175,000,000) | (175,000,000) | | | (−175,000,000) | (−175,000,000) | |
| Memorandum— | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization | (77,000,000) | (2,510,000) | (44) | (44) | | | | |
| Grand total | (15,126,246,000) | (15,515,479,600) | (14,909,089,000) | (14,985,449,000) | (15,111,870,500) | (−401,099,100) | (+202,781,500) | (+126,421,500) |

[1] Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218. Includes 2d supplemental but interaccount transfers are excluded.
[2] Includes $175,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1971.
[3] Includes $25,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-113 and $125,000,000 in S. Doc. 91-36.
[4] Reflects reduction of $210,000 in H. Doc. 91-100 and addition of $160,000 in S. Doc. 91-34.
[5] Reflects reduction of $80,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[6] Reflects reduction of $2,052,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[7] Reflects reduction of $19,672,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[8] Reflects reduction of $7,477,400 in H. Doc. 91-100 and addition of $7,396,000 in S. Doc. 91-29.
[9] Reflects reduction of $80,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[10] Reflects reduction of $45,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[11] Includes $300,000 in H. Doc. 91-113.
[12] Reflects reduction of $405,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[13] Reflects reduction of $17,600,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[14] Reflects reduction of $5,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[15] Reflects reduction of $333,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[16] Reflects reduction of $2,200,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[17] Reflects reduction of $41,151,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[18] Reflects reduction of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[19] Reflects reduction of $3,728,000 in H. Doc. 91-113.
[20] Reflects reduction of $7,500,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[21] Advance funding for fiscal year 1970.
[22] For fiscal year 1970. Original budget estimate of $1,250,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1971 deleted in revised estimate in H. Doc. 91-100.
[23] Reflects reduction of $28,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[24] Reflects reduction of $1,250,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[25] Reflects reduction of $5,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[26] Reflects reduction of $500,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[27] Reflects reduction of $10,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[28] Reflects reduction of $150,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[29] Reflects reduction of $75,000,000. Original budget estimate of $1,250,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1971 deleted in revised estimate in H. Doc. 91-100.
[30] Reflects reduction of $100,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[31] Includes $5,000,000 in revised estimate in H. Doc. 91-100.
[32] By transfer from previous items.
[33] Reflects reduction of $22,500,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[34] Reflects reduction of $7,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[35] Reflects reduction of $2,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[36] Reflects reduction of $4,900,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[37] Reflects reduction of $70,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[38] Reflects reduction of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[39] Reflects reduction of $1,100,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[40] Reflects reduction of $400,000 in H. Doc. 91-100.
[41] Contained in H. Doc. 91-100.
[42] Reflects reductions of $15,000,000 for "Grants for tenant services"; $5,000,000 for "Urban information and technical assistance"; $10,000,000 for "Planned areawide development"; and $7,750,000 for "Urban transportation".
[43] Contained in H. Doc. 91-117.
[44] Included in Urban Research and Technology.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my very deep personal appreciation and I am sure the appreciation of many thousands of veterans in the United States for the fight which the House conferees made to hold this necessary money for construction and modernization of veterans' hospitals in the United States in the bill. I think the House won a battle for thousands of men who were unable to appear here personally to plead their own case on this subject.

In eastern Oklahoma I know we have been waiting to get this modernization of this veterans' hospital for many, many years, and I know there will be thousands who will applaud the action of this House on this matter.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I have these figures straight. This bill is how much above the bill as first passed by the House? Did I understand $202 million?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct. However, $125 million is for disaster relief as I explained.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point here that over $132 million of this money was first considered in the other body; $125 million of it is for disaster relief that we did not even have an estimate on.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. If you eliminate that, the bill is just slightly above the House-passed bill but is still under the revised budget and substantially under the Johnson budget.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would repeat to the gentleman that this bill is some $401 million under the Nixon budget.

Mr. GROSS. This business of how much the bill is under the budget or over the budget does not have a great deal of meaning insofar as I am concerned. I am interested in what the conference did to the House bill, and how it stacks up with the spending for the same general purposes last year.

Does the gentleman have any kind of figure of what was expended in the Independent Offices and Urban Development appropriation bill last year? How much is this above last year's bill?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The appropriations for 1969, including liquidation of contract authority, total $15,126,-246,000 and the conference report carries $15,111,870,500 for 1970. This is $14,375,-500 less than last year.

However, the 1969 total includes some contract liquidations, such as $75,000,000 for open space land programs, and advance funding for urban renewal that are not in the 1970 bill. So the comparison does not accurately reflect comparable programs. There have been cuts and reductions in many items, as the gentleman knows, and of course some of the programs in housing are growing and therefore require some increases. The total is about $3 billion under the budget which was originally presented to the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about the budget. We all understand what budget requests mean. They are more or less like campaign platforms: they are made to be busted and broken. Budgets are the asking price, and the departments and agencies expect them to be cut.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In total it is $14,375,500 less than the appropriations for last year.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It is $14,-375,500 less than last year.

Mr. GROSS. It is $14 million?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is that by virtue of a 75-percent cut in new construction, or what?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Some construction has been deferred.

There have been reductions all the way through the bill, I would say to my friend. We have made reductions below last year and below the budget in the space program; we have made some reductions in housing, we have made reductions in many areas in this bill in which some 20 agencies and the Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development are represented.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that at least there is a ray of hope that one Appropriations Committee of the Congress is making some reductions. I hope this stands up, and does not come back to us in the form of a supplemental appropriation.

Incidentally, was any money put in by the conference to fund the pay raises that became effective earlier this year, or will these be left to a supplemental?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There is no money in this bill for the pay raise.

Mr. GROSS. That cost is left for a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This will come later. There are no funds in this bill for the pay raise.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), in commending this conference report to the House. The committee of conference worked all of yesterday afternoon reconciling the differences between the House-passed and the Senate-passed bills. Of course, the managers on the part of the House had engaged in preliminary conferences before meeting with the Senate conferees.

We bring to the House today a conference report which we feel is deserving of the support of the House. As the report indicates, 50 amendments had been adopted by the Senate to the bill that passed the House back in June. All except four of these amendments were cleared up in conference and four are brought back in disagreement and these will require affirmative approval today by the House if the bill as agreed to in conference goes to the President for his approval. I strongly urge the House to approve the motions that will be made by the chairman with respect to the four amendments.

I am including below a tabulation showing the pertinent actions taken by the House, the Senate, and the conference committee with respect to this bill:

| | |
|---|---|
| House bill: | |
| Johnson budget | $18,197,672,000 |
| Nixon budget | 15,380,413,600 |
| House bill: | 14,909,089,000 |
| Below Johnson budget | −3,288,583,000 |
| Below Nixon budget | −471,324,600 |
| Senate bill: | |
| Budget considered by Senate | 15,512,969,600 |
| Senate budget over House | +$132,556,000 |
| Disaster relief | +125,000,000 |
| CSC salaries and expenses | +160,000 |
| GSA-FBI Academy | +7,396,000 |
| Senate bill | 14,985,449,000 |
| Senate bill over House | +76,360,000 |
| Conference: | |
| Conference bill | 15,111,870,500 |
| Under Senate budget | −401,099,100 |
| Under House budget (Nixon) | −268,543,100 |
| Over House bill | +202,781,500 |
| Over Senate bill | +126,421,500 |

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5. Page 4, line 4, strike out "of which $175,000,000 shall be available during the fiscal year 1971 for the Appalachian Development Highway System."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert ", of which $175,000,000 shall be available for the Appalachian Development Highway System, but no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for expenses in connection with commitments for contracts or grants for the Appalachian Development Highway System in excess of the amount herein appropriated."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14. Page 10, line 16, strike out "$19,137,000" and insert "$13,248,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,533,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34. Page 31, line 25, after "expended" insert ": *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,800,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction for construction of Federal regional operation centers."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50. Page 52, line 4, strike out: "None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project." and insert: and "None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals for projects not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided,* That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks on the conference report just passed and include tabular material and all Members may also extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON S. 2917, COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint two additional conferees on the bill, S. 2917, the Coal Mine Safety Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as additional conferees on the bill (S. 2917) the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

The Clerk will notify the Senate of this action.

## PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

## JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amirault.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF JESUS J. RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called House Resolution 86, referring the bill (H.R. 1691) to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. BEATRICE JAFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1865

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding any limiting law or regulation, the Veterans' Administration is authorized and directed to pay insurance benefits to Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe, of 248 East Twenty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, New York, in accordance with the national service life insurance application of her late husband, Hyman Jaffe, executed on September 14, 1943, in the amount of $10,000 and identified by insurance number N-14 238 056 for which monthly premiums were duly deducted from the Army pay of the serviceman during his active service and prior to his discharge on April 19, 1945. Payment of the $10,000 authorized by this Act shall be made notwithstanding the adverse determination made on or about September 18, 1945, that the original application for insurance could not be accepted in absence of a medical examination. Any amount paid under the authority of this Act shall be reduced by the amounts of any refunded premiums.

No part of the amount authorized in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY of New York: Page 1, lines 3, 4 and 5, strike "That, notwithstanding any limiting law or regulation, the Veterans' Administration is authorized and directed to pay insurance benefits" and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000".

Page 1, line 6, after "New York," insert "in full settlement of her claims against the United States for insurance benefits".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6375) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6389) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

YAU MING CHINN (GON MING LOO)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CAPT. MELVIN A. KAYE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1453

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain Melvin A. Kaye (Air Force service number FV3166742) of Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, the sum of $10,831.84 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising out of the destruction of his household goods on August 1, 1968, near Houghton Lake, Michigan. At the time of their destruction, the household goods were being shipped at Government expense from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, in connection with his assignment to a permanent station at Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "$10,831.84" and insert "$3,628.22".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. RUTH BRUNNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9488) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. IRENE G. QUEJA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 564) for the relief of Mrs. Irene G. Queja.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. SABINA RIGGI FARINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3629) for the relief of Mrs. Sabina Riggi Farina.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PLACIDO VITERBO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3955) for the relief of Placido Viterbo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM PATRICK MAGEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9001) for the relief of William Patrick Magee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 901) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2302) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unan-

imous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## MILOYE M. SOKITCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3571) for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERRING JURISDICTION OVER CLAIM OF PHILIP J. FICHMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10658) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Philip J. Fichman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## CAPT. WILLIAM O. HANLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 882) for the relief of Capt. William O. Hanle.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## REFERENCE OF CLAIMS OF BRANKA MARDESSICH AND SONIA S. SILVANI

The Clerk called House Resolution 498, to refer the bill (H.R. 4498) entitled "A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice .

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

There was no objection.

## MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11500) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12089) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## IRVING M. SOBIN CO., INC., AND/OR IRVING M. SOBIN CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1782) for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Co., Inc., and/or Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## MR. AND MRS. WONG YUI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 92) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 92

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui shall be held and considered to have been born in China.

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

## DUG FOO WONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2019) for the relief of Dug Foo Wong.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## TIMOTHY L. ANCRUM (ALSO KNOWN AS TIMMIE ROGERS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3590) for the relief of Timothy L. Ancrum (also known as Timmie Rogers).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

## REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF JOHN S. ATTINELLO

The Clerk called House Resolution 533, to refer the bill (H.R. 3722) entitled "A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 275]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Frelinghuysen | Powell |
| Ashley | Gallagher | Pryor, Ark |
| Belcher | Giaimo | Pucinski |
| Bevill | Griffin | Purcell |
| Blackburn | Harrington | Rees |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Howard | Reid, N.Y. |
| Cahill | Jones, Tenn. | Rooney, Pa. |
| Casey | Kirwan | Rostenkowski |
| Celler | Landrum | Scheuer |
| Chappell | Leggett | Sisk |
| Clark | Lukens | Stephens |
| Clay | Mathias | Stratton |
| Dawson | May | Stuckey |
| de la Garza | Melcher | Teague, Tex. |
| Denney | Morgan | Thompson, N.J. |
| Diggs | Morse | Tunney |
| Downing | Morton | Udall |
| Esch | Murphy, N.Y. | Ullman |
| Fascell | Passman | Utt |
| Findley | Patman | Whalley |
| Fish | Pirnie | Wold |

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 708 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 708

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14794) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, all points of order against lines 4 through 10, on page 12, and lines 14 through 20, on page 16, are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 708 provides that during the consideration of H.R. 14794, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriation bill, all points of order are waived against lines 4 through 10 on page 12, and against lines 14 through 20 on page 16.

The language on page 12 covers traffic and highway safety. The authorization bill, H.R. 10105, has passed the House but has not been acted on by the Senate.

The language on page 16 covers urban mass transit. H.R. 13827, the applicable authorization bill, passed the House on October 23. Passage was subsequently vacated and S. 2864 was passed in lieu thereof after being amended with the House-passed language. The House then requested a conference and the Senate agreed to a conference on November 12.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 708 in order that points of order may not be raised against the portions of the bill set forth above.

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

House Resolution 708 provides for a waiver of points of order, as the gentleman from Tennessee has explained, in two specific sections of the bill:

The first is found on page 12, lines 4 to 10. This appropriates funds for the traffic and highway safety program which has not yet been authorized. The bill has passed the House but not the Senate.

The second is found on page 16, lines 14 to 20. This section appropriates funds for the urban mass transportation fund. The legislative bill has passed both Houses in different forms and is now in conference. The appropriation contained here is about 50 percent of the House-passed authorization.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14794) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14794, with Mr. JONES of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies brings this bill to the floor today. I am pleased to report that all members of this subcommittee are in complete agreement with the bill, except in one instance.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third year of operation of the Department of Transportation, and it is the third year the Committee of the Whole has considered this bill. The Subcommittee on Transportation spent a considerable amount of time in hearings on the bill and we have voluminous hearings in three volumes.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, all the committee members agree that the Department of Transportation under the able leadership of Secretary Volpe is directing itself to some of the great problems that the Department has experienced and will experience in the foreseeable future. I think it can be said and I think Members will agree with me that Under Secretary James M. Beggs, the Deputy Secretary, Charles Baker, and all the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Transportation, men who have been appointed by the Secretary, are men who have considerable knowledge and expertise. In their appearances before the committee all of us were impressed by their knowledge and dedication.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to serve on a subcommittee with such wonderful colleagues. All of the members of the subcommittee are active and hard working. They question the witnesses closely and with a great store of knowledge. As chairman, I could not ask for finer cooperation on either side of the aisle.

We lost a valuable member when the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), due to the pressure of his other committee assignments, decided not to serve on the subcommittee this year. His replacement, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), brought new thoughts and made a significant contribution to the deliberations of the committee in his first year.

The able and experienced member from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), who is himself a pilot, is a real expert on matters involving the FAA and is a ranking minority member who, in the fine tradition of the Committee on Appropriations, always places the national needs above political consideration.

My two Democratic colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), continued their excellent service to the committee, the Congress, and the country. It is a privilege and honor to serve with them.

Also at this time, Mr. Chairman, I pay my respects to the staff of this committee, to chief of staff Ralph Preston, who has been with the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years and was assigned to the subcommittee 3 years ago. He is one of the most able members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. Also I pay my respects to Thomas Kingfield, an associate on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that this bill may become known as the SST bill. The SST is certainly the single program included in the scope of the bill, which has received the most publicity. I think you will find from the hearing record that the committee gave an appropriate amount of attention to the SST. Volume 3 of the hearings, which totals 348 pages of testimony, is concerned solely with the SST.

However, such a designation would be inappropriate. There are many other very important transportation programs funded in the bill that reflect a degree of detailed effort that, I am sure, every member of the subcommittee takes pride in. Mr. Chairman, I believe we performed our duties well and have brought a good bill to the House.

We recommend the appropriation of $6,614,430,000 for the transportation programs financed in the bill now before us. Of this amount, $4.5 million is liquidating cash and just over $2 billion is new obligational authority. The reduction recommended below the budget request is $158,175,000; but, Mr. Chairman, as our population and our economy grow, our transportation needs grow also, and the bill would provide $596,438,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for the same activities.

Early this year, the chairman of the full committee added the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to the jurisdiction of the Transportation Subcommittee. This is the first time that appropriations for these agencies appear in the transportation appropriation bill. Since they are obviously a part of the Federal transportation picture, we welcome them and believe that the opportunity to analyze their programs has added to the overall knowledge of the committee in the area of transportation.

In addition to the $158 million reduction referred to, the committee also placed limitations on obligating authority on programs funded under contract authorization. Such authorizations were limited to $95 million, a reduction of $45.5 million.

This year the Congress and the executive branch have been very mindful of expenditures and I am pleased to re-

port that the estimated expenditure reduction reflected in this bill is $172 million, a greater sum than in any other appropriation bill reported thus far this year. This is because of reductions made in liquidating cash which has a direct, almost 100 percent, impact on expenditures in this fiscal year.

The bill includes funds for approximately 67,100 civilian and 38,200 military personnel. This is an increase of 5,200 civilian and 400 military personnel over fiscal 1969. The civilian personnel increases provided for are almost exclusively related to safety functions, both in the FAA and the Federal Highway Administration. The committee denied increases for military and civilian personnel totaling over 500 positions. This was offset, however, by the addition of 1,000 air traffic control personnel over the 2,800 in the budget.

I would call the attention of the Members of the Committee to the summary of the major actions recommended in the bill which is found on page 5 of the report. These actions are as follows:

First, the additional of 1,000 air traffic control personnel above the 2,800 in the budget for a total of 3,800 new air traffic control personnel;

Second, the addition of $90,000,000 more than the $134,000,000 budgeted for equipment and facilities for the FAA to help ease the crises in air congestion and enhance safety in aviation;

Third, the appropriation of the $95,958,000 requested for the continued development of a civil supersonic transport aircraft;

Fourth, a reduction of $100,000,000 in liquidating cash for the highway construction program as an estimate of the impact of the President's program to achieve reductions in federally assisted programs;

Fifth, a reduction of $20,000,000 in liquidating cash for the State and Community Highway Safety program based on the estimated impact of the ceiling on budget outlays;

Sixth, a reduction of $20,000,000 in the acquisition, construction, and improvement program of the Coast Guard based on the impact of the construction curtailment;

Seventh, a reduction of 2,500 personnel in the Coast Guard Selected Reserve;

Eighth, a reduction of $4,000,000 in the high-speed ground transportation research and development appropriation based on the required reduction in outlays and on large unobligated balances;

Ninth, a reduction of $12,000,000 in the request for transportation planning, research, and development in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation;

Tenth, a reduction of $30,000,000 in research and technical studies for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration;

Eleventh, reductions in liquidating cash of $12,000,000 in the forest highways and $5,000,000 in the public lands highways programs due to the restrictions on federally financed construction; and

Twelfth, provision of the $43,173,000 requested for the Federal share of the subway system in Washington, D.C.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides $24,020,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. This is a reduction of $8,880,000 from the budget request of $32,900,000. The amount recommended is $7,870,000 more than the $16,150,000 provided in fiscal year 1969. Most of this increase is occasioned by a large one-time appropriation of $4.5 million for the cost of moving many of the elements of the Department into the new Nassif Building in Southwest Washington. The committee conducted very detailed hearings and had a staff investigation made of the activities and related costs involved in the Department's move into the new building. We wanted to insure that the cost to the Government was held to a minimum and that the employees of the Department were given every possible consideration in this movement.

On balance, the committee approves of the consolidation. The various offices and activities of the Department were widely scattered in the city of Washington—at 14 different locations. It is hoped that greater efficiency will be promoted by consolidating these activities in two buildings in the same area in Southwest Washington.

The January budget requested $6.4 million for expenses related to the move into the new building. This request was withdrawn and at the present time no budget estimate is before the Congress, so the $4.5 million recommended by the committee is technically an amount above the budget. The Department did present an unofficial request for $6.5 million in the hearings. It was this request on which the committee based its action and its $1.9 million reduction.

We are particularly disturbed by the handling of parking in the new building. Floors 2 through 10 of the Nassif Building were leased by GSA and will be occupied by various elements of the Department of Transportation. The David Nassif Associates, the owners of the building, leased the parking facilities to Parking Management Inc., a commercial automobile parking firm. PMI, as this firm is known, is charging $35 per month for parking space in the building. The committee felt that GSA should have leased this space and provided it to the employees for a monthly amount, which would cover actual expenses but would not allow a profit to be made. Departmental employees presently working with the FAA and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation in Federal Office Building 10A, a Government-owned building, pay a little over $6 per month per parking space as contrasted to the $35 per month rate in the privately owned Nassif Building.

The committee heard not only the Department of Transportation on this matter, but representatives of the General Services Administration, who claim they have no authority to lease this parking space. We looked into the matter thoroughly and think they made a very weak case since, at the same time, GSA is leasing parking space in connection with a leased building called the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md. GSA had based its position with respect to the Nassif Building on a decision of the Comptroller General on a matter in Mobile, Ala. Neither the Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Administration, who handled the matter for the Department, or the Regional Administrator of the General Services Administration requested a specific ruling of the Comptroller General with reference to the Nassif Building.

The committee was told of a plan which would lessen the cost of parking space to the employees in the new building by forcing the employees in the FAA building, Federal Office Building 10A, to share in the cost. Under this plan their parking fee would go from $6.25 a month to $23 or $24, the same amount that would be paid by the employees housed in the Nassif Building. The committee is uncertain as to the legality of this so-called parking equalization plan, and has asked the Comptroller General for clarification.

The committee also feels that the arrangement under which the new building will be occupied on a floor-by-floor basis as construction of an individual floor is completed, is an unnecessary inconvenience for the employees of the Department. The dust, dirt, confusion, noise, and greater degree of safety hazards inherent in such an operation is obvious, but, again, the Department and the General Services Administration agreed to this procedure—agreed to start paying rent on the building on a floor-by-floor basis as floors are completed. Members desiring to obtain more information on this matter can read the committee report on pages 8 through 11, and that part of the committee's hearings in volume 2 where the matter is discussed in considerable detail.

For salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary, $11.5 million was recommended instead of the $12.9 million requested. The committee has approved only 15 of the 97 new permanent positions requested. The past 2 years—the first 2 years of the Department—the committee provided language permitting the transfer of personnel from the various administrations of the Department into the Office of the Secretary, as determinations were made that such transfers would be in the best interest of the Department. The Department, again, requested such language this year, but the committee feels that the Department is now mature enough to tell Congress what jobs it wants where, and to budget them and justify them on this basis. Therefore, this requested language is denied.

Other departments of the Government are not permitted such leeway and we believe that at this point in time the Department of Transportation can follow the regular budget procedure in this matter.

Also in the Office of the Secretary, a very large increase was requested for planning, research, and development. The fiscal year 1970 budget request was $20 million compared to the appropriation of $6 million of last year. We recommend an increase of $2 million—the appropriation of $8 million and a reduction of $12 million.

COAST GUARD

The Coast Guard is one of the great organizations in our Government. It has the reputation for operating a trim ship and for being cost conscious. In the operating expenses of the Coast Guard, the committee recommends a less than 1-percent reduction, recommending an appropriation of $386 million and a reduction of $3,015,000.

A rather sharp reduction is recommended in the acquisition, construction, and improvement appropriation of the Coast Guard, but this reduction is based on the application of construction curtailments and expenditure limitations which have been tentatively applied in the executive branch. It is believed at this point in time, that the Coast Guard will be permitted to obligate about $22 million less than in the budget. The committee's reduction of $20 million leaves some leeway for the Coast Guard in this area. The committee has provided funds for the one high-endurance cutter requested in the budget and the six new helicopters requested.

For the most part, this should not be considered a reduction, but a postponement in that the facilities included in the budget will, at some point in time, be required by the Coast Guard. The committee believes that the sum recommended is realistic in view of the fiscal situation and the present policies of the administration with regard to expenditures and construction.

In the area of reserve training, a reduction of $700,000 is recommended in the $26.6 million request. More significantly, a limitation on the numbers of personnel in the selected reserve in the Coast Guard is recommended. The authorized level at June 30, 1970, is 17,500. After having requested and received a staff investigative report on the operations of the Coast Guard Reserve and after discussing the matter during the Coast Guard hearing, we believe that the Coast Guard Reserve could be improved by a reduction in personnel. Committee investigators found that in the training program, the motivation and the morale of the Coast Guard were at a very low level. We believe that it is imperative that a peacetime mission, other than training, be found for the Coast Guard Reserve if it is to be continued. The Reserve is oriented basically toward the wartime mission of the Coast Guard, not to its peacetime mission, which is much broader and covers many more areas of operation and offers many opportunities for being of real assistance. I believe that in working with the Coast Guard we will improve the Coast Guard Reserve and reduce unnecessary expenditures.

A sizable increase is recommended for the research, development, test, and evaluation program of the Coast Guard. The sum of $4 million was provided last year and $14.5 million is recommended this year. Of this increase, $4 million is related to the detection and control of oil pollution and $6.5 million is for the national data buoy development project. Both of these are important new functions of the Coast Guard. The data buoy program involves the development and deployment of unmanned ocean data buoys in the Gulf of Mexico. The Coast Guard plans to utilize the Mississippi test facility of NASA for the reduction of data gained. It seems like the program, as presented, will provide important weather and other information for that area of the country.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

With the growth of aviation, the Federal Aviation Administration has grown into one of the larger organizations in the Government. The budget request for the FAA totaled more than $1 billion, and $1,139 million is recommended.

The committee recommends the full $767 million requested for operations in the Federal Aviation Administration. This includes the hiring of 3,800 new air traffic controller personnel. The budget requested an increase of 2,800 personnel in this area and the committee has added an additional 1,000 personnel.

It was developed in the hearings that the Administrator of the FAA felt that the number of additional personnel provided in the budget was inadequate and that he was trying to get the Bureau of the Budget to approve a supplemental request of $5 million to provide an additional 1,000 controllers. The committee, in its markup on the 3d of November, voted to include the 1,000 controllers requested. Later that week, the President sent a letter to the Congress in which he requested 1,000 controllers and stated that the funds in the budget would be adequate to provide for the salaries of these personnel for the short part of the fiscal year in which most of them would be on board. I would point out to the Committee, that next year when these personnel will be on the rolls for a full year considerable additional funds will be required.

All of the Members of the House fly from time to time—some several times every week. We all know of the increasing congestion in the air, and we all know of the increasing safety problems associated with this congestion. It is my feeling that it will be the sentiment of the House, and of the other body I might add, that the positions which we recommend adding should be added. There may be some who feel that the additional $5 million should have been provided, but the FAA has operated under continuing resolutions for almost one-half of the fiscal year. There have been slippages, there have been savings. The FAA has grown rapidly in recent years and there is some fat which could be cut out without impairing safety in the air. I believe the committee's recommendation is a good one.

In the area of facilities and equipment, the committee recommends an appropriation of $224 million, an increase of $90 million more than the budgeted amount. The budget in this area only provided funds for automation of the en route traffic control system. The committee believes that there are additional urgently required items such as long-range radars, terminal-area radars, communications, and new control towers, and recommends the appropriation of the additional funds. In the hearings it was disclosed that the FAA believed that $116 million would be required for a list of items in addition to those in the budget. The committee studied the list and believes that the highest priority items can be accommodated with the $90 million recommended.

Included in the list are 54 new control towers. These towers are listed on page 15 of the report and they are the 54 towers of highest priority on the list submitted by the FAA, and were the only towers included in the FAA's supplemental request.

A $14 million increase over fiscal year 1969 is recommended in the funds for research and development for FAA. It is felt that with the rapid growth of aviation activity, the present equipment will not be able to fully cope with the situation in which we will find ourselves in a few years, and that new and better equipment will be required. To that end, an appropriation of $41 million is recommended as compared with the $27 million provided in fiscal year 1969. The recommended amount is $6,500,000 less than the budget request.

The SST would be funded at $95,958,000 in the committee's recommendation. This is the full amount of the budget request. We have already appropriated $623,000,000 for the development of the SST. It is estimated that $662 million more will be required to complete the development and testing effort.

As I said when I began, this program is controversial and it has been for several years. It is an expensive program. It does involve development of a civil aircraft, but since 1962 Presidents have recommended the program and Congresses have voted to continue the program. I believe that this Congress will go along with this President's recommendation that the program be continued further and be completed. To stop the program now would be to lose not only the $623 million already appropriated, but additional funds for termination costs, which could amount to another $50 million. The contractual arrangements are such that if we complete the funding of the development program and the manufacturers sell 300 SST aircraft, royalty payments will accrue to the Government in a sum equal to the Government's investment. If as many as 500 aircraft are sold, and this is not altogether out of the question, the Government will gain an additional $1 billion.

There are those who are quite disturbed by the SST—some are even emotional about it. They point to sonic boom and engine noise, and dangers of flying at 1,800 miles an hour above 60,000 feet and think that the program should not go on. Of course, those of us who have studied history know that the first steam locomotives, steamboats, automobiles, as well as airplanes, were considered to be dangerous objects and, by many, to be completely impractical. The history of transportation, not only the history of aviation, is the history of ever increasing speed—and the SST is the latest step in this direction. It is not a step being taken in this country alone. The British and French, working together, have developed and have flown and have flown supersonically, their SST transport called the Concorde. The Soviet Union has like-

wise developed and flown, and flown supersonically their SST transport, TU-144. The competition is ahead of us. The American plane will be larger, will carry more passengers, will fly faster, and we think, be more attractive to the airlines and to the public. We will not be the first in the SST market, but we will be the best.

Today, more than 80 percent of the jet aircraft sold are manufactured in this country. If this country fails to develop an SST, this will not remain true. We will continue to sell subsonic aircraft, and I would trust many of them, but the leadership role will pass to those who fly the fastest as it always has, and if American-owned airlines cannot buy American SST's they will buy foreign built SST's. Our aircraft sales have been a bright spot in a very dreary picture in recent years in international trade and balance of payments. Sales of aircraft and a healthy aircraft manufacturing industry involve hundreds of thousands of very valuable jobs in this country—the high-paying, skilled jobs to which all workers aspire. The loss of these jobs and the loss of sales to foreign competitors would be felt throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe those who continue to raise the specter of SST aircraft flying supersonically across the United States, with the resultant sonic booms awakening citizens, breaking windows and creating general havoc and confusion are completely unfair, in view of the repeated statements by those in the executive branch and in the Congress close to the program that SST's will only be permitted to fly over water or unpopulated land areas until the sonic boom problem is solved. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this problem will be solved easily or quickly or in the generation of aircraft to which we address ourselves today. The marketing estimates for our SST, the 300 aircraft sales break even point, are based on an overseas flight market, not on flying over the United States. I do not think it is realistic to imply that the citizens of this great Nation are so powerless or that their representatives in the Congress are so powerless that such an intrusion would ever be permitted.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who say that we should not spend money on the SST—that we should spend it for some of the great social programs to meet some of the great social needs in our country today. Mr. Chairman, I am an advocate of funding to meet the social needs of the country. Mr. Chairman, I know that the funds to pay for the social programs must be based on the productivity of this Nation and I believe the SST will add to that productivity and help generate the funds to pay for some of the social programs. The funds we are asking for the SST would not go very far in meeting the funding requirements of our social programs, but the SST and the other great productive efforts of the country will underwrite those programs.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the committee's record in the last 3 years in connection with financial management in the Federal Highway Administration. We have created new appropriations. We have established limitations. I think we have to a very great extent, increased congressional control over the operations of the Federal Highway Administration and have found areas in which unnecessary expenditures could be curtailed. Since much of the money spent by the Federal Highway Administration has been from the highway trust fund there are those who would say that this is not real money and does not come out of the general funds of the Treasury and, therefore, we should be lax in its administration. I say this is not so. American taxpayers pay their tax dollars into the highway trust fund just as they do into the general funds of the Treasury, and we are charged as guardians of the public purse with the proper administration of these funds. I point with pride to the committee's record in this area.

This year we have created a new appropriation and have broken out the Office of the Administrator as a separate appropriation item. This Office had been funded heretofore by bits and pieces from several other appropriation accounts. It was difficult to see just how much was being spent in this area and just how it was being spent. We believe that the new separate account will facilitate congressional scrutiny and scrutiny in the administrative branch of this Office. We provide $14.1 million for this Office.

Some reductions are recommended in the Bureau of Public Roads, which is also set up in a single appropriation account after the establishment of a separate account for the Office of the Administrator. The committee found in the hearings that the Bureau of Public Roads had not given Congress as good information as it should have had as to just how it would spend funds allocated to it. These matters were discussed in detail in the hearings and some reductions are recommended in this area. A total reduction of $10.1 million is recommended for the Bureau of Public Roads, of which $7 million is in a new comprehensive corridor transportation demonstration program. We could obtain very little information about this program, since it is in an early planning stage. We allow $1 million in planning funds in lieu of the $8 million requested.

In a somewhat unusual recommendation we recommend the deletion of $100 million in liquidating cash for the funding of the Federal-aid highway program. This recommendation is based on an estimate furnished by the Federal Highway Administration and the Department of Transportation of the action which will probably be taken by the Administration in this area. Since almost half the fiscal year is gone, it is felt that the guidance in expenditures which has been given on an interim basis is likely to be rather firm.

Under our recommendation, no reduction in obligations for the highway program this fiscal year will be required or would be recommended. It is believed that by careful management of the expenditure of funds in the program, the $100 million reduction in this $4.5 billion appropriation will not have an adverse impact on highway construction. I will point out that this is more in the nature of a deferral than a denial of funds in that under the contract authority provisions under which the Federal-aid highways program is administered, the Government must honor its commitments and must provide the liquidating cash which is required. It is felt that with the expenditure problem facing the President and facing those of us in Congress in this fiscal year, this rather minimal reduction will have to be made whether we make it now or not.

A total of $40 million is provided for a new right-of-way revolving fund which promises to be of assistance in expeditious handling of payments involved in the acquisition of rights-of-way and relocation expenses. This is a new program which was passed in the Highway Act last year.

For highway beautification, the committee recommends $5 million in liquidating cash rather than the $10 million estimated in the budget. This reduction is based on recent figures submitted by the Department in connection with the limitations on outlays currently in being. The highway beautification program is another area in which there has been considerable controversy. It has not been an entirely satisfactory program. The program was placed on a contract authority basis last year rather than a straight appropriation basis which it had been under heretofore. The committee recommends a limitation of $16.1 million on obligations in this program in fiscal year 1970, which includes $15 million for direct expenses of the program and $1.1 million for administrative expenses.

In traffic and highway safety, the committee recommends appropriation of $27,550,000 instead of the $34,146,000 requested. This is an area in which great contributions to highway and traffic safety are being made. This is an area in which the automobile safety standards are administered. This is an area in which research and development is done in areas of additional safety devices such as the air-bag device which is now under very active development.

In the hearings, it was developed that the highest priority requirement of this organization was for additional personnel and the committee has approved all of the 38 additional positions requested. In addition, we recommend approval of 13 of the 23 positions associated with the administration of the State and community highway safety program. Of the total recommended increase, more than $2 million is for the contract research program of the National Traffic Safety Institute. This would make $19 million available in 1970 compared with $16,950,000 in 1969. The committee feels that these increases are warranted and that continued important contributions will be made by the Department in this area.

The State and community highway safety program is that part of the highway safety program in which grants are made to States on a matching fund basis for highway safety programs in the States. The program operates under contract authorization and $50 million liqui-

dating cash was included in the budget. The committee recommends the appropriation of $30 million, a reduction of $20 million based on the most recent estimates of the administration and the Department of the actual requirements for the fiscal year.

The committee recommends a limitation of $65 million on obligations in this program in fiscal year 1970—the same amount as was provided in fiscal year 1969. The committee is concerned that this program is being administered in such a way that proper matching funds are not being required from all States. The General Accounting Office studied this problem and issued a report which was discussed in detail in the hearings. The committee feels that the funds spent in this area should be for the Federal share of new highway safety programs in the States, and that Federal funds should not be utilized to fully fund new programs by the acceptance of ongoing State highway safety programs as the State contribution in this area. It is the feeling of the General Accounting Office and of the committee that this is not the intent of the law and certainly not what was testified to be the intention of those administering this program in the past. This matter is discussed in the Report and in the hearings. It is our understanding that the Bureau of the Budget is also concerned about the administration of this program and we hope that improvements will be made in this area before next year's hearings.

Rather sharp reductions are recommended in both the forest highways and public lands highway programs. Both of these programs are 100 percent federally financed construction and fall under the present 75 percent construction freeze. The $30 million requested for liquidating cash for forest highways has been reduced to $18 mllion, and the $12 million for public lands highways has been reduced to $7 million. Obligations for forest highways are limited to $12 million and for public lands highways to $3 million. In both of these instances, the recommendations are based on the latest estimates of the executive branch in this area.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Under the Federal Railroad Administration the only program of real size is the high-speed ground transportation research and development program for which $14 million was requested and $10 million is recommended. In making this reduction, the committee has directed that no part of the reduction be made in the ongoing demonstration programs such as the Boston to New York turbotrain and the New York to Washington metroliner.

There are considerable unobligated funds in this program, and they totaled $11.7 million at the beginning of the current fiscal year. This amount, along with the $10 million recommended in the bill, will provide $21.7 million of obligating authority in this fiscal year. Reductions will be made in the research efforts. The committee believes that the amount provided will be sufficient to fund the most urgently required efforts.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

The committee held detailed hearings which we recommend to the Members, on the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. We had a staff investigative study which reviewed in depth the operations and activities of this Administration, and found that the management was incredibly sloppy and that for the funds administered by the organization too few personnel were available to oversee the proper use of the funds. Therefore, we recommend 70 new positions for this Administration, and a salaries and expenses appropriation of $1.5 million. This is a reduction of $500,000 in the $2 million request.

A total of $220 million is recommended for the urban mass transportation fund. This is a reduction of $30 million from the budget estimate of $250 million. In the housing bill which passed the House about 2 weeks ago and which has also passed the Senate, $300 million is authorized for this program. These funds are for fiscal year 1971. It has been the practice of Congress to advance fund the urban mass transportation program in order to give the cities and counties an opportunity to finance their share of the program. We believe that this procedure should be continued and recommend advanced funding in this instance.

Of the $220 million recommended, $176 million is for grants to various programs and the remainder is for research and development, and technical studies. The reduction is applied to this research and development area. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration has spent funds on research projects which seem quite removed from the realities of mass transportation and transportation in this country. The hearings are informative in this regard. The committee has not specifically denied any individual programs, but was assured by personnel and officials of UMTA that a careful screening of these activities would take place.

RELATED AGENCIES

For the related agencies, $5 million is provided for the National Transportation Safety Board, an organization which investigates catastrophic or fatal accidents and has done an extremely fine job. They have made many worthwhile recommendations to the FAA and to other organizations as to ways of improving safety. The amount recommended is $100,000 less than the budget request.

For the Civil Aeronautics Board—$10.2 million was recommended for salaries and expenses—a reduction of $200,000. Payments to air carriers are also provided. The $33.5 million recommended is a considerable decrease from the amount provided last year and is indicative of the downward trend in subsidy payments to air carriers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is provided $25 million as compared with the $24.6 million provided last year and the $25.5 million requested. The committee recommends the full budget request for the Federal contribution to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. We believe that the Washington subway is at long last about to be constructed and feel that the full amount of the request is a realistic requirement for this fiscal year. Overall, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the committee's action is marked by selectivity. We have reduced items where we found that they could be or would be reduced. We have added funds in those instances where we thought that funds were urgently needed and that further delay would not be in the national interest. We have looked at all the items I think objectively and with a desire only to do a workmanlike job.

CONCLUSION

I want to commend witnesses who appeared before us for their forthright answers. In many areas we requested and received the information concerning reductions in personnel, budget outlays and in construction programs which had been imposed on a temporary or interim basis by the administration, fully realizing that witnesses are reluctant to give such information to congressional committees because this may lead to reductions. But the witnesses were frank with us and I believe we have been fair with them.

As I said earlier, it is a real pleasure to chair the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations and work with such an active and interested group of men. We had good attendance at our hearings. We had active participation by all members. They usually met early and stayed late and took short lunch breaks. We started late in the year for a number of reasons, but we performed our work in an expeditious way and the entire atmosphere was one of interest and stimulation and intellectual activity. I wish to commend all my colleagues for the fine work they did and especially thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee for his cooperation. I think we can accurately say that this subcommittee is nonpartisan in a political sense and that Democrats and Republicans worked together as one. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I will be delighted to yield to my colleague.

Let me say before I yield to the gentleman that our hearings on the SST were the most lengthy and extensive hearings held by any committee of the Congress in this area. On this subject the subcommittee is particularly indebted to the distinguished and knowledgeable gentleman from Illinois, my good friend (Mr. YATES).

If Members of the House will just follow his incisive and probative questioning all through the hearings, I think they will see that he brought out some exceptionally fine points. His questioning was extensive and it was knowledgeable and I express the committee's gratitude to our colleague for the manner in which he conducted himself in the hearings on this very, very important and controversial item.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman well knows that I consider him to be among the most valuable Members of the House. I cer-

tainly consider him to be one of the finest chairmen of any committee of the House.

The gentleman, I know, wants to be accurate. But he said with respect to the sonic boom a few moments ago that the SST will not be permitted to fly overland unless the sonic boom problem was solved. That is not in accordance with the statement of the gentleman of the FAA and of the Department of Transportation when they testified before our committee. I wonder whether the gentleman equates the phrase with the one that they used, which is as follows.

They said:

The supersonic transport will not be allowed to fly supersonically over populated areas unless and until the noise factor comes within acceptable limits.

Acceptable to whom? The FAA is under an obligation. It is charged with the responsibility of doing everything it can to assure flight of the SST. There are some experts who believe that if the SST is not permitted to fly overland, if it does have the sonic boom restrictions against flight overland, there is a very serious question as to whether it would be economically viable.

This being true, it seems to me that the pressures will become very, very intensive upon the FAA to be less firm against sonic boom and to promulgate a noise standard that would permit supersonic aircraft to use American airports. And I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the noise factor from the supersonic aircraft is greater than it is for today's jets, certainly, with respect to sideways noise, at least.

Second, with respect to sonic boom I say the average American is entitled to total freedom from a jarring, disruptive, nerve-shattering type of pollution—and I use the word "pollution" advisedly, because it is noise pollution, such as the sonic boom.

Is it the gentleman's understanding, and does he state to the House that the SST will not be allowed to fly supersonically over the United States as long as it generates a sonic boom?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, that would be my position on it. Let me say this, before I yield to my friend on the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), that in this particular area the gentleman from Illinois was most helpful. I think you made an excellent record with reference to the evil of noise pollution. As you have indicated, it is pollution. I do not think anyone in the United States ought to be subjected to that kind of disturbance. I agree with you totally. I do not totally agree with the remarks which were made by the Administrator of the FAA, Mr. Shaffer, who is one of the fine members of this Government and an extremely able Administrator. I think that the word "acceptable" is precisely as you have suggested. It ought not to be left as "acceptable" without adding "to whom?" I agree with the gentleman completely. If it is not acceptable to fly supersonically, then I say there ought to be rules that would prevent it from flying over any populated areas. There is no question about that in my mind.

I am delighted that you have made the record on that point. As I said, you were particularly helpful to the committee in this area. I think you made a fine record here. I think the FAA ought to understand, and I think the Secretary of Transportation ought to know that we are concerned about this. We do not expect that they are going to permit the SST to fly over populated areas using their yardstick—acceptable to the FAA or to the commercial airline industry.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that statement. It will let the FAA and the Department of Transportation know the viewpoint of this committee.

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the sonic boom, as I understand the hearings, the economic viability of the SST is based upon the premise that aircraft would be flying only over water, and not over land.

Further, with reference to the conversation here about the word "acceptable" which has been used by the administrative head of the FAA, I do not know whether we need to argue about what acceptable means. I think both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) have said that they would not have the SST fly over the United States with a sonic boom which would damage the people below, and I agree with them. I suppose each of us would have his own definition of what "acceptable" means, if you want to get into the field of semantics. What I understand Mr. Shaffer to mean is that it would be acceptable to anyone in the United States.

But I think the standard ought to be, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has outlined it, that there should be no flight of the SST over the United States when there is a sonic boom problem.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think what my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), has said is very good. He, too, as I understand it, joins the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) in stating that it is our intention and our desire as Members of Congress and hopefully the viewpoint of all the Members of Congress, that supersonic flight will not be permitted over the United States as long as it generates a supersonic boom.

The reason I believe it is important to state this position now is because the former director of the supersonic program, Gen. Jewell Maxwell has said, and this is why I am so concerned and why I cross-examined the Administrator so strongly when he appeared before the committee. This is what General Maxwell said:

We believe people in time will come to accept the sonic boom as they have the rather unpleasant side effects which have accompanied other advances in transportation.

Some have referred to the sonic boom as the sound of progress. Others have called it the 20th-century sound. If this is the kind of attitude some proponents of the SST take, I think we must make it very clear that it is the intention of Congress that there should be no supersonic flights that generate a sonic boom over the United States by any commercial plane. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) agree to that.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in response to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, about the sonic boom, I want to say, as the gentleman has already said, that I do not know, in my 6 years of having followed progress of the SST program, of anyone who has gone into it in greater detail or more carefully than my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), but the gentleman has brought up the question of sonic boom, and I want to make it unequivocally clear that the Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, and the FAA Administrator, John Shaffer, have in very clear words said there would be no flight of the SST over land masses.

If the gentleman will bear with me, I will read several paragraphs from a speech that the FAA Administrator made on November 17 before the Long Island Association of Commerce and Industry, at Long Island, N.Y. In speaking of the sonic boom and the SST program, Mr. Shaffer said:

Let's talk for a minute about the sonic boom. There is a lot of misunderstanding about this issue and frankly, I'm not too surprised. Speculation on the sonic boom has run rampant of late. All sorts of dire consequences are being predicted. I personally believe that these "scare stories" will be dissipated in time, first, as we learn that the boom *would* be rather than what it's reported to be; and, second, as we demonstrate that we do, indeed, intend to respect the wishes of our citizens and respond to their watchfulness in this matter.

The fact is that the "boom" is a sudden sound, similar to a thunder clap. It can be startling if you are not expecting it. The sonic boom from the American SST will not damage anything on the ground or on the sea, but it could surprise—or startle—people if they are unprepared for it.

Now I want to make this point about the SST and sonic boom, or as we water people say "now hear this." There will be no sonic boom nuisance or annoyance because the whole program is based on the President's policy that the plane will not be operated at boom-producing speeds over populated areas.

The 2707-300 program is based on supersonic operations *only* on overwater routes (it's a "water bird") and unpopulated areas, such as those north of the Arctic Circle. This doesn't mean it can't be flown—subsonically—over land, or that it can't serve certain major inland cities. The plane is designed so it can be flown efficiently at subsonic speeds for considerable distances. It will fly subsonically when approaching or leaving airports, and during those times when its flight routes take it over populated areas.

Now a little plain English on what the sonic boom would be like if we *could* hear it. The boom created by our SST flying at high

altitude is only three or four per cent as powerful as those which could—and have—caused damage to buildings. The effect of the boom from the SST is much overrated and almost universally misunderstood. Sonic booms of 50 to 100 pounds per square foot can be destructive; but the boom from the SST is two pounds per square foot.

Mr. Shaffer goes on in some detail. His speech is reproduced in the RECORD for yesterday at page 34366 for those who care to read it.

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

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

Mr. YATES. May I ask a question of my good friend from Ohio. Is it his understanding as well that there will not be supersonic flights by commercial planes over the United States so long as they generate a sonic boom?

Mr. MINSHALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I should like to commend the gentleman for an excellent statement on the bill, on which he has done a tremendous amount of work. He has been an able chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation.

I should like to commend also the gentleman from Massachusetts for his comments on supersonic transportation. I believe it ought to be stressed in this discussion about supersonic transportation problems that, concurrent with the problems of pollution, with the problems of noise abatement, with the problems of sonic booms, all of which will have to be worked out, whether it means planes will have to fly subsonically over land or otherwise. These are all technological problems and arguments that have to be worked out.

But it must be stressed that the SST and supersonic transporation are with us, and commercial supersonic aricraft will be with us in a short period of time.

The French and British Concorde will be in existence. The TU-144 will be in existence.

So the age of the supersonic transport aircraft is here. The question is whether the United States is going to stay competitive in this area of the sale of airplanes, as we are now when aircraft of Boeing and Douglas have practically been enjoying a monopoly in the sales of planes throughout the world.

The question is whether or not we are going to forgo this leadership, this economic competitive leadership, to other nations in the world, or whether we are going to stay in this race in this advanced age of aviation and have our own supersonic transports.

I believe firmly we must stay in it and that we must produce a supersonic transport.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I believe he is precisely right.

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

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

Mr. YATES. On the question of the gentleman's statement about competition and the Russian plane, General Quesada, formerly the Administrator of the FAA, in his statement to the review committee said this on that point:

I do not mean to imply that there should not be a supersonic transport program. But I would like to see controlled, if not eradicated, this demand that we must beat the Russians. As far as I am concerned, the Russians can never compete in the open market with the supersonic transport or any other type of transport in the next four decades. They just cannot make ariplanes. And in my opinion the supersonic transport that the Russians have could not be given away.

Mr. BOLAND. Those are General Quesada's remarks. I am sure if the Russians were willing to give them away somebody would take them. They are now in the process of attempting to sell them not only to Italy but also to Japan and India.

General Quesada is a very able man in the field of aeronautics. He does not suggest killing the SST program, as I understand it. General Quesada suggests that we go ahead with additional research and development.

All I know, from what was developed by the committee, is that any effort to go ahead further only with research and development is a positive and total waste of money. We have gone as far as we possibly could on research here. Now, we need to proceed with phase three, and get into prototype development, with 100 hours of test flying. Then there is a gap between the prototype development and the production area, so that they can work out some of the bugs.

I think one of the greatest authorities in aviation design in this country is Dr. Bisplinghoff, who is one of the great educators at MIT. His background is in the record. I have never read a statement by anyone with a finer background or with better knowledge of the field of aeronautics than Dr. Bisplinghoff. His testimony before the committee was that to go on with research and development is a waste of money and that we are now ready to go into the development of the prototype and that we ought to do it.

At this point in the RECORD I insert the biography and statement of the distinguished Dr. Bisplinghoff:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. RAYMOND L. BISPLINGHOFF, DEAN, SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Dr. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Dean of the School of Engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is a recognized authority in aeronautical and space research and development.

Dr. Bisplinghoff was on leave of absence 1962–1966 while serving as Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. At this time he was responsible for the leadership of NASA's activities in advanced research and technology in aeronautics and space programs looking toward space flight beyond the Apollo program. These responsibilities embraced direction of NASA's Langley, Ames, Lewis, Edwards and Electronics Research Centers. In 1966, Dr. Bisplinghoff was consultant to the Administrator of NASA, and chief scientific advisor to the Federal Aviation Agency Administrator.

Born in Hamilton, Ohio, in 1917, Dr. Bisplinghoff received the Aeronautical Engineer degree in 1940 and the S.M. degree in physics in 1942 from the University of Cincinnati. He was awarded the Sc.D. degree in 1957 by the Swiss Federal Institute, Zurich.

From 1937–40, Dr. Bisplinghoff served as an aeronautical engineer with the Aeronca Aircraft Corp., Middletown, Ohio, and from 1940–41 as a vibration engineer at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. Dr. Bisplinghoff spent 3 years with the University of Cincinnati (1941–43) as research associate and instructor of aeronautical engineering. From 1943–46, he was an engineering officer in the Navy Department's Bureau of Aeronautics.

Dr. Bisplinghoff came to MIT in 1946 as an assistant professor of aeronautical engineering. He was made an associate professor in 1948 and professor in 1953. He was named deputy head of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics in 1957 and head of the department in 1966, following his NASA service.

Since coming to MIT in 1946, Dr. Bisplinghoff has been responsible for the development of research and instruction in flight vehicle structures. He also served the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics as director of the Aeroelastic and Structures Research Laboratory and as chairman of the Aerospace Research Division. Together with Dr. H. Guyford Stever, then at MIT, he carried out a 3-year program of research on the effects of atomic bomb blasts on flying aircraft.

Dr. Bisplinghoff has received many honors in his profession including membership in the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. He received the Certificate of Achievement for atomic tests at Eniwetok Atoll from the USAF-Operation Greenhouse, and the Sylvanus Albert Reed Award, 1958, for developing ways to calculate aircraft loads and stresses during maneuvers. In 1955 he was honored as 19th Wright Brothers lecturer and in 1962 as the third Samuel P. Langley Memorial lecturer, University of Pittsburgh. From 1956–57 he was a post-doctoral fellow for the National Science Foundation. In 1963 he was invited by Japan Society for Aeronautical and Space Sciences to present lectures at Tokyo, Nagoya and Osaka. Recipient of the Honorary Sc.D. degree at the University of Cincinnati 1963, Dr. Bisplinghoff was the third annual Von Karman lecturer, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 1965. In 1965 he received an honorary doctorate in engineering from the Case Institute of Technology. He was elected national president, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics for 1966. Dr. Bisplinghoff is also a member of Phi Eta Sigma, Tau Beta Pi, Sigma Xi, and a member of the Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C.

Past professional affiliations of Dr. Bisplinghoff include membership on committees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and later the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. During World War II he was a member of several Army-Navy-Civil Committees. He also participated in several U.S. Air Force and U.S. Navy boards and committees including the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board.

Dr. Bisplinghoff's current professional affiliations include fellowship in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; American Association for the Advancement of Science; Honorary Fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; Royal Aeronautical Society; American Astronautical Society. He is a member of the American Society for Engineering Education, Association of Former Students of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, the Visiting Committee of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, member from the United States of the International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences, New York Academy of Sciences, Sonic

Boom Committee and Scientific and Technical Communications Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, International Academy of Astronautics, International Astronautical Foundation. In addition, he is chairman of the Aeronautics and Space Engineering Board of the National Academy of Engineering and director, Engineers Joint Council.

Dr. Bisplinghoff is the author or coauthor of numerous articles and three books: "Aeroelasticity," "Principles of Aeroelasticity" and "Solid Mechanics."

Dr. Bisplinghoff, his wife, the former Ruth Doherty, and their two children, Ross and Ron, reside in Wellesley, Mass.

STATEMENT OF DEAN OF SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, MIT

Dr. BISPLINGHOFF. I welcome the opportunity to appear before you this morning to give you very briefly my assessment of technological readiness for proceeding with the development of prototype supersonic transport airplanes. As you know, we are considering design objectives, cruise speeds of 1,780 m.p.h. above 60,000 feet for distances up to 4,000 statute miles, that have never before been achieved with commercial transportation standards of safety, reliability and economy. The SST is the only truly advanced-technology, high-performance supersonic airplane under development in the United States at this time. Its successful completion will be the result of synthesis, development, test, and perfection of thousands of components that have never been built before. The question of readiness is one that has been and rightfully should be raised at this point in aviation history, and this is the question that I intend to speak to.

In early August of this year, I had the opportunity to review with Boeing and General Electric engineers the status of the airplane and the engine as they stood at that time. My remarks this morning will be based largely upon this review.

The original conception of a supersonic transport by aeronautical engineers was based upon a principle laid down some 60 years ago by the French engineer, Louis Breguet. Breguet showed that the range of an airplane, or the distance it can travel, is the product of three factors: aerodynamic efficiency, propulsive efficiency, and structural efficiency.

It was realized in the early 1960's by quite a few people in the industry and in NASA and the Federal Aviation Agency that if certain levels of efficiency could be reached in these three areas, supersonic commercial air transportation would be economically attractive. A large part of the question of technological readiness is answered by assessing our ability to reach these efficiencies. After reviewing the results of the wind tunnel tests, engine tests, and structural component tests, both on my own and with my two colleagues—Dr. Arthur Raymond, the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif., and Dr. Ernest E. Sechler, executive officer for aeronautics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.—at a previous time, we became convinced that the efficiencies that can be reached in these three areas are sufficient to construct a supersonic transport weighing roughly 750,000 pounds that will carry nearly 300 passengers over a range of 4,000 statute miles with a mach number of about 2.7.

In view of the change from a variable sweep to a fixed wing configuration in 1968, it is logical for anybody who looks at this program to ask, "Now, how sure are we now that the underlying technologies can be brought together in a successful overall design?" The aeronautical engineer can answer this question with assurance provided he has had the time to proceed through enough airplane design cycles. In the case of the 2707-200, the variable swept wing airplane, it was found that as we progressed through four design cycles there resulted a continuous reduction in structural efficiency and a corresponding degradation of range and payload. It was for this reason that in 1968 it was concluded by Boeing and the Federal Aviation Agency that there should be a reexamination of the airplane configuration. I can report, however, that as the Boeing Co. has progressed through four of the design cycles of the present 2707-300 airplane, they find a solid convergence in aerodynamic, propulsive and structural efficiencies. It is this result, obtained by an experienced design team, that gives me the confidence to predict that we can achieve with the 2707-300 configuration the payload and range characteristics that I mentioned earlier.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, achievement of payload and range in an SST design is only part of the story. Can it be achieved with the commercial transportation standards of safety, reliability, and economy of operation? I can say frankly it is more difficult to answer this question with the same assurance as the previous one because much of the answer will depend upon the detail design and the prototype flight test experience, yet to be completed. One can observe, however, that the history of airplane design shows we have consistently been able to design and build higher performance and more complex aircraft with even higher standards of safety, reliability, and economy, than their predecessors.

There are numerous examples of design features in the 2707-300 airplane where higher levels of safety and reliability than ever achieved before are being sought. Let me give you a couple of examples very briefly.

Development of automatic flight management was started early in the SST program to reduce pilot workload during short flight times with numreous events demanding attention. Such automation puts the pilot in better command of the airplane and could considerably improve safety during periods of poor visibility. On the present-day subsonic aircraft system, reliability and flight safety has been achieved largely by using many nonintegrated elements such as cables, beams, power units, instruments, and two pilots cross checking procedures. The SST, to achieve safety, will require automatic flight control systems and advanced cockpit displays. Achievement of safe and reliable automatic flight controls has stimulated the development of multiple-control activating systems with duplicated electronic control channels devised to detect failure and automatically take the action required to continue normal flight. Automatic flight controls can also relieve the pilot in congested traffic, provide a smoother and safer ride through rough air, and permit automatic landings in extremely adverse visibility. These are all things that go well beyond anything we have done in the past in terms of flight control.

Another example of a higher level of safety to be achieved in the SST is its fireproof structure. Contemporary aircraft use titanium extensively as firewall material because of its superior resistance to penetration by fire. This material is actually used for the fuselage shell surrounding the passenger compartment of the SST and will provide a safety advantage relative to today's aluminum structure, because of its much greater resistance to external fire damage during crash conditions. The stimulus of the SST program could hasten the day when all future aircraft will utilize titanium structures for both cost and safety reasons. Indeed, one could conclude that many technological advances already in process and to be completed for the SST will apply to the whole of air transportation. These include not only safety advances stemming from automatic flight control equipment and fireproof structures, as I mentioned earlier, but flight efficiency improvements derived from advances in structures; propulsion; aerodynamics and lightweight components; manufacturing advances particularly in the realm of titanium structures applicable to other equipment; and, finally, flight operations advancements that will permit the efficient handling of increased air traffic. As a result of these comprehensive efforts to improve the safety, reliability of the SST, there is no reason, in my mind, to believe that the consistent trend of aircraft engineering history, which tells us that the SST can be safer and more reliable than its predecessors, will reverse itself.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would reaffirm my belief that aeronautical technology has been developed to the point where we can now construct a successful supersonic commercial air transport and that enough comprehensive design studies have been completed to give us a configuration that is very close to optimum. There are no justifiable technical reasons for delay in constructing prototype aircraft and little could be gained, in my opinion, and in the opinion of those who joined me in the evaluation group from the outside, by continuing this program further in an R. & D. status.

This completes what I have written down in terms of a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions.

I will yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER), and then I would like to wind this matter up.

Mr. OTTINGER. This is on another subject, Mr. Chairman.

Robert Nelson, the outgoing head of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, told the Appropriations Subcommittee during hearings on the Department of Transportation bill—and this is in response to a question from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES)—that the Penn Central Railroad had not complied with roadbed specifications called for in the contract between the ePnn Central Railroad and the Department of Transportation for the development of the Metroliner. The roadbed at present does not meet the contract specifications. Penn Central's position was stated to be that if the Government wants the roadbed ungraded, it would have to bear the cost. I want to make it clear on the record it is the intent of the Congress that the Penn Central Railroad be held to the terms of its contract without additional subsidy by the Government.

Therefore, I will ask the following question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is it the intent of the committee that the Penn Central Railroad be required to bring its roadbed up to the standards in the specifications of its contract with the Department of Transportation without further Government subsidy?

Mr. BOLAND. I am glad that the gentleman from New York raised that question. It is the intent of the committee to have the Penn Central Railroad honor its obligation with respect to the roadbed without coming to the Federal Government for a handout on it.

This question was developed in the hearings as a result of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) questioning one of the Government witnesses on an accident that occurred at Glenn Dale, Md., where one passenger was killed. The

evidence was adduced that if it had been a Metroliner involved at the greater speeds at which it travels, there would have been a considerable number of people killed or injured in the crash.

So I agree with the gentleman from New York that the Penn Central Railroad ought to take care of its own problems on the roadbed and not expect to come to the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This question is not on the SST. I want to commend the gentleman and his colleagues for the time that they have spent on a very vital element of the whole transportation question, which is the question of urban mass transport. Particularly I congratulate them on allowing additional personnel for the Urban Mass Transit Administration, including those in the field of research.

I heartily concur with what is said in the report that what is needed in the field of mass transit for the future is fewer paper studies, and more action-oriented programs. They did a great job there, although I have to say that I am disappointed in the advance appropriation for research and development and demonstration, which has been pared from $50 to $25 million.

What I just said about action-oriented programs was one of the reasons for this cut, but I would ask the gentleman, knowing his belief in mass transport, whether, should the administration, under what I think is a dynamic new leader, Mr. Carlos Villereal, show an intention to get into action-oriented projects and programs, the gentleman and his colleagues would feel kindly about some effort at a later stage of this legislation to restore the research funds?

Mr. BOLAND. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, the thrust of the whole action that the committee took here was in that direction. We would like to see better research performed on fewer programs to solve some of the mass transportation problems with which the gentleman from Wisconsin is so familiar, serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency from which authorizing legislation comes on mass transportation.

It is the feeling of the committee, and has been for some time let me say, that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration is spread too thin on research and development. It is our feeling, and we think this will be agreed to by my colleagues on the committee, that there have been too many programs in research that are really not paying off. With the expenditure of the $25 million recommended in this bill, it will come to approximately $120 million for research and development with respect to mass transit that has been obligated to date.

I must say that we have very little to show for it. There are some great programs in which they are engaged and upon which they are concentrating. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the committee feels as you do, and we are concerned about trying to solve some of our mass transportation problems. If they will come up with programs that have direction and point to a solution of these difficult problems that we face in mass transportation, the committee certainly will fund them.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. I am gratified at his response.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me for this question.

The gentleman knows that mass transit is one of the urgent priorities in this country. It affects every area of this country. The gentleman knows that all we have in the bill before us for mass transit is $220 million, both for capital grants and for research and development.

With respect to research and development the sum of $25 million appropriated is actually $5 million less than appropriated for the current year.

When one thinks of the fact that the Nixon administration is going to bring in a bill—and there are other bills already pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency—which would spend upward of $10 billion either over the next 4 years or the next 12 years depending upon which bill we are looking at—does it make sense to cut down on research and development? I say this because the Nixon administration has asked the Appropriations Committee for $50 million for research and development. Yet the committee in its wisdom cut that amount to $25 million.

I ask the gentleman whether it makes sense to do that when we hopefully will soon be spending billions of dollars for capital grants and research and development is so very, very important to make certain that each capital grant dollar is used wisely.

Now, it is correct when the gentleman says that research and development to date has not fulfilled our expectations. But there is a new group in the DOT working with former Governor Volpe who have a great commitment to mass transit which up to now has been treated as a stepchild.

When you look at the funds this Congress has appropriated for research and development generally and in other fields, we find we have appropriated $96 million for the SST, $41 million for the FAA, $1.5 million for NASA outside of the Apollo program. When you think of the moneys that we are investing, and correctly so, on research and development in a great number of important areas, when we have one of the most significant areas; namely, mass transit that affects every one of our citizens, is it right to reduce the research and development appropriation from the modest $50 million administration request to $25 million?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman poses a very good question. However, some of the programs which UMTA is directing its research efforts in mass transportation are not the kinds of programs that will solve our problems in this area. It was the feeling of the committee after looking at the program—and we looked at it in detail—that not all these research programs should be funded this year. If you will pick up the justifications, I think you will find there are a number of programs that I think you yourself would not approve.

I totally agree, you cannot solve the problems of mass transportation without research, or the problems of housing without research; there is no question about it. You cannot solve problems of pollution, or many of the other problems with which we are perplexed today, without adequate research. I could not agree with the gentleman more. But my disagreement only comes in the fact that there are some programs in the budget that ought to be dropped, and we gave them an opportunity to drop them. The Administrator testified that he was going to take a very close look at these research programs. We gave them $25 million; we reduced this $5 million below the level of the previous year. We are just trying to tell them to get on the ball, keep your feet toward the fire.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the gentleman that the areas of research and development that we are talking about are tunneling, air pollution controls, center city programs, express bus systems with express lanes, a moving belt, or a moving sidewalk.

Mr. BOLAND. I would say to the gentleman that some of those are fine. The gentleman is naming some of the good ones. I am sure we could detail some others that are not so good.

Mr. KOCH. I agree with the gentleman. The point I want to make is this, that of the $250 million that was requested by the Nixon administration, under the provisions as originally requested, no more than $50 million could have been spent for research and development.

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

Mr. KOCH. And would what was not used for R. & D. would be used for capital grants.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administrator Carlos Villareal, has said that the request for funding from the various States will exceed $400 million for capital projects, and that is just a very small drop in the bucket of need. So what I intend to do when amendments are in order, is to offer one, and I would hope the gentleman might consider that amendment and accept it at that time—it would restore the appropriation for mass transit to $250 million with a maximum restriction of $50 million for research and development, with the expectation that not a single dollar will be spent on excess R. & D., and whatever is not used for R. & D. would be used to fund additional capital grants.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 55 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have taken so much time. I am terribly sorry. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio can yield some of his time to those on this side who wish to speak on the bill.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this marks the third

time, and the second full fiscal year I have had the privilege of joining the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on the Department of Transportation Appropriations in presenting the transportation appropriation bill to this Chamber.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is a hard act to follow. As usual, he has presented an exceptionally detailed, excellently prepared, item-by-item analysis of the bill. He completely covers the fine print. As the ranking minority member of this great subcommittee, it is a privilege to work with a chairman who has the great ability that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I want to join in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee, and the entire committee, for presenting what I believe is a balanced and realistic appropriation measure on the important transportation matters facing the country.

I believe the record developed with respect to the SST earlier and the supersonic boom problem will serve the committee and the Congress very well. As was developed during the dialog and the colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) the Congress must be concerned with and guard against any adverse problems associated with the sonic boom problem.

However, I would like to make a couple of observations, in addition to the sonic problems, we must realize we are dealing primarily with prototype aircraft at this point; many of the concerns expressed will be researched and solutions for operational technicians advanced, prior to full-scale production. I believe that some of the questions raised are somewhat hypothetical, and I believe there will evolve over a period of time more specific answers to these unusual aeronautical problems.

There is one final point I would like to make. The Armed Services Committee and the Congress for years have been financing appropriations to build aircraft purely for defense purposes. A lot of the advanced technology in the aerospace field has come as a result of expenditures directed toward building these aircraft for defense purposes. Most of the comfortable civil air travel of today and the economic benefits associated with aviation have come as a result of these dollar commitments.

I would like to look on this as expenditures for offense purposes. I am referring to an international economic and technologic offensive. I think it is about time the American people generally understood that this kind of expenditure will pay many, many dividends in the future as we move toward maintaining a first position in the field of aerospace technology. In a nuclear age, a defense posture, by itself, will not give us the kind of security we all desire. Worldwide air marketing and free nation building must be the wave of the future. The SST, jumbo jets, and advanced aerospace technology are the necessary ingredients for a successful air borne freedom ideological offensive.

Therefore, I support the committee's efforts to keep the United States ahead in this vital field.

The free world nations must move forward toward developing economic interdependence. We need more foreign trade in order to minimize or eliminate foreign aid.

By our action today, we will decide whether or not our aviation, airport and airways systems and equipment are superior or whether the Soviet Union and/or other countries grab the lead in aviation technology.

Balance of trade and our balance-of-payments problems are directly involved in this question.

This is a day of decision. America is at the crossroads in aviation history. I urge my colleagues to keep the United States out in front by supporting the SST and other aviation programs. We want to build a better world for all mankind.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I will not reiterate all of the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the gentlemen from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), in which he so excellently reviewed the items on a line-by-line basis. We can discuss those items as debate progresses.

As was pointed out, the appropriations for transportation calls for a grand total of $6,614,430,000.

I will not reiterate what he has so excellently reviewed on a line-by-line basis. We can discuss these items as debate progresses. As has been pointed out, the transportation appropriation calls for a grand total of $6,614,430,000, of which some $4 billion is in the highway trust fund.

This is an overall reduction of $158,175,000 from the 1970 departmental request. That represents a very substantial savings to the taxpayer.

Those of you who know my record are aware that I am always gratified when economies can be achieved. My years on the Appropriations Committee constantly reaffirm that reductions can be made, no matter what budget comes under our surveillance. It may come as a surprise today to those acquainted with my economy voting record that I point this time with pride not only to the economies we have achieved in the transportation appropriation bill, but also toward two increases.

Specifically I refer to additional personnel and funds the committee has approved, at my urging, for air safety.

The report of this bill is significant for it authorizes FAA to add 1,000 new air traffic controllers to their request for 2,800, bringing the total to 3,800. FAA has assured me that 3,800 trainees will not put a strain on their Oklahoma City facilities. Air traffic continues to burgeon, the skies are becoming increasingly crowded and dangerous. Since it takes as long as 4½ years to fully qualify an air traffic controller in a busy terminal like New York, Washington, or Cleveland and more than 3 years for a smaller terminal, the time to start training these men is now, if we are to meet the burdens future years will impose. I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the air traffic controllers for their many hours of hard work. There is, of course, no reckoning in dollars the toll in human life and suffering which accompany a commercial airline tragedy. These personnel are a sound investment, good insurance.

The major increase to which I call the attention of the House is for $90 million, for air safety facilities and equipment.

Insufficient or antiquated equipment has no place in the air world of the 1970's. It has been more than 3 years since any funds were provided for air control towers. There are 54 locations across the Nation which meet FAA criteria for towers. Our increase will permit their funding.

It will provide, too, for additional long range and terminal area radar, for new sectors at 19 locations, for remote center air-ground channels, for modernization of towers at 95 locations and for other long overdue, urgently needed updating of facilities and equipment.

I believe this House recognizes and will approve expenditures which will provide a maximum of safety for air travelers.

Safety has been a vital consideration throughout our hearings, reaching into all facets of transportation we reviewed. We approved more than a million dollars more for 1970 than 1969 for traffic and highway safety under the Federal Highway Administration, an increase of almost a quarter of a million dollars above the 1969 appropriation for motor carrier safety programs, more than a quarter of a million more than 1969 for the Bureau of Railroad Safety, and an increase of $202,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board.

The key to this appropriation bill is safety: Safety in the air, at sea and on the ground. We have attempted to eliminate overlapping or duplicatory safety programs and have achieved economies without jeopardizing any safety feature of any of the Transportation Department's duties.

Obviously, the controversial portion of today's bill is the request for $95,958,000 to continue prototype development of the civil supersonic aircraft. Included in this request are $5 million for supporting research and development and $2.6 million for program management.

I am aware there are many who sincerely feel this money might well be channeled into other domestic uses, or eliminated completely to reduce Federal expenditures.

Let me anticipate those comments by saying here and now that continuation of the program will provide new employment for an estimated 50,000 persons in the prime air frame and engine manufacturing industries. This new employment has been projected to as many as a quarter of a million new jobs in pe-

ripheral industries supplying the major contractors and subcontractors. These new jobs will be for people at all economic levels. I do not believe we should overlook this very important benefit of the SST program, or ignore the fact that if the SST is canceled these new job opportunities will evaporate.

This is a projection for worthwhile peacetime employment which will also assure U.S. leadership in world aviation during the 1970's and 1980's. You must realize that if American industry does not have an SST on the market, our airlines will make their purchase abroad. Aircraft exports are an important factor in our balance of trade.

Cancel the SST and you will see a supersonic flight of U.S. dollars overseas which will seriously disrupt that balance of payment, as well as throwing American workers out of jobs.

Time is all important. Soviet, French, and English versions of the SST already have been flight tested. The Russians flew their TU-144 in December 1968, the French Concorde was tested last March. Two foreign supersonics already have been in the air while we argue the desirability of continuing our own program.

Our country has spent many billions of dollars to put a man on the moon. I cannot understand why we suddenly balk at spending a total of $1.3 billion in Federal money on a program based on a royalty payment basis which assures a return of nearly $1 billion of the Government's investment. Add to that new tax revenue generated by increased employment, sales, and air travel.

I urge you to give these facts your most serious consideration—not only America's prestige is involved, but a vast segment of our economy.

This, then, is the fiscal 1970 Department of Transportation appropriation—a money bill from which we have pared $601 billion-plus in nonessentials, a budget in which we have given safety and progress top priority.

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

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

Mr. YATES. It was recently reported that when the French-Anglo Concorde made its maiden flight this past winter, NBC reported that on takeoff the roar of its four engines could be heard in villages 20 miles away, and the Concorde is expected to be even noisier on approach.

Do you think if Concorde exhibits that much noise, it will be allowed to land at American airports? Second, if it is not allowed to land in American airports subsonically, can it be designated a commercially viable airplane?

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad to have the gentleman's remarks, and if the gentleman will bear with me, I will quote a speech recently made by the FAA Administrator in Long Island, N.Y., in response to a question like that. I think it is better to have it in his words than in mine. The Administrator said:

Another concern that is being voiced relates to the noise of the 2707-300, apart from sonic boom, let's look at that. There are three types of noise to be considered—community noise under the flight path on climb-out, community noise on approach, and sideline noise at the airport itself during ground run and takeoff. Taking these one at a time, we have so much power in this airplane, to enable it to accelerate through the transonic regime, that it takes off in a short (8000 ft.) distance (10,300 ft. field length) and climbs out like a "homesick angel."

The airplane will be about twice the usual altitude at the classic three and a half mile distance from brake release point (1,800 ft. and climbing). Likewise, we expect the SST to be quieter than today's jets on approach. This is accomplished primarily by means of a choke on the supersonic air inlets that keeps much of the sound from coming out the front.

We do have a problem on sideline noise, but we have a development program going on between Boeing and General Electric to improve this. One means of attacking that part of the noise problem has been identified which involves breaking up the low frequency sounds into higher frequencies which do not carry as far. We understand the problem, we are working at it, and we expect, by the time the production airplane rolls out, that this problem will have yielded to the intensive and extensive development efforts being waged on aircraft noise.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks correctly give the testimony of the FAA Administrator, but my question was directed at the Concorde. My reason for this statement is because I remember the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) attended the airshow, and he came back after having seen and after having heard the Concorde and made the statement that he never heard such a racket in his life as the surface noise from the Concorde.

The gentleman from Ohio stated a few moments ago that we have competition from the British-French Concorde and the Russian Tupolev. If the noise of the Concorde will be so great, will it be allowed to land at the airports at Boston and Chicago and New York and Los Angeles? Will it be as great as the gentleman suggested and as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) suggested, and if so, will it be allowed to fly into those airports?

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert on the noise made by those other jets. The gentleman however, has made a case for the American SST program, and we can practically guarantee it will not have anywhere near the noise factor of that you claim the British-French Concorde.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my point was directly the result of the argument the gentleman was making, that the Concorde is competitive. If the Concorde cannot fly into those airports, if the noise of its motors and engines is so great, can it be competitive?

Mr. MINSHALL. As I say, I am not an expert on that.

Mr. YATES. There would be a very serious consideration which would have to be given by the FAA as to whether it will permit the Concorde to fly into those airports.

Mr. MINSHALL. The gentleman is looking a little further down the road than my expertise permits.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I was at the air show this year and the year before that and the year before that, and I was there the first time they brought one of the Concordes in, but I did not find the noise was so shattering

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that the noise the morning after a night out in Paris can be very penetrating and deafening.

Mr. YATES. And sometimes it can be much more quiet.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, referring to page 16 of the report, under "Construction, National Capital Airports," that breaks down to $1.3 million for the National Airport and $1.9 million for Dulles Airport. Are any of these funds to be used for expansion at National Airport?

Mr. MINSHALL. As far as I know, none of these funds will be used for expansion at the Washington National Airport. I stand to be corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. BOLAND. None of the funds are scheduled to be used for expansion of Washington National Airport.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, know the gentleman has other subjects to cover, and I do not want to belabor the SST program, but is it not true that today, in the air transport field, we have one item in which the industry of the United States has not priced itself out of the world market?

Is it not true that 80 percent of the planes which are sold throughout the world are from the United States, and that here, so far as our balance of payments is concerned, is the one hope—as I see it, at least—that we can continue to maintain our supremacy and protect our balance of payments.

Mr. MINSHALL. The gentleman has made a valid point, and I heartily concur.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Is it not a further fact that most of the airplanes which have been developed and sold were built by the airplane manufacturers and were not subsidized by the Government?

Mr. MINSHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. We discussed this at great length in the committee.

This is such a massive program that one cannot possibly see it being handled by private industry as an economically viable project.

Mr. ADDABBO. There is one further

point, since there has been brought up the remarks of the FAA Director, Mr. Shaffer, about sound at Long Island. When he was out at Long Island he was nowhere near Kennedy Airport. If he had been near Kennedy Airport he would not have been able to hear his remarks.

When we speak of 3½ miles, at every major airport there are people living within 500 feet. At 3½ miles a person can sleep, but not 500 feet away.

Mr. MINSHALL. This is one thing I cannot understand. People complain about the noise at airports, but more frequently than not we find they moved to that area long after the airport was in existence.

Mr. ADDABBO. This may be the case for some of them, but not for most.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time. I am very appreciative for his thoughtfulness not only on this occasion but also for his many courtesies during the committee sessions. I am afraid I took a great deal of the time of the committee on this SST problem, and I am grateful to all the committee members for the consideration that was shown at that time in permitting the SST to receive the thorough review that it did.

I want to express not only my very distinct pleasure at serving on a subcommittee that has such fine members but also particularly to state to the House my feelings about our very fine chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), who, apart from his superlative personal traits and his general excellence as a legislator—and, as I stated before, I consider him to be one of the most valuable Members of the House—is also a superb chairman. He is fair. He is impartial. He is thorough.

I recall that the great Sam Rayburn used to say, when the late Congressman Albert Thomas used to take the floor with his independent offices appropriation bill, as he paid him the greatest compliment that Mr. Rayburn would give to any Member, "He knew his bill."

So it is, too, with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. As has already been made clear on the floor of the House and will be made clear in the further debates, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows his bill. It is a pleasure to serve on the committee with him.

Mr. Chairman, I will have two amendments that I will offer to this bill. One will seek to strike the $96 million for the SST program. The other will seek to prevent the use of any funds to construct any airport in Florida unless there first shall have been obtained a joint study by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Transportation stating that such construction will not upset or interfere with the ecology of the Florida Everglades.

Mr. Chairman, let me discuss my second amendment first.

This is not a local Florida problem, although the Everglades do lie in Florida. The Everglades belong to the Nation. Their natural beauties and wonders make this area one of the most uniquely spectacular sights in the United States and in the world, to be sure.

Just as the attempt to alter the Grand Canyon by building dams in proximity to it projected a national controversy, so, too, has a controversy been raging over the question of building a jet port in the Everglades.

Conservationists and nature lovers and, to my mind, every American who wants to preserve America's natural beauties for our children and as a part of our natural heritage want the Everglades protected. I propose to offer an amendment which will do that.

On the SST, Mr. Chairman, the discussion has already shown my views. I made my views much more amply and thoroughly known in the report to the committee, where I filed separate views. I dislike very much to dissent from the members of my committee. They are very able Members of the House. They see this as a difficult question, as do I. They favor the continuation of the program. I think it should be brought to a halt at this time. If that is done, I believe very little will be lost. Many Members who object to this program do so in the belief that this is in a great measure a Boeing bonus bill. I think there is a great deal to be said for that viewpoint, because, of the $1.5 billion, approximately, that will be put up for this program, 88 percent of those funds will come from the Federal Government and approximately 12 percent will come from Boeing and General Electric, which is making the great, powerful motors that are proposed to fly this plane. Yet I know that Boeing is taking a very grave risk here. I wonder whether it is a valid risk, because of the tremendous dangers that are implicit in the development of this prototype. I do not know Boeing's corporate structure. I do not know its financial strength. But if the SST is not commercially viable—and there are very strong arguments that it is not commercially viable—I think there is a good chance that Boeing may go bust. Perhaps I should not say something like that, but I read an article which appeared in last night's Star, an article which quotes the very authoritative Jane's of Great Britain, which produces the publication "All the World's Aircraft." It was stated in this article:

> The cost of America's space flights could bankrupt both the United States aircraft industry and the public.

It says this:

> This became inevitable when the industry began to produce aircraft of such high performance that normal company resources could no longer finance their development or purchase.

Then it asks the question:

> Can the process continue without bankrupting both the industry and the customer?

I quote further:

> The aircraft industry seems to have got itself into the position where it must continue to build progressively bigger and faster transport aircraft to stay in business, even if the customer does not really want them.

I quote further:

> The cost and size of the new designs has forced the United States Government to subsidize Boeing's development of its supersonic airliner and this could lead to more and more Government involvement in aircraft industries.

The article continues:

> Only a decade ago the cost of a DC-8 or Boeing 707 seemed crippling at $7 million. Yet today airlines must think in terms of $21 million for a Boeing 747 and anything up to $33 million for a large supersonic airliner.

Well, that is not the price. So much for the article. That is not the price for the SST. The currently quoted price for the SST is $37 million. It was testified to before our committee that before the SST goes into production and is able to fly it is expected that the price of an SST will have escalated to $52 million. How many planes, how many planes, can the airlines afford to buy at those prices?

Who knows what dangers still lurk in this prototype phase of the supersonic plane?

Mr. Chairman, testimony before our committee indicated that there were still four problems that have not been overcome during the prototype phase. One relates to noise, one relates to the inlet, one relates to the fuel cell and it seems that the noise of the fuel cell seems to be the one that bothered them most. However, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most complex scientific undertakings that was ever attempted. It is a different kind of plane. The SST will not replace the Concorde. It is not in competition with the Concorde as such. The Concorde is an extension of today's aircraft. The Concorde will be an aluminum plane and it will have special fittings. It will fly at subsonic speed and to the extent that the tension of the metal will permit. But the SST will not be made of aluminum. It will be made of titanium. It will be an entirely new horizon in aircraft flight, if it is successful, and with all the dangers connected with the friction problem and the sonic boom. If the SST runs into difficulty at this prototype stage, the sky is the limit on what the ultimate cost of the aircraft will be.

Next, Mr. Chairman, is the aircraft viable?

I have here the "Review of Reports Relating to the Economic Feasibility of the Supersonic Commercial Transport, No. B-159141," by the Comptroller General of the United States—the General Accounting Office—reviewing the various points that have been made. On page 21 of that study after discussing the various expert treatises that have been proposed by the FAA, it says—it offers a comparison as to the economic viability of this plane depending upon its price and depending upon whether there will be a sonic boom restriction; that is, whether the plane will not be able to fly supersonically over the United States—and we all agree that it will not be able to do this whether it has a sonic boom restriction or not.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. YATES. This comparison shows the number of planes that are anticipated to be sold if the price is $40 million, if the price is $50 million or $60 million with and without the sonic boom restriction.

If the price is $50 million it is anticipated that there will be 155 planes sold if there is a sonic boom restriction and 422 planes sold if there is no sonic boom restriction.

If the price is $60 million and if there is a sonic boom restriction, the number of planes to be sold is 101. If there is no sonic boom restriction, it is estimated the total will be 280 planes.

So, I say it is a very serious question as to whether or not there is adequate viability to this plane. I hope the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will have time to read my views that are contained in the report and in the hearings and it is my opinion that if you do, there is a good chance you will vote for my amendment.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this is, as you know, my first year on your very distinguished Transportation Subcommittee. It has been a good freshman year, if I may call it that, and one in which I learned a lot.

We certainly had our work cut out for us. To begin with, the bill, H.R. 14794, is a big one. It calls for spending $6.61 billion for transportation and related systems.

Our committee cut some $158 million from the original request of $6.77 billion to arrive at this figure. The recommendation represents an increase of $596 million over the appropriation for fiscal 1969.

The transportation needs of this country are great. Improvements are essential if we are to maintain an effective system balanced among air, rail, motor vehicle, and mass transit components. These improvements cost money. This distinguished committee has the responsibility of deciding where that money is best spent and, therefore, where the necessary improvements will be made. We have worked hard to arrive at these decisions. I think the bill before us reflects both the great effort that went into it and the balance that must be struck between improving transportation systems and holding back inflationary spending.

The most controversial item in the entire bill is undoubtedly the $96 million we have allocated for the supersonic aircraft. The question of whether to go ahead with the SST is, as my colleagues know, a very complicated one. Persuasive arguments can be made on both sides of the issue, but the time has now come for this body to make a decision.

I took no position on the SST either during the hearings or at the mark up. I have kept my mind open completely to all different points of view. I have read and studied everything I could get my hands on. And I have finally come to the conclusion that we should go ahead with the SST.

This was not an easy decision. I listened carefully to all the testimony in our hearings. I also raised several questions that I had about the SST. For example, I asked how we could sell the SST to foreign airlines when it cost twice as much as the *Concorde*, and how countries like India and Pakistan in particular, which are potential customers but which cannot afford luxuries, could buy the craft. I also asked about the very serious noise problem—including current *Concorde* noise levels, the need for international noise agreements, and sonic boom damage payments.

Moreover, I took a hard look at the estimated 50,000 jobs that would be created and the suggested military application of SST technology.

But my work did not end with this testimony. I went on, as I said earlier, to read everything I could. Among other things, I read the ad hoc committee report from cover to cover. That report is, I must admit, devastating—so much so that had I stopped my research there, I would have come out against the SST.

I went on, however, because the report raised additional questions in my own mind—foremost among which was how could the administration support the SST after such a devastating report?

In continuing my work, I was able to answer this question in my own mind and to my own satisfaction. The report alleges many things which my research showed were either inaccurate or subject to serious question. For example, whether or not the sonic boom will be considered intolerable by most people is not the issue because the SST will fly at subsonic speeds over land. Thus, there will be no sonic boom affecting populated areas. In addition, the SST will make no more noise during takeoff and landing than the 707 or the DC–8.

I would also like to mention a few other answers that I came up with. Passengers will be subjected to less radiation exposure per SST trip than the same trip in subsonic aircraft due to differences in exposure duration.

The SST engines will not produce visible smoke, and the environment in the plane will be more free of ozone than today's subsonic jets.

Most scientists reject the proposition that the SST flights will pose a significant threat to modification of the weather.

Moreover, the ad hoc committee report assumed that the Concorde would not be commercially viable. That assumption now appears to be incorrect. This means our balance of payments will be improved—rather than hurt—by the SST. If 500 are sold, we will end up with a favorable net balance of $10.1 billion. On the other hand, if we do not build an SST, we could end up with a net loss of $15.8 billion.

I am also impressed by the fact that the same arguments were raised in the fifties about the technological feasibility and commercial viability of passenger jet aircraft. I need not elaborate on the success of commercial jets since that time, but I would like to point out some of the more interesting predictions made during that debate.

It was alleged that the jet-airliner market might not be large enough to support profitably more than two U.S. companies and possibly only one and one British.

It was alleged that while the pure jet had the speed, it was known to be an optimum performer only at certain ranges—a fact that might put severe restrictions on the size of its market.

It was alleged that in the race for jet supremacy, the market was less certain than the technology.

The pure jet—turbojet—was regarded as a specialized airplane by BOAC—which was flying the Comet in the early fifties—and thus suited only to specific tasks. In fact, because tourist travel was reportedly reaching a saturation point, BOAC expected the big new expansion to be air freight for which they felt the turboprop was especially well suited.

The U.S. airlines were generally skeptical of the jet in the beginning. One airline indicated that it did not plan to buy any until one were available that would yield a profit, unless forced to purchase uneconomical equipment by the competition. Another airline pointed to how efficient, safe, and dependable nonjet transports were at 6 cents a mile, but as it turned out, the 707 jet runs at 4.5 a seat-mile.

In fact, the general outlook on jets on the part of U.S. airlines was described as "bearish" some 15 years ago. The reasons were many, and the technical problems of putting jets into operation seemed formidable. The jet was then limited to airfields with long runways. Its fuel consumption at low altitudes raised questions of reserves, airport stacking, and alternate airports. It had braking problems on landing. Its speed raised numerous traffic problems. And in addition to all this, its noise—yes, its noise—raised serious problems.

This all has a familiar ring as one follows the SST debate. Can you imagine, however, what would have happened had we not gone ahead with the development of commercial jet aircraft?

In this regard, it might be worth noting what did happen to our merchant marine fleet in the last 25 years. After the Second World War, we were carrying about 75 percent of U.S. foreign commerce, both exports and imports. The figure declined to around 50 percent in the midfifties. Since then, it has dropped all the way down to 6—I repeat, 6 percent.

This is not the end of the sad story about the decline of our merchant fleet. We are now fifth in the world in number of vessels, behind Liberia, Norway, Great Britain, and Japan, and only slightly ahead of the Soviet Union, which is sixth.

We are, however, behind Russia in tonnage of our fleet, but worse than that, our ships are relics compared to their Soviet counterpart. Fifty percent of the Russian fleet is 5 years old or less, and 80 percent is 10 years old or less. On the other hand, 80 percent of the U.S. fleet is 20 years old or more. I repeat, 80 percent is at least 20 years old.

I mention these statistics only to show what could happen if we did not remain in the forefront of aircraft development.

I also want to make it clear that I am talking about a very tangible concept—economics or just plain dollars and cents. I am not talking about prestige and about being first as ends that justify whatever means are necessary to get there. To my way of thinking, the SST is a matter of good business on both a national and international level.

As I look over my remarks, I am reminded once again of how often the experts have been wrong. Their crystal balls have been clouded up on numerous occasions. I would like to share some of these inaccurate predictions with my colleagues, many of whom will no doubt recall them and others like them.

In 1904, American aviation pioneer Octave Chanute said:

> Airplanes will eventually be fast, they will be used in sport, but they are not to be thought of as commercial carriers.

In 1939, Rear Adm. Clark Woodward said:

> As far as sinking a ship with a bomb is concerned, you just can't do it.

In 1941, the Navy indicated that it was not feasible to use gas turbines on airplanes, but beginning the very next year they were used successfully in airplanes.

In 1945, Adm. William Leahy said:

> That is the biggest fool thing we have ever done. The (atomic) bomb will never go off, and I speak as an expert in explosives.

The point I am trying to make, at the risk of being repetitious, is that the so-called experts can and do make mistakes. I have just mentioned a few of them, but it would not be hard to find more. For this reason, I feel justified in being skeptical about many of the overly pessimistic predictions on the SST.

But after all is said and done, the emotional question of budgetary priorities remains. The fact of the matter is that, as I said before, the SST—apart from these emotional arguments—makes good sense economically. The same can certainly not be said for many other Government programs.

Here we have a good investment that promises to pay handsomely in the long-run. This is not a subsidy, but rather, I repeat, a national investment designed to be self-liquidating.

Royalties on production sales will return the full prototype investment of $1.2 billion by approximately the 300th plane sale, and an additional $1 billion by the 500th sale—the present market estimate.

Moreover, it will generate some 50,000 jobs directly and roughly two to three times that many jobs indirectly.

And finally, personal and corporate income tax payments—Federal, State, and local—by participants in the program will return some $6.6 billion.

In conclusion, the SST program does not seem to be an inversion of priorities. On the contrary, it seems to be a good business venture on the part of the Government and the entire Nation.

I have spent a lot of time on the SST because it is so controversial. Nevertheless, by my own calculations, it only represents about 1.5 percent of the total amount recommended in our bill. I would like to turn now to the rest of the bill.

We are recommending a total of $24 million for the Office of the Secretary. This represents $7.8 million more than the figure for fiscal 1969 and $8.8 million less than the request for fiscal 1970.

This item is composed of three elements. We added $4.5 million for the consolidation of departmental headquarters in the new Nassif Building. However, we cut $1.4 million from the request for salaries and expenses and recommended $11.5 million. This is only an increase of $1.35 million over the figure for 1969.

I might also note that we only allowed 15 of 97 new positions requested—10 of which are for the Office of Hazardous Materials and five of which are for the Office of Pipeline Safety.

The salaries and expenses appropriation finances the principal costs of policy development, central supervisory and coordinating functions, and the administrative services necessary for the overall direction of the Department of Transportation.

In the Office of the Secretary, we also cut $12 million from the request for transportation planning, research, and development. Our recommendation of $8 million is $2 million more than last year. We denied all 21 new positions requested for this item.

This research money includes $1.5 million for studies toward full automation of the air traffic control system. The R. & D. facilitation program has, among other things, shown how $2.5 billion could be saved from the elimination of processing and storing documents currently required on U.S. imports and exports and in the standardization of commodity descriptions and codes.

Our total recommendation for the Coast Guard is $541 million. This is $2.9 million less than the figure for 1969 and $24.1 million less than the request this year. This appropriation is composed of several items.

We recommended $386 million for operating expenses, which is an increase of $14.5 million over 1969 and $3 million less than requested for 1970.

The big decrease took place in the appropriation for acquisition, construction, and improvement because of the President's freeze on Federal construction. We only recommended $57.3 million. This is $32.7 million less than we appropriated last year and $20 million less than the request this year.

We did not cut the request of $57.7 million for retired pay, which is $4.7 million more than last year.

A nominal cut was made from the Reserve training request and we recommended the 1969 level of $25.9 million.

We recommended $14.5 million for research and development. This is $400,000 less than the request but $10.5 million more than the figure for last year. Part of the increase is the result of new efforts to combat the problem of oil pollution. We have allocated $4.4 million for oil pollution detection and control.

I might note here that the additional cost of Coast Guard operations in Vietnam, adjusted for pay changes through fiscal 1969, is $18.18 million.

The Federal Aviation Administration is the largest single item in our bill. The committee recognized the seriousness of air traffic controller, air congestion, and related problems, and recommended $1.14 billion. This is $81.9 million more than the FAA requested, and $247.1 million more than the 1969 appropriation.

The biggest element in the FAA budget is operations. We have approved the request for $767 million, which is $61.6 million more than the appropriation last year. Our recommendation provides for 4,015 new positions, including 2,800 air traffic controllers. In addition, we have recommended the hiring of 1,000 more air traffic controllers, bringing the total number of new controllers to 3,800. The $5 million necessary for the extra 1,000 controllers can be obtained from savings in other areas. We expect that this action will make a significant contribution to easing the air traffic controller problem.

The FAA recorded savings of some $1.9 million in maintenance of the traffic control system. Improvements in manpower utilization and the discontinuance of nonessential facilities and services made this savings possible.

Savings of $236,000 were also realized as a result of implementing GAO recommendations concerning FAA activities in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East.

The second element of the FAA budget is facilities and equipment. Here we added $90 million to the original request of $134 million and recommended $244 million. This represents an increase of $104 million over the appropriation last year.

The original request was for automation equipment for the en route air traffic control system. This equipment is expensive. The full implementation cost of the automation system is about $25 million per center.

We added $116 million for a variety of items related to control and safety. These included $41 million for terminal area radar, and another $13 million for instrument landing systems that are desperately needed at our smaller airports. Savings, however, reduced this increase to the $90 million figure I have already mentioned.

The third element of the budget is research and development, for which we have recommended $41 million. This is $14 million more than the figure for last year, but $6.5 million less than the request. Included in this amount is a broad noise research program.

The FAA appropriation also covers the National and Dulles Airports. For their operation and maintenance, we recommended $9.5 million which is $380,000 more than last year but $300,000 less than the request. We also recommended $1.9 million for construction, an increase of $1.2 million over last year but a decrease of $1.3 million from the request.

The projected loss for Dulles Airport is $7 million, but because National is profitable, the projected net loss for the two airports is only $3.5 million.

The cost of depreciation and interest at the airports totals $8.2 million, of $6.3 million is attributable to Dulles.

I have already dealt at length with the SST which is the final item in the FAA budget. We have, as I said, approved the request for $95.9 million.

Before leaving the FAA, I would like

to mention the highly controversial Everglades Jetport. Some very serious and very legitimate objections were raised by conservation groups. They maintained the jetport would permanently alter the delicate balance of nature that exists in Everglades National Park and thus destroy one of our last great natural wildernesses.

The FAA has invested something less than $1 million in the jetport, according to testimony by Administrator John H. Shaffer. This includes an initial $500,000 investment, an additional $163,000 for lighting this year, and the transfer of instrument landing systems.

Nonetheless, Mr. Shaffer testified that as a result of consultations between Secretary of the Interior, Walter Hickel, and Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, the Federal Government will no longer participate financially in the development of the project. I might note, in this regard, that there is no money in the current budget for its further development.

The Federal Highway Administration is another major item in our bill. We recommended $36.6 million, which represents an increase of $4.9 million over 1969 but a decrease of $6.9 million from the request. This appropriation is composed of many elements.

To begin with, we have set up a new appropriation for the Office of the Administrator. We have recommended $1.6 million, which is $180,000 less than requested, out of general funds, and $12.4 million, or $590,000 less than requested, as a trust fund limitation. We allowed 26 of 39 new positions requested.

We have recommended $59 million as a limitation on general expenses for the Bureau of Public Roads. This is $10.1 million less that what was requested. We only approved 21 of 42 new positions requested.

The largest item in the Federal Highway Administration budget is the allocation of trust funds for Federal-aid highways. We cut $110.7 million from the request and recommended $4.4 billion. This is $263.9 million more than the figure for last year.

We also cut $10 million from the request for the right-of-way revolving fund, which is another trust fund item. Our recommendation was for $40 million for this new program.

The highway beautification program, about which there has been a lot of publicity, is also funded under the FHWA budget. We cut $150,000 from the request for administrative expenses of this program and recommended $1.1 million. This is $36,000 more than the figure for 1969. We also cut $5 million from the request for liquidation of contract authority, and recommended $5 million.

This is the first year the program is operating under contract authority so there was no appropriation in 1969.

We recommended $27.5 million for traffic and highway safety, which is $1 million more than last year but $6.5 million less than requested. This includes approval of 38 new positions.

The State and community highway safety appropriation for the liquidation of contract authority is $30 million, or $20 million less than both the request and the figure for last year.

The administration of the grant program for State and community highway safety is to be transferred to traffic and highway safety. This year we recommended $2 million for it, which is $800,000 more than 1969 but $100,000 less than requested. In so doing, we approved 13 of 23 new positions.

We cut $64,000 from the request for motor carrier safety and recommended $2.3 million. This is $220,000 over the 1969 level, and includes eight new positions.

To liquidate contract authority for forest highways, we recommended $18 million. This is $11 million less than the figure for 1969 and $12 million less than requested because of the Federal cutback in construction.

The Federal cutback is also responsible for our cut of $5 million for the liquidation of contract authority on public lands highways. We recommended $7 million, or $600,000 under last year's figure.

And finally under the FHWA, we approved a request for a $4 million for the Chamizal Memorial Highway. There was no 1969 appropriation for this item.

The committee spent a lot of time looking into the Federal Highway Administration. In view of the many items I have just mentioned, this is understandable. I would like to note a few of the things the FHWA told me that I think are important to know as we consider this bill and the general operation of the Department of Transportation.

Under Federal statute, no highway can be placed through an historic area, like the famed French Quarter of New Orleans, unless there are no feasible or practicable ways of avoiding it. Fortunately, there were ways to avoid it in the New Orleans case.

In the past several years, there have been more than 25,000 projects for correction of highway booby-traps.

The billboard element of the highway beautification program is not working well because, according to Administrator Francis C. Turner, there is not enough Federal money to pay for their removal. The other features of the program, like automobile junkyards, roadside rest area and scenic strips, have, Mr. Turner added, been highly successful.

The FHWA also provided extensive rebuttals to charges that it was dragging its feet in the areas of auto and truck safety.

All in all, the highway program—like every other transportation program—really has its work cut out for it.

The Federal Railroad Administration is another major item in our appropriation bill. We have recommended $15.3 million, a $3.2 million decrease from last year's level and $4.9 million below this year's request. The total appropriation consists of four components.

The first is the Office of the Administrator. We recommended $1 million for salaries and expenses here, which is $100,000 more than last year but $300,000 less than requested. In so doing, we denied 20 new positions that were requested.

We recommended $4 million for the Bureau of Railroad Safety, an increase of $260,000 over the figure for 1969 but a cut of $400,000 from the 1970 request. We denied five new positions for oil pipeline safety in anticipation of this function being merged with gas pipeline safety in the Office of the Secretary.

We cut $4 million from the request for high speed ground transportation research and development. Our recommendation of $10 million is $3 million below last year's level. In arriving at this figure, we denied 12 new positions for administration but did not make any cuts in the demonstration program.

And finally, we cut $200,000 from the request for railroad research and recommended the 1969 level of $300,000.

No appropriation was requested or recommended for the Alaska Railroad revolving fund.

Our committee went into the very serious problem of rail safety at great length. I noted that in my district alone, the First District of Massachusetts, there had been 38 derailments in a little over 2 years. Most of the derailments occurred at the same places. The situation on a national scale is equally as serious.

One thing that troubled me is the fact that no one seems to have the necessary authority to do anything about the problem. For instance, the Federal Railroad Administration's authority is limited to those areas which account for only 5 percent of the total railroad accidents. I repeat, only 5 percent of the cases. The other 95 percent seem to fall in a shadow area over which no one will claim jurisdiction.

The FRA is quite aware of this problem. They did extensive work on the rail safety situation and came up with a sweeping reform bill. I had the pleasure of introducing that legislation, H.R. 14417, on October 20. It would replace existing Federal laws that only touch scattered aspects of the rail safety problems with a comprehensive new law that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to set safety standards for all areas of railroad safety and that would also authorize a program of railroad safety research. I think the bill, if passed, would go a long way toward remedying the serious rail safety problem.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration has the very difficult job of solving the urban transit crisis. All it takes is one trip to any city to realize how big a job this is going to be.

We recommended $1.5 million for UMTA salaries and expenses. This is $647,000 more than last year but $500,000 less than the request. We approved 70 of 92 new positions requested.

The request of $250 million for the UMTA grant program was unofficially withdrawn because of the proposed new mass transit legislation. However, since it is unlikely this legislation will be enacted in this session, we felt that an advance appropriation was necessary. Therefore, we recommended $220 million for fiscal 1971, an increase of $45 million over the 1969 appropriation for fiscal 1970, but $30 million less than the request.

Our recommendation includes $176 million for capital facilities, the total

amount requested; $25 million for research, a cut of $25 million from the request and a decrease of $5 million from 1969; and $15 million for technical studies, a cut of $5 million from the request and an increase of $6 million over 1969.

Urban mass transit is essential in our increasingly urban society. Many questions must still be answered about how best to improve urban transportation schemes, but I am hopeful that UMTA will find the answer and thereby significantly contribute to easing the serious urban crisis in which we find ourselves today.

In this regard, I might also mention our recommendation of $43.1 million for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This is the Federal contribution for fiscal 1970 to a new rapid rail transit system for the Nation's Capital. The figure is $599,000 less than last year's, but the same as this year's request.

The rapid transit project in Washington gives one a good idea of how expensive such projects are. The total project cost is estimated at $2.55 billion. The net project cost after revenue bond issues of $835 million is $1.72 billion. The Federal share of this is $1.14 billion or two-thirds and the local share is $573 million, or one-third.

There are four more items in our bill that I would like to briefly mention. First, we recommended $600,000 as a limitation on administrative expenses for the St. Lawrence Seaway. This is $50,000 more than last year but $30,000 less than requested.

We also recommended $5 million for the National Transportation Safety Board, which is $202,000 more than the 1969 appropriation. However, we did cut $100,000 from this year's request. In addition, we approved eight of 11 new positions requested including six of six asked for aviation, and two of five asked for surface transportation, accident cause determination, and safety promotion.

The committee cut $200,000 from the Civil Aeronautics Board request for salaries and expenses. We recommended $10.2 million, or $350,000 over the 1969 level. We also cut $1.1 million from the CAB request for payments to air carriers, and recommended $33.5 million. This figure is $11.5 million below the figure for 1969.

This brings me to the final item—the Interstate Commerce Commission. We cut $508,000 from their request. Our recommendation of $25 million for salaries and expenses is $336,000 over the figure for 1969.

The ICC has a real problem trying to keep enough freight cars in circulation. It is currently cheaper for the railroads to keep loaded cars sitting around than it is for them to unload the goods and pay for storage. The ICC admits the reason for this is that the demurrage penalty charge is not steep enough. They are, however, trying to put sufficient teeth into the penalty to bring cars into circulation.

The ICC also has another problem—the length of its hearings. One particular case took two hearing examiners 149 days of hearings resulting in 23,000 pages of record and over 1,800 exhibits. The combined efforts of these two examiners totaled 6,713 man-hours, which, at an average hourly cost of $12.22, amounts to $82,033. The ICC is fortunately considering ways to simplify legal procedures for merger cases.

Mr. Chairman, that wraps up my discussion of H.R. 14794, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal 1970. It has been a real pleasure serving with you on this committee. As I said earlier, we put in a lot of work but I think we came up with a good balanced bill.

I thank the Chairman for the opportunity to make these remarks.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on a very fine statement. This is his first year on this Subcommittee on Department of Transportation Appropriations. He has served with distinction on two other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and his knowledge and the work he has done on those subcommittees is well known to the Members of the Congress.

As he has said in his statement here, he has wrestled with the problem of the SST. I have lived with it now since 1963 when President Kennedy first recommended that we go into the development of the SST when he sent to Congress in mid-1963, a request for $60 million to start research and development on a supersonic transport.

So I understand what the problem of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has been. In the time the gentleman has served on this subcommittee that I chair, I have not asked the gentleman to support the SST. I felt he would come to his own conclusion in his way, whatever that conclusion might be.

In wrestling with the problem as he has, the gentleman indicated that he refrained from voting in the subcommittee on this matter—and he did—and he refrained from voting in the full committee—and he did—because he was still not satisfied in his own mind at that time that we should proceed with the SST. He gave a great deal of time and study to the ad hoc committee review, about which many other Members of this body are concerned, and about which the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, and as so many are rightly concerned. So the gentleman from Massachusetts went outside the ad hoc committee review and went to other reports, some written many years ago.

This is precisely what the Department of Transportation has done in this area. It has not hung its hat or pegged its decisions on the ad hoc committee review report, but there were other reports, some that went back for 6 to 8 years.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has looked into those reports. He has made his decision without any pressure from any members of this committee and without any pressure from the Secretary of Transportation. I am sure the gentleman in the well has expressed his point of view to the Department of Transportation. I congratulate the gentleman on his work and on his position.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). It has been a pleasure for me to serve on the Committee on Transportation. It has been a pleasure for me to serve with my neighbor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), who does such an excellent job in chairing that committee, and to serve with all the members of that committee, including my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois. It really hurts me that I could not be side by side with the gentleman and with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, as we usually are, but I had to come to this decision.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding. I know the soul searching the gentleman has gone through in trying to find the correct solution to his decision on the SST. I wish the gentleman had come to another conclusion. I wish he had come to another decision. I know from my conversations with the gentleman that he almost did.

My good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), has indicated the gentleman's decision was predicated in great measure, not upon the ad hoc report, but on reports that went on before that time. If this is true, I would hope the gentleman would reexamine those, because they refer to the variable sweptwing aircraft that was discarded, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CONTE. That is correct. It was not only those reports, but also the Library of Congress prepared reports that gave me great help. Many of the assumptions have changed since the ad hoc report came out, such as the findings on the *Concorde* and the Russian TU.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the impression that I may have left with the committee, if I left that impression with the committee. that the reports were based on the sweptwing aircraft design. I am talking about reports that went back to 1963, when President Kennedy formed a committee to inform him as to whether or not we should proceed with the SST, and the sweptwing design was not even in being at that time. They cover the time from that date to this. So those are different reports.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding the airplane is the largest export item we have today.

Mr. CONTE. It may be one of the largest.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I understand it is the largest.

Mr. CONTE. The United States manufactures approximately 80 to 85 percent of the jet aircraft sold throughout the world.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. There is a big question about the confidence of the airlines themselves in this aircraft. Is it not true there are 122 reservations, which are fairly expensive, which have been placed for this aircraft.

Mr. CONTE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Have any of them been canceled?

Mr. CONTE. I do not know.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. It is my understanding there have been no cancellations by commercial airline companies, and one of the major airlines of this country has actually considered buying the TU-144 from Russia.

I do not know whether they have gone that far. I suppose the gentleman has read the publicity.

Mr. CONTE. There is no doubt in my mind. That was one of the prime arguments that got me to go along with the SST—that if we did not go along with it and we did not build it, the American airlines would be forced to go on the foreign markets. They would have to buy the Concorde. The Soviets have not been in the airplane business, but they are now, and they are seeking to sell these airplanes throughout the world.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Lastly, is it not true that the present economic projections made by the airline companies are based on the reality of not flying supersonically over the continental limits at this time?

Mr. CONTE. Definitely. I believe that question is moot at this point. Secretary Volpe, President Nixon, and Mr. Shaffer the head of FAA, have all stated that this airplane will not fly supersonically over land massed areas.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for a very fine statement.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER).

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Chairman, throughout my section of the country and indeed in all areas of the United States, there are airports that are totally tied up, rail systems that have been allowed to disintegrate, urban bus systems that are no more, and highways that are just one long parking lot. In fact, it can be said that although there may be 1,000 transportation happenings in the United States, there is no transportation system.

Several months ago, I pointed out that if, in the future, we are going to spend money on transportation as we have spent transportation funds in the past, then such expenditures will be a waste. At that time I urged the Congress to prevent the waste of transit funds by requiring future expenditures to embody the new concepts that are essential to unraveling our national transportation snarl.

Yet today in the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, Congress continues the policies of the past for not only does this bill fail to coordinate the expenditures of Federal transportation moneys, it cuts back funds in vital areas of rail transportation and urban mass transit.

We live in the age of the automobile and airplane. Because of the emphasis on these two modes of transit, it is difficult to convince my colleagues of the urgency of a mass transportation solution.

I would like to point out, however, that as the population of the Nation continues to grow, the rural areas of today will find themselves in the 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's facing a similar situation as occurred in my section of the country in the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's.

When this time comes, if the present transportation trends are not reversed and new direction taken to coordinate our transportation systems, the rural areas will find, more airplanes overhead, more airports using up open space, more highways creating new traffic problems and more cars infringing on the environment.

The indisputable fact is that even in this day and age of advanced technology, the railroad is the one means of transportation that can carry the greatest number of people with speed and comfort and with the least imposition on the environment.

I do not speak out against the highway trust fund; I do not speak out against the concept of an airport trust fund or a mass transit trust fund. But not one of these modes of transportation can serve the Nation by itself.

I am for all of these modes of transportation, but I am for them in a balanced and integrated way.

This appropriation bill makes the mistake of playing to the transportation system that is most current in the public spotlight rather than providing a balance of funding in ratio to our overall transportation needs. It does not insist upon coordination and, therefore, provides for continuation of a policy that perpetuates transportation happenings rather than a transportation system.

Where are the provisions in this bill that say if you build a Federal highway you have to coordinate its exits with rail links? Where are the provisions in the bill to construct rail links between airports and urban centers?

I can assure my colleagues that unless such conditions are attached to Federal appropriation bills, nobody is going to plan these coordinated transit systems on their own.

It is incredible, that the focal point of the debate on this bill is the supersonic transport project which is involved in getting from New York to Europe when thousands of people cannot even travel without difficulty from Norwalk, Stamford, and Greenwich, Conn., to New York.

It may seem almost impossible to conceive that a single transportation trust fund will ever be established to fund a coordinated transit system. However, until there is such a fund, the United States will continue to build more modes of transportation, but it will not be better transportation.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLANCY).

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and urge the adoption of the bill.

We live today in a transportation-oriented society. The quality of transportation or its availability determines our mobility, affects our capacity for commerce, and even influences the ability of people to get and hold jobs. On the international scene, transportation has taken on a new importance with the advent of the jets, and now the supersonics promise to further compress travel time and again increase the consumer demand for air travel. The development of a supersonic transport will not only keep the United States in the forefront of world aviation, but will result in many economic benefits to the Nation as well. It is well to point out here that the Government will collect a royalty on all U.S. SST sales to recover all of its costs plus interest. These royalty provisions are designed to provide an additional return to the Government on all sales beyond 300 planes.

There are many positive national interests to be served by a successful SST program. The supersonic transport program which President Nixon and previous administrations have endorsed is expected to provide 50,000 jobs directly, and many more will be indirectly created as a result of the SST's impact on our economy. Many of these will be high-technology jobs, of the type which the space program has fostered in the past.

The GE Co. in Evendale, Ohio, was selected by the Federal Aviation Agency to develop and produce the engine which powers the U.S. supersonic transport. It is estimated that up to 2,500 persons will be employed by General Electric in phase III and up to 8,000 in the production phase of this program.

The economic impact of the SST program which we have mentioned will be felt in many ways. Here at home, investment expenditures will raise employment levels, consumption, and tax revenues. The U.S. workers will be producing an airplane that would have otherwise been purchased abroad by U.S. carriers. In addition, it is estimated that the development and sale of the SST will have a favorable net effect on the U.S. balance of payments of about $17 billion.

As a result of technological expertise, production knowledge and risk capital, capital goods have historically been a major factor in our export business. Reports show that in 1967 the largest single contributor to the export business in the capital goods account was commercial airplanes. This amounted to $914 million or 8.4 percent of the $10.9 billion of capital goods sold abroad. In other words, this $914 million of commercial airplane exports constitutes 22.3 percent of the total $4.1 billion merchandise trade surplus in 1967.

The American tourist will still travel abroad and will still be able to fly in supersonic transports whether or not the United States builds the SST. The French/British Concorde and the Rus-

sian TU–144 are in flight-test programs and have flown supersonically. It is estimated that the Concorde will enter the market in early 1973. As far as supersonic transports are concerned, the issue is merely whether tourists will ride on Concordes or on U.S. SST's. Therefore, it is the sale of the U.S. SST aircraft that will be important to our balance-of-payments position.

The prospects of a supersonic transport in commercial airline operation are both exciting and unique. There are risks in undertaking the SST program, just as there are risks in any large program involving advances in the state-of-the-art, in the engineering and in the design of complex technical equipment.

I believe that the doubts raised in the report of the Ad Hoc Review Committee have been satisfactorily resolved and can be dispelled.

President Nixon, Secretary Volpe, and the Federal Aviation Agency have stated that the SST will not fly supersonically over inhabited land masses. The airplane will take off and cruise subsonically until it is over water or unpopulated areas before accelerating to supersonic speed. Therefore, there will be no disturbance by sonic boom.

In an attempt to understand the impact of noise generation on airport environment and surrounding communities, aggressive studies of engine influences, basic research, airplane operational procedures and scale model/full-scale testing are being made. Using the measuring points established by the FAA, the SST is projected to be substantially quieter than the presently operating intercontinental subsonic jets. Improved operational techniques and additional suppression devices are a solution to this challenge.

To insure the design of a safe and reliable cabin pressurization system, considerable engineering development in the form of analyses and tests have been conducted at the airplane contractor's facilities and the FAA. While the SST cruise altitudes will be higher than the present subsonic commercial jet airplanes, the SST cabin pressure altitude will be essentially the same as in subsonic jets. Pressurization limits have been validated in physiological studies at the Civil Aeromedical Institute. The cabin pressurization system of the SST is designed with sufficient excess capacity to maintain cabin altitude within these regulations in the event of an emergency situation. The capability of maintaining control of the cabin pressure to assure passenger safety during normal and failure conditions is a prime design requirement of the SST.

Although the temperature on the outside of the airplane will reach 425° F. during supersonic cruise, four independent systems will provide cabin cooling, interskin cooling, and heating. With three of the four units operating, interior temperature can be held as low as 65° F. The probability that all would fail simultaneously is extremely remote; however, if they did, it would take at least 10 minutes for cabin temperature to rise to 110° F. In that time the airplane can safely descend to 8,000 feet where pressurization is no longer required.

Turbine engine design technology is sufficiently advanced so that the SST engines will not produce visible smoke over the complete power range.

The take-off and landing "g" forces will be essentially the same as with today's aircraft. The acceleration during all phases of flight will be gradual and will not be felt by passengers. As the clear air turbulence is less at the SST cruise altitude than at current flight altitudes, the possibility of encountering severe turbulence will be greatly reduced. The SST will have a much greater and safer flexibility or speed spread than a subsonic jet transport. As water routes will be used, the air turbulence associated with mountains will not be a problem. In addition, gust velocities are not as severe at 60,000 to 65,000 feet as they are in lower altitudes.

Cockpit instrumentation and aircraft automatic stability control systems for the SST will represent an appreciable advance in state-of-the-art applications of technology for the purpose of improving ride comfort in turbulence.

The advent of supersonic transport aircraft flying routinely in the stratosphere has raised the question of inadvertent atmospheric modification. However, based on the findings of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, the worldwide climate will not be affected adversely as the local condensation of vapor from flights, even on crowded routes, will be spread rapidly and will be of no significance. Based on an assumed traffic volume of four flights per day for 400 supersonic transport airplanes, neither water vapor absorption of a long-wave radiation nor additional cloudiness—contrails—will be sufficient to appreciably disturb either stratospheric properties or the large-scale circulations that are influenced by its thermodynamic state.

SST passengers will be subjected to less radiation exposure than their subsonic counterparts due to the difference in exposure time. As a result of the induction system temperatures, the SST's environment will be more free of ozone than today's subsonic jets. Research has proven that the rate of ozone decomposition into oxygen is greatly increased at higher temperatures. Consequently, at the SST induction temperature of 500° F., decomposition is nearly instantaneous.

I feel that the above discussion adequately handles some of the so-called misconceptions surrounding the SST. It is my hope that the great majority of the 50 million Americans who will be taking international flights by 1980 will be riding SST's made in the U.S.A. and that millions of travelers on foreign airlines will also enjoy the superiority of the U.S. SST.

As I mentioned before, it is most important to note that the development of the supersonic transport will significantly improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States and that the Government will recover its investment in this program by the sale of the planes.

I urge that all Members of the House support the decision of President Nixon to enable the United States to maintain her leadership in the field of aviation.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations bill, H.R. 14794, for the Department of Transportation in fiscal 1970. Within this bill Congress is providing funding to more effectively combat the growing problems of air traffic congestion and aviation safety. In addition, the Appropriations Committee, on which it is my privilege to serve, has, after extensive hearings, recommended necessary funding for the supersonic transport program to insure the continuing aviation leadership of the United States.

I support these actions. The committee has recommended that the Federal Aviation Administration hire 1,000 more air traffic control operations personnel than the 2,800 budgeted. In addition, the Appropriations Committee has added $90 million to the FAA budget for the facilities and equipment required to help meet the growing air traffic congestion and aviation safety problems. Eventually, such costs will be borne by user charges; but there is urgent need to move ahead and we are asked to provide funding now.

High priority is to be given for the early installation of long-range radar, terminal area radar, communications and new control towers.

Mr. Chairman, there are compelling reasons why the United States must move ahead with the development of supersonic transport aircraft. The age of the supersonic transport aircraft is upon us. It is the next logical step forward in commercial aviation.

The British, French, and Russians already are flight testing their own versions of the SST. While they still have "bugs" to iron out in their experimental models, these countries will have SST's in service years before an American SST is ready.

The longer we delay, the more SST's will be purchased from the British and the French and the Russians. We have been wrestling for some time with a serious balance-of-payments problem. Aircraft sales are not only a favorable factor in our balance of payments at the present but have great opportunity for export growth.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations underscored the importance of the SST to the balance-of-payments situation. The FAA Administrator, John H. Shaffer, stated:

> Without a U.S. SST in being or on the way, U.S. carriers would probably have to for competitive reasons import about 300 Concordes by 1990, at a cost of 7 billion U.S. dollars flowing out of the country. Offsetting that flow to some degree will be exports of about $1.3 billion in additional subsonic jets that will be sold if a U.S. SST is not available. The difference, combined with the $101.1 billion in gold flow that would otherwise be earned through the sale of U.S. SST's overseas adds up to a possible net loss of $15.8 billion for the United States.

In this bill, nearly $96 million will be provided for the continued development

of the SST. This money, along with unobligated appropriations from prior years, will finance the Federal Government's portion of the 1970 costs of construction of two prototype aircraft.

Now the Congress already has appropriated over $623 million on this program. To cancel the program now would be to breach the Government's contract with the manufacturers and cause the loss of all of the $623 million.

However, if we move the program along to completion, the Government will through a royalty payment agreement recoup all of the Federal funds by the time the 300th aircraft is sold.

One of the most important domestic contributions of the SST program is the impact it will have on employment. It will not only mean jobs at Boeing and General Electric, the principal contractors, the work will be spread throughout the country, touching most of the 50 States. At the production stage the program will employ an estimated 50,000 persons directly.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who argue that there are problems connected with the SST. We often hear the arguments of sonic boom, noise, pollution. However, these are problems which must be dealt with through continuing research. Meanwhile, the President and the Department of Transportation have agreed that flights at supersonic speed over the United States will not be permitted as long as the sonic boom is an "unacceptable factor."

Many of the reservations being voiced today about the SST were also uttered 15 years ago when the introduction of commercial jets were being debated.

My colleague from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), the distinguished ranking Republican on the subcommittee, put this issue in proper perspective when he stated during the hearings:

> One question that came up earlier was the risk factor involved in this. My only thought was that the Wright Brothers had a risk factor when they took off. If they had stayed on the ground wondering whether or not they would get up in the air, we would still be going around on bicycles.

We must see to it that when the day of extensive supersonic travel arrives, U.S. aircraft lead the way.

On September 23, 1969, President Nixon committed this Nation to proceed with SST prototype construction. The House today must act favorably to provide the necessary funds to fulfill that commitment. To do otherwise would cripple the aircraft manufacturing industry of America and damage severely the economy of our Nation. It also would mean the United States would surrender aviation leadership to the British, French, and Russians.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS).

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supersonic transport appropriation.

We have heard a lot today, and we will hear more, about the various problems involved with an American SST. These are good, valid points, and we should be worrying about them.

But they are not the point, the one that really counts. For just about all of them apply to the TU-144 being built by the Soviets, and to the British-French Concorde.

We are told that the balance of payments plus which would be enjoyed by airlines buying the American SST would be offset by a balance of payments minus resulting from more Americans traveling and spending abroad in the American-built SST.

Mr. Speaker, more Americans are going to travel abroad by SST and spend abroad whether the American SST is built or not. The TU-144 and the Concorde will carry them if the American SST does not.

We are told that the sonic boom is going to be a problem if the American SST is built. Well, Mr. Speaker, an SST—or, rather, two versions of supersonic transports—are going to be flying into and out of the United States in a short time now, and a Russian-built sonic boom or a British-French-built sonic boom is no different than an American-built boom. We are going to have to face the sonic boom problem. It is with us, American SST or no American SST.

We are told there will be safety problems with the American SST. But this holds true with the other SST's also, and we are better at solving American problems than Russian or British or French problems.

We are told of a wide variety of environmental problems which the SST may cause. I think this danger is vastly overstated but, if such problems are going to develop, they are going to develop whether or not America builds an SST.

We are told also, Mr. Chairman, that there may not be a market for a supersonic plane. Well, I recall some 20 years ago hearing that there might not be a market for commercial jet airplanes, that military application of the jet was the only one that had proven feasible.

Boeing gambled, if that is the term, and developed what became its 700 jet series. And it has sold 2,000 of these planes in what has been called a "questionable" market. Denied Government funds for assistance, Boeing was able to go ahead with development of the subsonic commercial jet.

It is not able to go ahead with SST development, for the simple reason that the cost is too high. The total cost of SST development through prototype construction and test will be approximately twice the net worth of the company. And do not forget that industry will have invested $410 million by that time, too.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that there will be new problems to solve with the advent of the SST, just as there were new problems with the railroad, the steamship, the airplane, the automobile—presumably, with the advent of the wheel itself.

I had not previously thought that we would be seriously considering backing off from progress just because there were problems.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the problems will exist, and surely we will solve them.

The question is whether we solve them to the benefit of the Soviets and Britain and France, or to the benefit of the United States.

And the main issue before us today is, simply, whether we build SST's or buy them. To me, the answer is obvious, we must build an American version of the SST and I urge the House to support the committee in its endeavor to keep this project moving forward.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 14794, and commend the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on his extremely able leadership in the field of transportation.

I have heard few reports from a subcommittee as comprehensive as he has made to this committee.

However, I deeply regret that it has been necessary to limit expenditures and authorizations on Forest highways and public lands highway. I may say criticism is not due the subcommittee on this transportation bill. Upon inquiry, I have found that the small amount provided is a result of the administration's order curtailing construction on these highways. This curtailment is a mistake. These are important roads to the development of rural economy as well as in providing access to our forest resources on lands in Government ownership.

In many States the ownership of land by the Federal Government is very substantial. In my State of Washington, almost 30 percent of the land is in public domain. Other States with large Federal ownership are:

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| Alaska | 98 |
| Arizona | 44 |
| California | 44 |
| Colorado | 36 |
| Idaho | 64 |
| Montana | 29 |
| Nevada | 86 |
| New Mexico | 34 |
| Oklahoma | 52 |
| Utah | 66 |
| Wyoming | 48 |

The total governmental ownership in all the States is 33.7 percent of the total area. These lands are usually in areas remote from centers of population. As is to be expected, the States give priority to highways which are needed to reduce congestion on existing highways. The needs of the rural areas take second priority. The needs of highways to develop wildland resources usually come last.

The authorizations for forest highways and for public lands highways were devised to relieve this situation. Forest highways are the main trunks into and through the national forests. Public lands highways are highways through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, and other Federal reservations.

In the Federal Highways Act of 1968, the Congress wisely authorized $16 million for public lands highways and $30 million for forest highways for fiscal years 1970 and 1971. These are small amounts in relation to the need. For instance, in testimony before Congress, the Chief, Forest Service, has stated that,

at the rate of $33 million per year, it would take 100 years to complete the forest highways system. We do not have reliable figures on the total public lands highway needs; however, we do know that the needs are also tremendous. There is no planned public lands highway system such as exists for forest highways; however, these highways are on the planned State systems. The States submit their highest priorities to the Department of Transportation which allots the funds on the basis of highest need. The submissions each year by the States are about 10 times the available authorization. This is an indication of the size of the problem.

The importance of these roads in the overall national interest may be illustrated by a very graphic example. The national forests, public lands, and Indian reservations provide an annual cut of timber approaching 15 billion board feet. About one half of this timber is converted into lumber and plywood for home construction—an amount sufficient to build about 1 million homes.

The cost of lumber is affected in part by the cost of transportation. This cost, for truck hauling is more nearly proportional to time of travel rather than miles traveled. The construction of comparatively high-speed highways to connect to the lower standard resource development roads will greatly cut down this travel time. In the West, timber hauls are sometimes up to 100 miles from forest to mill.

I assume that the amounts included in this bill are the best estimate of cash requirements needed to meet obligations of the curtailed program. It may be too late this fiscal year to prevail on the administration to restore the cuts in apportionment for these highways. However, I do urge that the administration reconsider its ultimatum of killing the public lands and forest highways program.

At this point I would like to relate a small episode. There is an Indian village of Queets in the Far West in my own district. There is also the Indian village of Taholah, at a distance of some 20 miles. At Taholah, the Government has spent a great deal of money for Indian health facilities which should be available to all Indians in that area. However, because the public lands road going from Taholah to Queets has been 8 years in construction—and is not done yet—Indian Health Service people must go at the present time 85 miles to reach Taholah. This is a waste of Government money to ask employees to travel 85 down and 85 miles back to attend the medical needs which are substantial in the area.

These villages are among the highest level of poverty. They need health programs. Taholah has shown a marked decrease in disease since the establishment of their medical facility.

Now, how stupid can we be in refusing to complete a road with funds designated for this very purpose and at the same time have to provide in the budget travel money to travel four times the distance which a little more money on a road could erase?

Does the administration by its policy suggest to us that we should build extensive health facilities in two locations 20 miles apart? If this is so, boondoggling is a gentle word for this kind of activity.

Mr. Chairman, I have had enough of this kind of governmental nonsense. It is high time we worked at commonsense and fiscally responsible Government.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, it is quite apparent that the Appropriations Committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, has done its usual excellent and thorough job.

There is one area, however, on which I want to call the attention of my colleagues. The report expresses approval of the creation of a new Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Studies. The committee felt, however, that the responsibilities of this office were not properly spelled out and withheld the request for additional personnel made by the Department of Transportation.

The role to be played by the Department of Transportation's Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Studies, as it relates to the quality of our environment and the urban problem confronting our Nation, will be significant.

Mr. Chairman, I would, therefore, call to the attention of my colleagues the crisis our Nation faces with environmental and urban problems. I would express the hope that the information relative to the responsibilities of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Studies will lead to proper recognition of the important functions it performs. I believe that the Senate, after a full and complete study of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Studies, will act favorably on the Department's request for additional personnel.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on our side to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to add my tribute to this great subcommittee, to its chairman and to every member of it. I do not know of a subcommittee which has done harder work and has been more open with its colleagues. It is a delight to do business with it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take my time to point out how the bill before us highlights our national priorities.

Take mass transit. At least 100 million Americans desperately need some better way of getting around our cities than the present air-polluting, fender-crumpling, traffic-jamming, tax-eating internal combustion automobile.

The mass transit research and development advance appropriation request was for $50 million, enough at least to make a start in developing new systems of mass transit that will carry people safely, inexpensively, conveniently, speedily, and without polluting the atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, as has been remarked earlier, cuts that in two, from $50 to $25 million.

Yet it gives every penny requested, $96 million, to the supersonic transport.

Let us take a look at it. I will stipulate that, if the SST works, it will cut down air travel time between New York and Paris from 5½ to 3 hours. As far as I can see, the principal beneficiaries will be a handful of jetsetters, a gaggle of international playboys, and, if I may coin a phrase, an effete corps of impudent snobs.

Mr. Chairman, it will hurt millions whose peace will be shattered by the noise of the SST and its air pollution.

In the famous suppressed administration ad hoc report on the SST, the Treasury says it will hurt, not help, our balance of payments. The Interior and HEW Departments say it will degrade the environment. The Council of Economic Advisers calls it a financial white elephant.

So, why in heaven's name are we building it, then, and at the taxpayers' expense?

It is said that it will give America prestige. Prestige my eye. Is it prestigious to be fourth on the world scene with a white elephant—after the British and the French and the Russians?

Well, it is said, it will help the SST's prime contractors, General Electric and Boeing Aircraft. They are already receiving billions every year in governmental contracts, and are already second and ninth, respectively, on the list of favored defense contractors. However, they want more.

I have nothing against General Electric or Boeing. In fact I like both very much. But why in the name of commonsense do we not put Boeing to work making a new mass transit vehicle, and GE to work producing a pollution-free engine for it? If we do, mankind all over the world will call us blessed. And America will gain some real prestige.

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

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. On the question of prestige the Under Secretary of State Alexis Johnson in his report to the ad hoc committee said this:

> One specific aspect of this position in our view is that it would not be proper to base the decision to go ahead with the project on any generalized concept on the enhancement of United States prestige, or the like.

Mr. REUSS. Yes, and one member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Houthaker, asked what prestige there is in a white elephant.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, if I am correct, we have 4 minutes remaining on this side. I would like to again commend the chairman and all the other subcommittee members for the outstanding manner in which we have conducted the hearings this year. It has been my privilege to serve on this sub-

committee for 3 years. I think that in this year's testimony we had more testimony in this 1 year than we have had in the other 2 years combined. We went into all the programs in detail and my colleagues, especially my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), did a lot of research on his own and he is to be commended for that. I also commend him on coming to the decision which he has made.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, when we start to read the bill, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point. If there is anyone now who would object to that procedure, I will not make the request.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a time when the country is faced with an urgent need to review its budgetary priorities. On the one hand we must dramatically increase our efforts to control air and water pollution, to increase our stock of available housing, to provide jobs and train those with limited skills, and to attack the problems of the poor and aged who are left behind as inflation gallops along, and medical costs and interest rates soar. On the other hand, we must watch our expenditures closely, to avoid stimulating the same inflation which gnaws away at the quality of the lives of most Americans.

The development of the SST is symbolic of our unwillingness to come to terms with this dilemma. Which expenditures are we watching? We are closely watching expenditures for medical research, water pollution control, and federally assisted housing. We are closing our eyes to massive expenditures for certain defense systems of doubtful effectiveness, for the military support of a regime that is unwilling to make any political sacrifices to gain the loyalty of its own people, and for the SST.

Our priorities are seriously out of balance. We can begin to restore balance to our national goals by deferring the $96 million included in H.R. 14794 for SST prototype development costs, and reassessing our original commitment in light of present national priorities. If industry believes that the SST is commercially feasible, then I think that it should go ahead on its own.

The administration carefully marked down the costs of SST development for the next fiscal year to the point where they appear a bargain. Like the proverbial encyclopedia salesman, however, they will keep coming back, each time asking for a little more: $315 million in fiscal 1971, $189 million in fiscal 1972. By fiscal 1974, we will have spent over $1.2 billion on prototype development alone. As Fortune magazine has stated, the industry will not stop there. It says:

> The manufacturers are hoping for major Government participation through the production phase.

And further:

> If the manufacturers get their way, total Government investment could rise to $4 billion.

I think that we must draw the line now. The time is getting late.

The SST is the only aircraft to be commissioned and directly subsidized by the Federal Government for strictly commercial use. Our initial commitment was made at a time when our defense budget was running at $50 billion, not $80 billion; when cost of living was increasing at a steady 1 percent a year, not a spiraling 6 percent. The combined net worth of the aerospace industry was only about $4 billion. The Federal budget was about one-half what it is today. The recommendation of the Black and Osborne committee to President Kennedy in 1963 stressed that industry could not obtain necessary development capital in the private market. So in 1963 the FAA was given management control of the SST. Congress was promised a definitive financing plan which it finally received in 1967.

By then, times had changed. The aerospace industry had a net income of over $600 million, $240 million above the figure for 1963. The combined net worth of the aerospace industry had increased by $1.6 billion since the earlier period.

I think that if there is in fact demand for the SST, private industry has the capacity to develop the aircraft. Federal subsidies have created an artificial situation where the demand for the aircraft has been ignored. It is a strange twist of the democratic process when the American consumer is told that he must have a supersonic transport plane whether he wants one or not. It is a novel situation where Government administrators decide when a product is going to be placed on the market, without regard for its economic utility, and without consideration for its environmental side effects. We are told that American prestige in world air travel is at stake. This is all too reminiscent of the justification for our escalated involvement in Vietnam. It has become a device for avoiding careful analysis.

How is the average person affected by the development of the SST? The SST is not safer, or more economical, or more comfortable than presently available aircraft. The new jumbo jets will carry as many passengers, at cheaper fares. The SST's will sell for between $40 and $48 million. This places a tremendous burden on capital structure of the airlines. Not only will SST fares be high, but the increased investment will probably inflate costs to the extent that increased fares will be necessary on all routes.

The average American will never fly on an SST. It will be a luxury enjoyed by only 1 percent of the population, who are willing to pay a premium to fly a little faster to Europe or the Far East.

Although the SST, according to the FAA, will not fly over land, there is every reason to expect pressures to permit overland flight. Sweden, Ireland, and West Germany have banned such flights. The FAA refuses to prohibit them categorically. Once it appears that the SST is not economically viable unless overland flights are allowed, I believe that the pressures to permit such flights will be irresistable.

The results will be catastrophic for many of us. There will be ear-shattering sonic booms over a 50-mile swath beneath the aircraft. Experience with Air Force reconnaissance flights have already demonstrated the harmful effects of such sonic booms. Houses quake, windows shatter, and nerves are jarred. I question whether thousands must suffer this, so that a few can travel a few hours faster.

Our transportation needs are more down to earth. We need faster and more convenient ways to reach our airports, we need to improve our airports to provide better air traffic control and greater safety. We need more airports to relieve congestion. We need mass transit systems in many of our major cities.

The technological abilities of the Aerospace Industry apply equally to solving the problems of our cities. There is currently no job shortage in this industry, and SST development is not necessary as a pump-priming technique to generate employment. Problems of absorbing the hard-core unemployed into the economic life of this country are much more pressing. Rather than pursue the goal of developing technology for the sake of technology alone, in the construction of the SST, I urge the Aerospace Industry to turn instead toward using systems techniques for overcoming our urgent urban and environmental problems.

We are moving toward controlling the arms race, a self-defeating cycle which diverts precious resources from crucial national problems. Do we need to embark on a federally funded "air race"? Do we follow Russia, Britain and France on a merry chase to develop technology which has no public acceptance, and no proven utility or economic feasibility? I think not.

This is technocracy with a vengeance. We must shed this bias, and accept the proposition that, in the final analysis, our national pride and prestige do not rest on whether we get to the moon first, or whether we build a plane that flies 400 miles per hour faster than somebody else's plane. It rests instead on the quality of life which we enjoy.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14794, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, but in opposition to the appropriation of $95,958,000 for the development of a civil supersonic transport aircraft.

The legislation before the House today contains several important provisions, including the funds to authorize 1,000 new air traffic control personnel above the 2,800 new slots provided for in the budget. I have advocated funds to hire new air controllers for the past several years and this is an important step in easing the hazards produced by air traffic congestion over our Nation's major jetports. Those of us who have read the alarming number of "near misses" over Kennedy Airport commend this provision to our colleagues.

In addition the 1970 appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies provides $224 million for equipment and facilities for the Federal Aviation Administration to relieve air congestion and to improve air safety. This represents $90 million more than requested and is a mandate from

Congress to the FAA to step up activities in this area.

It is unfortunate that this bill on the one hand recognizes these urgent priorities in spending to improve the Nation's airways and then proceeds to authorize the expenditure of nearly $96 million to continue the development of a civil supersonic transport. I have opposed this project since it was first proposed and sent to Congress by the last administration. The scientific and technological evidence relating to the control of sonic boom reinforce my opposition to this expenditure.

We are told by Government officials that the SST will only fly supersonically over water and subsonic speeds overland. I have serious reservations about approving an appropriation based on a mere promise that the aircraft will not fly overland until we have perfected the control of sonic boom. I also must challenge the economic justification for building, subsidizing, and fostering the development of a supersonic aircraft which cannot fly overland.

In addition to these reasons the unknown future costs, the lack of evidence of the need to compete with other nations in this field, the potential hazards to health and property from the aircraft, and the need for these funds in other areas are several other grounds for my opposition. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment to strike these funds.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply and particularly concerned with one aspect of H.R. 14794. That is the amount appropriated for forest highways. In fiscal 1969 the appropriation for forest highways was $29,000,000. The estimate for 1970 was $30 million. However, only $18,000,000 is provided for in this bill, a $12 million reduction below the 1970 estimate.

This is the wrong place to cut funds. These moneys are used to construct and improve main highways within or adjacent to national forests. Their development is essential to the forest products industry. This system is approximately 25,600 miles in total length and is of great value and benefit to all Federal land resource users. They move people and commodities to and from our national forests, an absolutely vital function.

In the State of Oregon, where the Federal Government owns 52 percent of the land, much of which lies within national forests, this forest highway system represents a most critical communications link for the peoples' use. Much more than has been done with this system needs to be done. Instead of reducing this appropriation we should be increasing it.

I sincerely hope that the other body increases the amount to be appropriated for this purpose so that necessary development of this most critical forest highways program will not be slowed.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record opposed to spending $96 million for the SST plane at a time when the Nation is committed to cutting back and fighting inflation.

How can we justify an outlay this large for machinery research and production when we say we must cut the budget in the area of antipoverty, crime prevention, and pollution control?

We should also question whether our Government should get involved in a project which is basically commercial and should be left to private enterprise.

As the ad hoc committee has pointed out, the military weapons systems advancement will not be aided by the SST program. We cannot justify the outlay on these grounds.

I do not believe that 1969–70 is the time to go ahead with this expensive project. The economy dictates frugality. The problems of the Nation dictate a reconsideration of priorities. And most of all, the SST project itself demands further study to insure against increased environmental pollution, noise, and other hazards to passengers and crew.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that H.R. 14794 is generally sound, insofar as its responsiveness to the Nation's fiscal problems is concerned.

In other words, viewing H.R. 14794 from the standpoint of its total impact on the Federal budget, it is quite satisfactory inasmuch as it provides for a funding growth for the Department of Transportation which is consonant with the rate of growth of our national revenues.

I would particularly commend the Committee on Appropriations for including in this bill two major items which are intended to alleviate our growing air traffic crisis.

The first item is addition of 1,000 air traffic control personnel above the 2,800 specified in the budget. The shortage of personnel in the centers which literally hold the lives of thousands of commercial, general and private aviation travelers in their hands has become a national shame, and this legislation will be extremely meaningful both in making the skies safer and in relieving current air traffic controllers of intolerable work overloads.

The second item is the addition of $90 million more than the $134 million originally budgeted for equipment and facilities for the FAA. This too, will be an important gain in the area of air safety.

I noted that among the new facilities will be 54 control towers, two of which are located at relatively small Colorado airports which sorely need positive control to handle an increasing traffic pattern. I am very familiar with both of these facilities—the Arapahoe County Airport, which is located in my district, and the Aspen Airport, located in the western portion of Colorado—and I can assure my colleagues that the money spent will pay dividends in flight safety.

There are two aspects about H.R. 14794 which, in my opinion, should be modified because they run counter to our national priorities.

First, I feel that our Nation is years behind schedule in the development and deployment of mass urban transportation systems. This is a situation which cannot help but detract from the quality of life, not only in the inner city but for those in the suburbs as well. Many authorities believe that immobility is a prime factor in the sociological ills which plague our lower- and middle-income families, and from my personal observations I believe this theory to be correct.

Thus, I view it as unfortunate that H.R. 14794 reduces by $4 million the requested appropriation for high-speed ground transportation research and development; by $12 million the request for transportation planning, research, and development; and by $30 million the hoped-for research and technical studies for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

On the other hand, the bill provides $95.9 million for continued development of a supersonic transport aircraft. While I do not quarrel with the expenditure of some funds for SST technology, I definitely believe that proceeding headlong with deployment of SST aircraft is unwise. For one thing, it is becoming increasingly clear that until and unless some startling breakthroughs are achieved in the sonic boom problem, this system will be extremely limited in its applications and thus will benefit a minuscule of our population. For another, I cannot believe that, considering the strained condition of our budget, deployment of SST to the airlines is more important than deployment of decent mass urban transportation systems.

I hope my colleagues will note that adequate funding for ground systems would cost less than half of the proposed fiscal year 1970 appropriation for the SST.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the spending of Federal funds for the development of a supersonic transport. My opposition is not based on lack of concern for the position of the United States in world aviation. My opposition is not based on a lack of sensitivity to the impact on our balance-of-payments problem if other nations take over the supersonic transport field.

I am opposed to Government funding of this program principally for three reasons.

First, I think the current financial crisis demands that we hold down Government spending whenever and wherever possible, and I personally do not consider spending the taxpayer's dollar to insure a 2½-hour flight time to Paris a matter of top priority.

Second, I think the basic burden of financing the program should fall upon private enterprise itself. It may be possible, as some of my colleagues have suggested, that an SST authority could float bonds through regular channels, and the Government might guarantee the principal and interest; other forms of indirect assistance might also be considered.

Third, to the extent that Federal funds are available for mass transportation, I believe we should direct our efforts toward improving transit between and within our cities. Our airways and highways are already overburdened; Government funds must be aimed at easing—not complicating—the problems of congestion.

I want to be clear on this point: I do believe development of a supersonic transport might be desirable. I do not believe, however, that it is desirable for the Federal Government to provide an estimated additional $602 million to com-

plete development and testing of the supersonic transport.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, as many of my colleagues know, I have often commented on those aspects of the Department of Transportation's programs that I believe can be improved. I have been concerned about the highway beautification program, aircraft noise, the transportation of hazardous materials, to name only a few. In those cases where I disagreed with the course of action recommended, I have made my views known.

Today, I would like to add my voice in support of an activity being carried out by Secretary Volpe and the Department of Transportation. Early in his administration, Secretary Volpe created an Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. This Office has the responsibility for seeing that our transportation systems are planned and constructed in a manner that is most beneficial to the environment. For example, highways and airports are not to be built in a manner that degrades the surrounding areas. Whether it be noise pollution, scenic beauty, protection of parks and wildlife areas, this Office has the responsibility of insuring that Federal programs protect rather than destroy.

The task of those in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems is not an easy one. The need for transportation often comes in conflict with other values, values that are not as well represented when decisions on highway routes, new aircraft developments are made. A strong voice for the environment is needed at these policy councils. It is the job of those in this office to inform Secretary Volpe of the environmental considerations involved in transportation programs.

Fortunately, Secretary Volpe has chosen an individual who is well qualified to head this office. Assistant Secretary J. D. Braman, former mayor of Seattle, Wash., has carried out his responsibilities with vigor and foresight. The rerouting of the New Orleans Expressway around the Vieux Carre, one of the oldest historic areas in the country, is an example of his activity. Those of us concerned about the impact of our interstate highway system on our cities are watching with keen interest on the decisions made by the Department of Transportation on similar problems throughout the Nation.

I am concerned, however, that the Appropriations Subcommittee report fails to recognize the need for an expanded effort in this area. This office is called on to meet with many different advisory bodies that deal with parks, highways, and all the other aspects of the environment that impinge on transportation. These coordinating efforts are central to the question of whether we can build a better America, a nation that is both convenient and yet attractive to the eye. The quality of American life is inextricably mixed with the decisions that we make on transportation. The environment should not be shortchanged when we make these decisions. I urge, therefore, that the committee report recommendation limiting the staff of this office be considered as advisory only and that as the needs develop, additional personnel will be added. This is a small price to pay for what they can add to our transportation programs.

I am inserting in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues a list of the assigned responsibilities of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. I also include an article by Secretary J. D. Braman on the functions of his office:

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

A. STAFFING PRESIDENTIAL AND SECRETARIAL COMMITTEES—ACTION OFFICE FOR ALL DOT STAFFING

1. *Urban Affairs Council* (Presidential):

Subcommittee on Urban Transportation (Secretary Volpe is Chairman).

Subcommittee on Model Cities (Secretary Volpe is Member).

Subcommittee on Land Use and Development (New Towns) (Secretary Volpe is Chairman).

Subcommittee on Minority Business Enterprise (Assistant Secretary Braman is Chairman).

2. *Environmental Quality Council* (Presidential):

Subcommittee on Automotive Pollution (Secretary Volpe is Chairman).

Committee on Handling, Transportation and Disposal of Toxic Materials (Assistant Secretary Braman is Chairman of Steering Committee).

3. *Urban Transportation Advisory Council* (Secretarial): Action office for staffing and program.

4. *Office of Intergovernmental Relations* (Vice Presidential): Staff.

B. STAFFING AGENCY COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES—ACTION OFFICE FOR ALL DOT STAFFING

1. Model Cities: DOT Steering Committee (Assistant Secretary Braman is Chairman).

HUD Coordination on Transportation Components of All Model Cities Programs (Action Office).

Under Secretaries Working Group on Model Cities (DOT Representative).

2. Federal Task Force on Alaskan Development (Assistant Secretary Braman is permanent DOT Representative).

3. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Assistant Secretary Braman is DOT Representative).

4. Joint Interior-DOT Task Force on Miami Jetport (Assistant Secretary Braman represents DOT).

5. Migratory Bird Conservation Commission (Assistant Secretary Braman represents Secretary).

6. Interagency Committee on Disposal of Chemical Munitions (Assistant Secretary Braman represents DOT on Committee with HEW and DOD).

7. Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action (Assistant Secretary Braman is DOT Representative).

8. Commission on Pesticides (DOT Action Office).

9. Planning Assistance and Coordinating Committee (DOT Representative).

C. DIRECTING DOT PROGRAMS FOR SECRETARY VOLPE

1. Section 4(f) of DOT Act—Delegated statutory responsibility for evaluation of and recommendation on *every* proposed transportation project likely to traverse parkland (Action office to work with HUD, Interior and Agriculture on all § 4(f) cases.

2. Section 134 of 1962 Highway Act—Directing Departmental evaluation of urban transportation planning process required by 1962 Act and aimed at new urban transportation planning guidelines.

3. Implementation of National Trail Systems Act (Action Office for work with Interior).

4. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 (DOT Action Office).

5. Special User Problems: Transportation of the Handicapped (DOT Action Office to prepare program).

6. Urban Corridor Demonstration Program (Directing Office for joint highway-mass transportation program to reduce congestion in 10-12 urban corridors).

---

APPLYING ENLIGHTENMENT TO TRANSPORTATION GOALS

(By J. D. Braman, Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—*As part of* FAA Horizons' *recent series on model agencies within the Department of Transportation, the following article discusses the work being accomplished by the Office of Environment and Urban Systems.*)

All around our country, transportation developments have become the vital concern of groups and ordinary citizens.

In San Antonio and Memphis, factions are at odds on the issue of parks over highways or highways over parks. In other cities, citizens are divided on the matter of subways versus highways versus keeping old neighborhoods intact. In New Jersey, the debate centers on whether to locate an airport in a vast expanse of land, accessible to New York and its critical need for new airport facilities—but a conservationist's treasure, a wildlife refuge.

Governors, municipal authorities and groups of concerned citizens throughout the nation are seeking solutions to such problems as air pollution, noise, traffic congestion and casualties, abandoned autos, freeway revolts, crowded airports, disrupted neighborhoods and land use without adequate planning for life's intangible and tangible values.

To apply policies, programs and resources of the DOT to public and private efforts to solve these problems, Secretary Volpe created the Office of Environment and Urban Systems.

The primary mission of this office is to provide a bridge between purely transportation objectives and the broader and more fundamental social, economic and environmental goals of the nation and the individual communities making up our 50 states.

In Florida, for example, Secretary Volpe is particularly concerned and has asked us to advise him about the full ecological impact of a proposed international jetport near the Everglades National Park. In New Orleans, he wanted to know whether modern technology and traffic should be allowed to impinge on the historic French Quarter. We advised against the use of Federal funds to build a freeway and the project was halted.

OPEN LAND SHORTAGE

In most cities we no longer have all the open land we need to do all the things that need doing. Something has to give. An established urban park is one of the last pieces of land to be taken for any purpose and we must explore all alternatives and avoid such action wherever possible. One of the jobs of the Office of Environment and Urban Systems is to develop policies, criteria and methodology to insure full consideration of nonquantitative values—for example, the value of a park as a park. Resolving such conflicts during the earliest planning stages of a transportation project is less expensive and less divisive within the community than last-minute confrontations.

In addition to our concern for an improved environment, we have major responsibility for coordinating the resources of the Department to achieve balanced, intermodal urban

transportation systems. With the growing demands upon the tax dollar and on land use, transportation improvements must complement, rather than compete with, each other.

In analyzing specific transportation problems, we work closely with teams of specialists, planners, economists, systems analysts and engineers from the secretarial staffs and operating administrations. In this way, programs and funding can be inter-related throughout the planning stages to increase transportation's effectiveness and decrease its costs.

At Secretary Volpe's request, my office serves as prime coordinator on the Model Cities Program, consolidating Departmental positions, channeling working relations with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and coordinating the commitment of Departmental resources to specific model cities.

WORK WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

We work closely with state and local governments and civic and business groups to check the urban and environmental impact of Federal transportation policies and activities in individual communities. This continuing contact is useful to us in developing new programs for helping the cities, suggesting improvements in on-going programs of our operating administrations and supporting our overall goal of promoting environmental quality in American life.

My staff and I work closely with operating administration officials to support the Secretary in his role on the important new councils established by the President—the Urban Affairs Council and the Environmental Quality Council. Responsibilities which flow from these assignments and which necessitate a teamwork approach on the part of the modal administration and this office include urban transportation policy, land use and new towns, model cities, minority business enterprises, automotive pollution and transportation of toxic materials. We represent the Department on the Federal Task Force on Alaskan Development and work with a variety of other public and private agencies concerned with urban problems and the environment and transportation's impact.

Secretary Volpe has stated "so many of our national problems these days are centered in our urban areas, and so many of our other problems revolve around the way we treat the world in which we live." The implication of such problems for transportation today and in the future is the daily concern of this office and provides a constant challenge to all of us.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, we have before us an appropriations bill which contains an additional $95.9 million in Federal subsidies for development of an SST while funds for mass urban transit have been cut in half by the Appropriations Committee.

In recent months, evidence has mounted showing that the SST is questioned by the very segment of American business who supposedly support and would benefit by its creation. A Cabinet task force warned early this year that the SST may produce serious balance-of-payments problems, unacceptable noise levels, and environmental pollution. Its report also stated that the plane would contribute relatively little to employment, technological advancement, or America's international prestige.

Some major air carriers have substantial misgivings about the SST. General Quesada, former FAA head and member of the board of American Airlines, voiced doubts to the task force.

What is most tragic is that no really viable defense can be made for the SST. Some of the objections shall be repleted herein.

Admittedly, the sonic boom has not been cured, and the sole answer of proponents to this problem is that the plane will not be flown overland at supersonic speed. Needless to say, this does not make sense, as even at subsonic speeds the current noise level of the SST is equivalent to ten 707 engines revving simultaneously.

The major objection, however, is the use of Federal funds in an enterprise, risky at the very best, at a time when $30 million in research and technical studies for urban mass transit is deleted from the appropriation bill. To me there is a greater need for expenditure of our resources in that area than for the development of a supersonic transport plane.

I live but 15 miles from Kennedy Airport. Of what value is it to me to go from Kennedy to London in 2 hours when it sometimes takes me 2 hours to go from my home to Kennedy Airport? Of what further value is it to arrive at Kennedy Airport in 2 hours of flight time and then circle the airport for 2 additional hours because there is an utter lack of airport facilities in the great urban centers of our country?

I do not oppose the SST as an instrument of the future, but I do think that as a question of priority we must devote ourselves to urban mass transit and that private industry should continue in their efforts to develop the SST.

I might indicate at this point that in the early 1950's the jet plane industry sought Government assistance and was turned down. Private enterprise was not discouraged; and as a result, the American aerospace industry is preeminent in the world.

In the future, of course, men will travel supersonically. The vast resources of private enterprise will make this the accomplished fact. The Federal Government has more important things to do.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, the Transportation Department appropriation bill before us represents a gross distortion of our national priorities. I am opposing the bill as a whole for the first time today in protest against these distortions, and despite the fact that there are many provisions in the bill that I warmly support, particularly the increases mandated by the committee for air traffic safety equipment.

Overall, however, the bill cuts in the areas of most vital national need, while committing Congress irrevocably to a huge subsidy for the civilian supersonic transport plane. This misplaced emphasis just cannot be tolerated.

Mass urban transportation to assist with subways, commuter trains, and bus service to get people to and from jobs in our metropolitan areas is the No. 1 transportation need of the Nation. Yet, the Mass Transportation Fund appropriation was cut $30 million, the research funds were cut in half, and the salaries for the Mass Transportation Administration were cut by $500,000.

Highway safety is another of our most crucial programs. Highway mayhem is the No. 1 killer in the United States today, taking many more lives than the Vietnam war. Yet the overall highway safety program appropriations were more than halved, a reduction that will seriously cripple the operation of the State and Federal highway safety programs.

Funds for the Bureau of Railroad Safety were cut by $400,000 in the face of an unprecedented rash of railway accidents that have cost millions of dollars in damage to property and resulted in many deaths and injuries. Our Nation's tracks are in deplorable shape, endangering not only passengers but every community served by the railroads. The transportation of dangerous cargoes over inadequately maintained tracks poses an ever-increasing hazard for which more, rather than less, supervision is required.

The National Transportation Safety Board which investigates public carrier accidents and recommends remedial action was cut $100,000, representing denial of badly needed additional personnel, in the face of sharp increases in both rail and air accidents.

Contrasted to these cuts in areas of vital national concern, the $96 million appropriated to finance a civilian supersonic transport as a part of a program that eventually will cost the Government billions of dollars seems ludicrous. The worst aspect is that the $96 million in this bill is not just for research and development. It commits the Government to proceed with the building of prototypes and to the huge eventual Federal subsidy. If the project were economically viable, the air industry would certainly have financed it. The Government should not gamble billions on a project industry has found too unsound to finance itself. This kind of special-interest subsidy in the name of national pride certainly must be the lowest of priorities; certainly that is so next to programs like highway safety that can save thousands of lives and the mass transportation programs that can mean getting people off relief rolls and onto payrolls.

To commit the country to finance supersonic air transportation for the benefit of less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the population while cutting transportation programs which affect the jobs and safety of the large majority of Americans just makes no sense.

I, therefore, feel I have no alternative but to oppose the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the sections of this bill that cut deeply into funds for forest highways and public lands highways. While the significance of these reductions may not be apparent to my colleagues from States with little or no public lands and national forests, it represents a serious oversight of the needs of those States with a major share of their lands in Federal ownership.

The fiscal year 1970 budget estimate for national forest highway construction was $30 million. This request was grossly inadequate compared to the need. In spite of the paucity of the request, this bill would provide an appropriation of only $18 million. The estimate for public lands roads was $12 million, woefully in-

adequate for the need. This figure has been reduced to $7 million for fiscal year 1970.

I want to state that I do not consider funds for these purposes to be a contribution of any kind. The Federal Government has a definite responsibility to finance the construction of highways that traverse vast acreages of Federal land. In a State such as Oregon, with over 52 percent of total acreage in Federal ownership, and therefore off the tax rolls, there is an acute awareness that this responsibility has not been met in the past. Under the provisions of this appropriation bill, we see a further erosion that will surely result in delay and cancellation of this vital portion of the State's highway construction program in areas that are already long overdue for action.

I regret that the Appropriation Committee has recommended these reductions. I have noted that the reason given is President Nixon's cutback in Federal construction expenditures as an anti-inflationary fiscal measure. I can assure the President, and you, my colleagues, that the administration's policies in this regard and the tight money policy that has crippled the Nation's housing industry have already taken a serious toll in the State of Oregon. This is a clear case of fiscal overkill that I hope will be remedied before this bill is finally enacted.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14794, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill. The work of the Subcommittee on Transportation, ably chaired by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is to be commended for their excellent and timely work on this bill.

This bill, as reported from committee is $158.2 million less than the administration request. The total for the entire bill is $6.61 billion which is $596.4 million over the fiscal year 1969 appropriations.

Both the subcommittee and the full committee have moved in this measure to alleviate some of the problems of air traffic congestion. This bill provides for an additional 1,000 air traffic controllers over what the budget request would have provided. In addition, the subcommittee provided $90,000,000 more for the en route automation equipment for air traffic control centers. These two constructive steps seem to me to enhance the possibility of having a safer air transportation system. The $90 million increase, coupled with the $134 million requested, will be used for long range radar, terminal area radar, communications and new control towers. All of these items are vitally necessary if air transportation is to remain safe.

The $135 million cut in various highway programs represents the committee effort to aid the President in his announcement that he desires a 75-percent cutback in federally financed projects. Although I see the need to cut back on Federal expenditures, I am not sure if this meat-ax approach is the wisest method of economizing. I support this bill, however, and I hope that the administration will utilize this cut by making discriminating choices in the projects to be financed, rather than applying it across the board, not taking into account important situational factors.

Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I was a little concerned over the decrease in expenditures for planning, research, and development in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, minus $12 million; Urban Mass Transportation, minus $30 million; and, High-Speed Ground Transportation, minus $4 million. These programs seem to provide the future directions for our mass transit needs. I am partially reassured by the subcommittee's report that much of these funds would be used for duplication of existing work. If this is the case, the cuts are more than justified. I am especially taken with the argument that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration should move from research and demonstration areas and technical studies to more action oriented programs. The need and pressures for mass transit are apparent. It seems to me that plans should now move into an implementation stage. I know that Bay Area Transit in my own area holds much promise for alleviating some of our transportation needs. This type of project seems to be the sort of project that should receive not only operational planning assistance, but also support from construction funds and thus be exempted from the 75-percent cutback.

There is one item in this bill which I find very objectionable. That is the provision of Federal tax dollars for the construction of the SST. It is my opinion that this project is one that should be funded by private investment. I realize that many Members in good faith feel the need for this Federal assistance for the SST. I do not share this view. It seems to me that our national priorities dictate that SST funding should be a private effort. Based on the available evidence, I am not convinced that the social priorities in this country, external balance-of-payments arguments for SST, or the environmental problems that are associated with the SST permit me to support the $96 million in new funds requested.

Mr. Chairman, with these few exceptions, I feel that H.R. 14794 is on balance a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill includes badly needed funds for the Federal Aviation Administration. There have been occasions in past years when the amount of funds appropriated for the construction of airports has fallen far short of the Nation's needs. In fact, on several occasions in past years I have called attention to and made attempts on the floor to increase the amounts made available for Federal aid to airports funds, at least to equal the amounts requested by the President and included in the budget. These attempts have failed, and the Appropriations Committee has confidently predicted that more funds were not needed. Unfortunately, this has not proven to be the case, as our airport crisis throughout the Nation has deepened until it has fast developed toward becoming a catastrophe.

THE GAP BETWEEN FUNDS AND NEEDS

For the fiscal year 1970, only $30 million was made available to meet the rising needs of the Nation for airport aid. This figure contrasts with the $70 million made available last year when the needs were not as great. The explanation has been made that only $30 million is needed because Congress is considering and will shortly enact the commendable plan to finance new airport construction through a trust fund derived from use charges on such items as aviation fuel and passenger ticket taxes. The trust fund concept, as embodied in legislation which I enthusiastically supported and which was passed by the House of Representatives on November 6, when it takes hold will certainly help break the airport bottleneck. Yet the widening gap between available funds and national needs has been dramatically highlighted on page 52 of the hearings.

But what about the hiatus between now and the passage and funding of this legislation? How long will it take before the trust fund is funded and in operation? I consulted with Mr. Edward Stimpson of the Federal Aviation Administration, and he assured me that he did not feel that this hiatus would cause any particular problems for the Federal Aviation Administration in its future funding for new airports. In fact, Mr. Stimpson expressed confidence that by next summer funds would be available for distribution under the new law. I informed Mr. Stimpson that I felt his schedule was over-optimistic, and that the administration should take some steps to insure earlier airport construction funding to cover the gap between the drying up of Federal aid to airport funds and the availability of funding under the new user charge-trust fund principle. Only time will tell whether the loss of funding during the upcoming construction season will once again deal a severe blow to the future development of desperately-needed airports throughout the Nation. I hope I am wrong in my pessimistic prediction.

MIDWAY AIRPORT DECISION

Meanwhile, it becomes more apparent every day that the Federal Aviation Administration made a wise decision when the FAA declared on May 15, 1967, that it "believes that the long-range airport requirements of the people of southern West Virginia are best met, and the public interest best served by the least-cost development of a midway regional airport" to serve Charleston and Huntington, W. Va.—the two largest cities of West Virginia, located only 50 miles apart and joined by an interstate highway.

Hundreds of experienced pilots, private and commercial, who have landed at these mountain-top airports, have commented on the far superior safety factors which a regional, midway airport would provide. The Air Line Pilots Association and the pilots who have flown into West Virginia have repeatedly pointed out the particular threats to safety at the Kanawha Airport in Charleston, W. Va. Members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Com-

mittee, speaking as individuals, have called attention to the dangerous nature of this airport. Recently, plans were developed to lengthen the runway from 5,600 to 6,300 feet at Kanawha Airport and make other improvements. The Air Line Pilots Association, in reviewing these improvements, terms them commendable, but only "temporary" in nature. A clear-cut recommendation is made to go ahead with the planning and construction of the long-delayed Midway Airport.

TEXTS OF LETTERS FROM AIRLINE PILOTS

The full texts of the letters from Capt. Joseph W. Meeks, chairman of the Air Line Pilots Association Airport Evaluation Committee, include telling evidence that we must get on with the job of building this vital facility midway between Charleston and Huntington, W. Va.:

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., November 11, 1969.*

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HECHLER: I must apologize for being so late in answering your letter of October 13. Your letter arrived while I was away on vacation and my wife suffered a heart attack on our return.

Thank you for your kind words about the Airport article in the National Observer. I do not recall discussing the actual length of the runway at the Kanawha Airport with the author. I believe the figures used were his.

ALPA does not agree that the improvements at Kanawha Airport would alleviate our objections to this field. The improvements now underway at Kanawha will help to some extent, the unsafe situation that exists at this airport. However, they should be considered an effort to satisfy the needs on a temporary basis until a new airport can be constructed. We think everyone connected with this effort should be complimented, but do strongly urge that the new Midway Airport be developed with great speed.

There are many problems that cannot be overcome at the present Kanawha Airport site. To name a few, the geographical location of the airport to the northeast of the industrial section keeps it continually in smoke and haze; the proximity to the Kanawha and Elk Rivers plus the valley around it develops a great deal of ground fog that envelopes the airport. It has no capabilities of being enlarged to accommodate the larger and newer jet aircraft; it can certainly never have adequate overrun and underrun areas; the terrain presents a terrific problem on approach both from an optical standpoint and physically flying of the airplane, and there is no possible way to achieve lower landing minimums.

The construction of a new airport at the proposed Midway site would solve these problems and give the traveling public a safer and more dependable transportation.

Thank you very much for your continued efforts to promote safer air travel. Please feel free to call on me at any time I can be of help in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MEEK,
*Chairman, ALPA Airport Evaluation Committee.*

---

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C. November 11, 1969.*

Mr. MICHAEL J. RUSSELL,
*Kanawha County Planning and Zoning Commission, Charleston, W. Va.*

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: I must apologize for being so late in answering your letter of September 17. This letter was forwarded to me while I was away on vacation, and, upon my return, my wife suffered a heart attack which disrupted my schedule.

First, I must state that ALPA did not list Kanawha Airport as one of the ten most dangerous in the United States. This came from an article in the *National Observer* by Mr. Peter Chew from an interview with me. The airports used in this article were merely examples of unsafe situations that exist at airports. When the wire service picked this article up, they did show it as an ALPA list of the ten most unsafe airports.

At the present time, we are attempting to survey all airports served by scheduled airlines for unsafe conditions. As you can well imagine, this is time-consuming effort and nowhere completion.

The extension of the runway to 6,300 and the other work to improve Kanawha Airport is a commendable project. This work is probably the best that could be done with the present physical location. This should be considered as money and effort will spent to satisfy the needs of safety and efficiency on a temporary basis.

There are many problems that cannot be overcome at the present Kanawha site. To name a few, the geographical location of the airport to the northeast of the industrial section keeps it continually in smoke and haze; the proximity of Kanawha to the Kanawha and Elk Rivers plus the valley around it develops a great deal of ground fog that envelopes the airports; it has no capability of being enlarged to accommodate the larger and newer jet aircraft; it can certainly never have adequate overrun and underrun areas; the terrain presents a terrific problem on approach both from an optical standpoint and physically flying of the airplane, and there is no possibility of achieving lower landing minimums.

As most forward-thinking officials involved in airport planning know, the sooner a site is selected and purchased for airport use, the cheaper will be the cost. Land prices have a way of increasing as time goes on; they do not come down. The growth of any community must be closely associated with the development of air traffic capability. Since air traffic must involve larger and larger aircraft, the development of a newer and larger airport must be faced and accomplished as soon as possible. If this is not faced now, the problem will become more acute in the future as other communities with adequate air service get the new manufacturing plants and other businesses that need good air service.

We therefore urge the construction of a new airport at the Midway site.

I am sending you under separate cover a copy of "ALPA Guide for Airport Standards."

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

JOE W. MEEK,
*Chairman, ALPA Airport Committee.*

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, matched against other large Government spending programs, the $6.6 billion for transportation under consideration today is not a huge amount. Nevertheless, I think its represents a distortion of national priorities.

The priority argument can be carried on at two levels. First, placing this bill within the broad scheme of national needs, I am upset when I see funds allocated for such marginal projects as the supersonic transport and additional superhighways at the same time that so little is spent for crucial programs in medical research and family planning, just to name two areas which have undergone substantial budget slashes or underfunding in current years.

But, beyond that rhetorical argument, I see major flaws within the overall direction of transportation policy.

And while I support policies leading to the most modern, efficient, and economical transportation systems this Nation can afford, it appears to me that in this bill we continue causing problems instead of solving them.

The highway program is a good example. Certainly the surface costs of the highway program are but a sliver of the total costs imposed by our continuing efforts to asphalt the Nation.

After much experience in this area over the past 15 years in public office, I am almost sure that there exists a perverse relationship between highways and cars, and that cars expand—in some Parkinsonian manner—to meet the amount of highway space available, and not the other way around.

Thus, the more highways we build, the more congestion we seem to end up with. Yes, even more important, the more highways we make, the more intense are our environmental problems—problems ranging from that of ever increasing smog levels to those of severe ecological imbalances and the visual ugliness created by the accumulations of scrapped vehicles and parts.

Then, too, we must remember that the costs of each new mile of highway must be counted in terms of so much less in funds allocated to important alternative transportation modes—and more specifically, urban mass transit programs and mass transit research.

Until today, I have always supported the highway program. Now I find that the mounting problems resulting from our extreme overemphasis on highway construction are too large to warrant my continued backing. Balance must be established between highways and alternative mass transit systems, and that balance is lacking in this bill.

Of course when we deal with priorities, immediately we come across the supersonic transport, and in my opinion, hardly any other nonmilitary spending program has so little to recommend it.

Economic analysis repeatedly shows that the SST figures to be a negative investment—unless the Government allows it to have land flyovers. But its unacceptable sonic boom renders the plane unfit for overland travel. However, if we allow the SST to be built, and it begins to lose lots of money, when the pressure begins to be applied to permit overland flights, it is not hard to guess who will prevail in the struggle between the industry lobbies and the public interest.

Then there are the billions of dollars, ones uncounted in mere construction analyses of SST costs, which will arise in order to provide adequate ground facilities to handle these monster jets.

Go right on down the list of controversial facets of the SST, as I have, and each time the benefits accruing from continued tax dollar investment in this project come out zero or negative. Yet the Government proposes spending over $95 million for fiscal 1970, and I foresee total costs for the entire SST program

topping well over the current projected level of $1.3 billion.

National priorities are not served by this bill. The highway program and the SST are but two examples of programs which make this legislation unacceptable to me. I support the attempts by my colleagues from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and New York (Mr. KOCH) to bring about a more rational allocation of transportation funds.

Without the Yates and Koch amendments, I find that I have no other choice but to vote against this appropriation package.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, immediately after President Nixon announced his approval of funds for continuing the development of the supersonic transport plane—SST—I issued a news release expressing my opposition to this decision.

While I am not against progress or industrial growth, I do believe the time has come for the Congress of the United States to take a good, hard look at the Nation's priorities. Today, our country faces a multitude of problems which are yet to be solved: Air and water pollution, education, housing, health, highways, and job development. In aviation, there is a dire need to straighten out the chaotic conditions in air traffic control before our domestic air travel becomes paralyzed.

Constantly, Mr. Chairman, I receive letters from my constituents advising me that a program of one type or another has been curtailed or canceled because of a lack of funds, programs which are doing a good job not only for their communities but for their State and Nation. Foster grandparents program in my district has been affected. Cities and citizens want to clean up their rivers and lakes but are unable to get full assistance.

Housing, which is a problem not only in urban America but also a tremendous problem in rural America, is in dire need of additional funding. Certainly the more than 4 million substandard homes in rural America must be improved. Granted we voted additional funds to begin to handle this problem, but is it enough? Would it not be to the benefit of all America to improve our homes throughout the Nation? Is it not time to return to the people, who have worked many long, hard hours to pay their taxes, some sign that we are responsive to their needs—that we realize we owe them a commitment to make life a little bit better by solving or working to solve the problems of our Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a need for improvement in our transportation system, both land and air. But it is my belief that these improvements should be made by industry itself. Were the Wright Brothers subsidized? Was Whitney when he worked on the cotton gin? No, they were not. If we did not have a problem of crowded cities, if we did not have the problem of air and water pollution, if there was not an immediate need to rebuild countryside America, if we had solved the problem of cancer, then, yes, I would be in favor of appropriating $96 million for further development on the SST. But we have not solved these problems, and certainly the need to is greater than the SST. I cannot condone this action.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the following sums be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $27,000 for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine; $11,500,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, and development activities, including the collection of national transportation statistics; $8,000,000, of which $400,000 shall be available only for the study of the existing motor vehicle accident compensation system authorized in Public Law 90–313, to remain available until expended.

CONSOLIDATION OF DEPARTMENTAL HEADQUARTERS

For necessary expenses in connection with the consolidation of departmental activities into the Southwest Area of Washington, District of Columbia, $4,520,000.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; recreation and welfare; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); $386,000,000, of which $131,370 shall be applied to Capehart Housing debt reduction: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed one hundred and seventy-three exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That, without regard to any provisions of law or Executive order prescribing minimum flight requirements, Coast Guard regulations which establish proficiency standards and maximum and minimum flying hours for this purpose may provide for the payment of flight pay at the rates prescribed in section 301 of title 37, United States Code, to certain members of the Coast Guard otherwise entitled to receive flight pay during the current fiscal year (1) who have held aeronautical ratings or designations for not less than fifteen years, or (2) whose particular assignment outside the United States or in Alaska, makes it impractical to participate in regular aerial flights: *Provided further*, That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriations for "Operating expenses" for the two preceding years, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236–244), this appropriation shall be available for expenses of primary and secondary schooling for dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed outside the continental United States at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and the Coast Guard may provide for the transportation of said dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $57,300,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan, $57,750,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law, including repayment to other Coast Guard appropriations for indirect expenses, for regular personnel, or reserve personnel while on active duty, engaged primarily in administration and operation of the reserve program; maintenance and operation of facilities; supplies, equipment, and services; and the maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; $25,900,000: *Provided*, That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriations for "Reserve training" for the two preceding years shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for a Selected Reserve programed to be in excess of 15,000 personnel on June 30, 1970.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; $14,500,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; purchase of five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; $767,000,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available, but at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska; $224,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel, or to purchase any land for or in connection with the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $41,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, includng purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $450 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $9,500,000.

CONSTRUCTION, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

For necessary expenses for construction at the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, $1,900,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including the construction of two prototype aircraft of the same design, and advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), $95,958,000, to remain available until expended.

AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available pursuant to section 1306 of the Act of August 23, 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1536), and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for aviation war risk insurance activities under said Act.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, as authorized by law, of the Office of the Administrator and staff offices of the Federal Highway Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and for hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,650,000, together with $12,467,000, to be transferred from the appropriation for "Federal-Aid Highways (trust fund)."

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, LIMITATION ON GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for administration, operation, and research of the Bureau of Public Roads, as authorized by law, not to exceed $59,012,000 shall be paid, in accordance with law, from the appropriation "Federal-Aid Highways (trust fund)" (including advances and reimbursements): *Provided,* That appropriations available to the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, $4,419,279,000, or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the "Highway trust fund"; which sum is composed of $847,481,534, the balance of the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1968, and $3,533,765,964 (or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the "Highway trust fund"), a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1969, $11,549,761 for reimbursement of the sum expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by title 23, United States Code, section 125, $133,443 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of bridges upon and across dams, as provided by title 23, United States Code, section 320, $24,949,709 for reimbursement of sums expended pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 131), and $1,398,589 for reimbusement of the sums expended pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act, as amended (78 Stat. 505).

RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 108(c), as authorized by section 7(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, to remain available until expended, $40,000,000, to be derived from the "Highway trust fund" at such times and in such amounts as may be necessary to meet current withdrawals.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 131, 136, and 319(b), to remain available until expended, $5,000,000, together with $1,100,000 for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out such provisions of title 23, United States Code, as authorized by section 6(g) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $27,550,000, together with $2,000,000 to be transferred from the appropriation for "State and community highway safety (Liquidation of contract authorization)."

STATE AND COMMUNITY HIGHWAY SAFETY (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402, to remain available until expended, $30,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,000,000 may be advanced to the appropriation "Traffic and highway safety" for administration of this program.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

For necessary expenses to carry out motor carrier safety functions of the Secretary, as authorized by the Department of Transportation Act (80 Stat. 939–40): $2,300,000.

FOREST HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 204, pursuant to contract authorization granted by title 23, United States Code, section 203, to remain available until expended, $18,000,000, which sum is composed of $11,950,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1968, and $6,050,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1969: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road construction and maintenance but the total cost of any such item under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 209, pursuant to the contract authorization granted by title 23, United States Code, section 203, to remain available until expended, $7,000,000, which sum is composed of $5,300,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1968, and $1,700,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1969.

CHAMIZAL MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of November 8, 1966 (Public Law 89–795), $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $1,000,000.

BUREAU OF RAILROAD SAFETY

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Railroad Safety, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $4,050,000.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH

For necessary expenses for conducting railroad research activities, $300,000, to remain available until expended.

ALASKA RAILROAD

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for

the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8146, to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided,* That no employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $1,500,000.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION FUND

For an additional amount for grants and loans as authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), to remain available until expended, $220,000,000, for the fiscal year 1971, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be available for research, development, and demonstration grants.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $3,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Secretary of Transportation, hire of passenger motor vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902) and $5,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); $5,000,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $10,200,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, $33,500,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $25,000,000, of which $150,000 shall be available for valuation of pipelines: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

To enable the Department of Transportation to pay the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, as part of the Federal contribution toward expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended (79 Stat. 663; 80 Stat. 1352; 81 Stat. 670), including acquisition of rights-of-way, land and interests therein, $43,173,000 to remain available until expended.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Administration shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 302. Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Administration may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Administration, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $16,100,000 for "Highway Beautification" in fiscal year 1970.

SEC. 304. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $65,000,000 in fiscal year 1970 for "State and Community Highway Safety".

SEC. 305. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $12,000,000, exclusive of the reimbursable program, in fiscal year 1970 for "Forest Highways".

SEC. 306. None of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $3,000,000 in fiscal year 1970 for "Public Lands Highways".

SEC. 307. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 308. None of the money appropriated hereby shall be used to make any payment on any lease purchase contract for jet airplanes to be used by the Federal Aviation Administration wherein the total cost of the lease payments plus the amount needed to exercise the purchase option exceeds the purchase price of the aircraft (which would have been charged were the aircraft to be purchased by normal appropriations) by more than 20 per centum.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1970".

Mr. BOLAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made against any provisions of the bill?

If not, are there any amendments to the bill?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 276]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Edwards, Calif. | Patman |
| Ashley | Evins, Tenn. | Philbin |
| Aspinall | Fascell | Powell |
| Baring | Frelinghuysen | Pucinski |
| Belcher | Griffin | Rooney, Pa. |
| Bevill | Gubser | Rosenthal |
| Blackburn | Hébert | Rostenkowski |
| Button | Howard | Stephens |
| Cahill | Jones, Tenn. | Teague, Tex. |
| Carey | Kastenmeier | Thompson, N.J. |
| Celler | Kirwan | Tunney |
| Chappell | Landrum | Udall |
| Clark | Lujan | Utt |
| Clay | Lukens | Vigorito |
| Dawson | McClory | Whalley |
| de la Garza | Mathias | Widnall |
| Denney | May | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Dent | Morgan | |
| Diggs | Ottinger | |
| Dingell | Passman | |

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14794, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 374 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 8, strike out line 19 and all lines thereafter through line 3 on page 9.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to strike out the funds for the SST. It comes at a logical time in the SST program because it is entering a new phase. The Boeing Co., the contractor on the plane, was engaged previously in developing a variable-swept wing design, and most of the funds have been devoted up to the present time to that purpose.

Last year the FAA in agreement with Boeing decided that the variable-swept wing would not work, and they scrapped that design. Now the program seeks to develop a prototype plane with a fixed wing. It is the start of that phase. That is why I say it is a logical time to knock it out.

My reasons for my views are ex-

plained at length in the report of the committee where I filed dissenting views. I urge you to read them.

The total SST program will cost approximately $3.5 billion, or more. The prototype phase will cost approximately $1.5 billion. Of the $1.5 billion, the Government will put up about $1.3 billion in appropriations funds, and the contractor approximately $200 million. Thus the Government will advance 88 percent of the funds and the contractors 12 percent.

It is argued that this must be done because we have to keep America first in the air. America will be kept first in the air, but not because of the SST. American will be kept first in the air through the so-called Jumbo Jet, the 747, the 1011, and the DC–10.

It was said that the airlines wanted a plane that will give them speed. That is true, but not entirely. The airlines want most of all a plane that will make money for them. The 747, the 1011, and the DC–10 will be much more profitable than the SST is likely to be.

This is from the report of the General Accounting Office on the feasibility of the plane, which compares the proposed SST with the 747. It says this, at page 223 of the hearings:

> In essence, only the Boeing 747 is shown to have the competitive advantage over the SST in operating costs with respect to distances exceeding 2,500 miles.

Only the 747 can do that. I assume the big jets of other companies will be able to do it, too. With respect to the argument that we need the SST to keep America first in the air, I say the 747 is the plane that is going to do that, not the SST.

President Nixon early this year appointed a committee of the ablest men in Government to review the SST to decide whether it ought to go ahead. This is what they said, and I read from page 36 of the committee report, from my dissenting views. On the question of prestige, and this is what the Under Secretary of State said:

> One specific aspect of this position is our view that it would not be proper to base the decision to go ahead with the project on any generalized concept of enhancement of U.S. prestige, or the like.

That is from the Department of State.

The Department of the Treasury said this:

> Proceeding to prototype production would not be prudent at this time in view of the uncertainties cited above, and the implied large commitment of U.S. government funds, not only for fiscal 1970 but for years ahead, very probably extending to substantial assistance in production financing.

That is the statement of the Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The Under Secretary of the Interior said:

> We believe that the probable adverse environmental impact of the SST is such that the program should not be pursued in the absence of overwhelming evidence of positive advantages.

The Assistant Secretary of Labor said—and you have heard the statement made about 50,000 jobs—this is what the Assistant Secretary of Labor said:

> The net employment increase from SST production would likely be negligible and would occur in the professional and technical categories where shortages already exist. The project would have practically no employment benefits for the disadvantaged hardcore unemployed with low skill levels.

These are the opinions of some of the highest officials in the administration.

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

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, innumerable dangers still lie in wait in development of the SST prototype.

But assuming that the contractors are able to bring this plane through the prototype stage, what would happen then? There would be the necessity of obtaining $2 billion to finance the production of the plane. Where is Boeing going to go to obtain the $2 billion? Will it return to the Federal Government? That is the most realistic prospect. Do you want your taxpayers to assume another $2 billion to finance the production phase of this plane? Somebody is going to have to put that money up. The airlines cannot do it because the airlines are in financial difficulties today. And they are buying the 747. Why? That is the most profitable plane for the airlines.

It is said that the British and the French are in the field and that we must build this plane to compete with them.

I am not sure there will be competition. The prospective cost of the Concorde is $21 million, of the SST $52 million. An airline can buy two Concordes for the price of one SST. Which will they buy? Moreover, the planes are entirely dissimilar. We do not know now whether the British or the French plane will fly. It is true that the prototype has had some short supersonic flights. Yet the noise factor was so great, I wonder whether or not the FAA Administrator will permit that supersonic craft to fly into New York or into Boston or Chicago or Miami. The noise factor will continue to be a barrier that will have to be overcome.

For all these reasons, for the reasons I have outlined at greater length in the report and I urge you to take a look at that report, I ask that my amendment be supported.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to eliminate funds for the SST. This project to construct a supersonic transport plane would distort national priorities for years to come. What we actually need is the construction of 26 million homes to eliminate slums and provide for our growing population. We need to construct new public facilities—decent schools, water and sewer facilities, public buildings, the whole range of public works that enable our communities to serve our people. We need to construct entire new communities to help meet our national housing goals approved overwhelmingly last year by the Congress. We are being asked now to hedge on that commitment to all of our people so that a few jet-setters can save an hour or two in their travels. At the same time, we would raise the threat of polluting our environment with sonic boms which might in the end lead to a prohibition against the use of this rich man's toy.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that we need to launch into this expensive venture to keep up with other countries, but what nation is it which now has men on the moon. This country leads the world in science and technology. We do not need to catch up or show off. What we do need is to eradicate the root causes of turmoil in our cities, to make the American dream a reality for all of our people, to overcome the shortage of housing and community facilities, and to provide more jobs for the average American workingman, not just scientists and engineers.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to look far to see the distortion in our national priorities—the question is raised right here in the bill before us today. I have the greatest respect for the hard and thoughtful work of the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees. I know how conscientious they are in their deliberations. Those of us who feel keenly about the critical traffic problems in our towns and cities, however, must feel disappointment at the funds provided for the vital urban mass transit program. Both the House and the Senate have authorized a level of $300 million for this program in the coming fiscal year, but unfortunately the administration requested only $250 million and even that inadequate amount has been cut by $30 million in the bill before us. The people of this country would be far better off if the mass transit program had been fully funded instead of undertaking an unneeded and costly venture to build the SST.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment to eliminate funds for the supersonic transport will receive the overwhelming support it deserves.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) to delete the $96 million included for the development and construction of the supersonic transport plane—SST.

The SST is not one of our Nation's paramount priorities. Funds for much more essential programs have been curtailed in this administration's drive for economy. If we cannot find funds to house our poor and cure our sick, I do not see how we can afford to subsidize an American industry which every year enjoys a large profit.

I cannot help speculating on what might have been achieved in the public interest if the almost $650 million in funds already devoted to the development of the new, powerful, and relatively smokeless SST engine had been used instead to produce a non-polluting automotive engine.

More than just the distortion of national priorities which would occur if the SST continued to receive Govern-

ment subsidy, there is the question of the desirability of the SST at all. We are told that it will improve our position in international affairs, be economically viable, provide jobs, improve our balance of payments and just about solve every other problem we have. Yet the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee appointed in January by the President and composed of some of the most able men in government recommended against the continuation of the development of the SST.

U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State, declared in the committee report that:

> There are no overriding foreign policy grounds . . . for pushing ahead with the SST project now.

Paul A. Voloker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, declared:

> Our own review of this project . . . has raised many unresolved questions concerning . . . the economic viability of the SST project.

Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor, declared:

> The net employment increase from SST production would likely be negligible.

Henrick S. Houhakker, member of the Council of Economic Advisors, declared:

> The balance of payments impact of the SST is likely to be adverse.

And there was the statement of Russell E. Train, Under Secretary of the Interior, warning of the effect of the SST on the environment. He said:

> It is my conclusion that the justification for . . . the program is not now apparent . . . However, we consider the environmental disadvantages to be of extreme significance.

We should eliminate any funding for the SST. We have better uses for our money than public works for the airline industry.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment to strike the funds for the SST. I oppose any appropriations for building a supersonic transport this year. My reasons are based on these unresolved economic questions:

First. Can the SST be economically justified while it is limited to flights over water pending development of our ability to control sonic boom?

Second. Can the SST be flown safely even though limited to oceanic flights? What would happen if a sonic boom hit the U.S.S. *Enterprise* or any other ship at sea?

Third. It has been estimated that less than 3 percent of our population will ever use the SST. Is the development of such ar. aircraft justified in light of national priorities?

Fourth. If the SST is important for U.S. competition with other nations, is it not more important for the United States to spend more resources to relieve the airport crisis—build and expand airfields to relieve congestion, improve air safety, and reduce aircraft noise and pollution?

Fifth. There is much concern about the Concorde but who will buy a plane that only seats 130 in view of the coming of the jumbo jets?

The Federal Aviation Act required that FAA, through its regulations of the use of airspace, "protect persons and property on the ground."

This mandate has not been followed and it is time for Congress to let the FAA know where it must direct its attention if the aviation industry is to continue to expand.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, today Members of Congress will be asked to appropriate nearly $100 million for continuing research on the proposed supersonic passenger plane. The question we all must resolve before approving this appropriation is whether or not the Government should require the American public—95 percent of which will never use the SST—to provide billions of dollars for a plane that will bring only discomfort and destruction into their lives. Beyond the obvious illogic of requiring such a public expenditure, there exist numerous policy arguments that require this legislation be defeated.

The history of the SST began nearly 10 years ago during the Kennedy administration. Since then, Congress has provided more than $500 million for the development of an experimental version of the supersonic plane. To make the project more palatable, three successive administrations have made a number of erroneous assumptions concerning the need for and practicality of a supersonic airliner. If the present administration expects Congress to continue funding this ill-conceived program, then it must correct those assumptions based solely on professional attachment to an apparently glamorous national effort. They also must begin to accept the findings of those constructive critics who are deeply concerned with the threats to man and his environment posed by the proliferation of hundreds of commercial supersonic airplanes.

The first assumption made by the administration is that the prestige of the United States is at stake—that American aircraft manufacturers, long the world leaders in the field, will suddenly become second rate if they fail to continue the SST project at this time. This assumption is erroneous for two reasons. First, it is a fact of life that we will not lead the world into the supersonic age. Both the French-English Concorde and the Russian Tupelev are already flying and the Concorde, at least, will be available for the international airplane market within the next couple of years. Aware of this, it is difficult to understand how this country assumes leadership in the race to put a fleet of SST's into service when our version of the SST is not planned for production until 1978 or 1979. The second reason why this assumption is wrong concerns the status of the American aircraft industry itself. Without question it is the largest, healthiest and most efficient aircraft industry in the world. Boeing alone has 1,700 jets in daily service. By the beginning of next year the industry will be filling orders for the first of the huge jumbo jets. Boeing already has over 200 orders from all over the world for its version of the 400 passenger plane. To suggest that a failure to proceed with the production of an SST at this time would tumble our aircraft manufacturers from their position of world leadership amounts to empty rhetoric. It is certainly an unfair and unjust criticism of one of this country's healthiest industries.

The second assumption the administration makes concerns the role of the SST within the airways system generally. Originally conceived as a vehicle for moving large numbers of people quickly around the world, its proposed use has been limited greatly due to the flight restrictions necessitated by the plane's sonic boom. The administration has admitted that the present design of the Boeing SST will give rise to a sonic boom 50 miles wide and 2,000 miles long. The resulting force of the boom is enough to break windows and crack foundations wherever the plane flies. The 100,000 square miles thus affected would contain in excess of 10 million persons. When multiplied by the number of trips to be made each day the total number of people affected by the boom would approach 100 million. Although General Maxwell, chief of the SST project, has assured the opponents of the SST that damage caused by the boom will be negligible, data recently released by the U.S. Air Force is to the contrary. In fact, from 1956 through 1967 the Air Force received 35,429 damage claims for almost $20 million as a result of sonic boom damage from its own limited supersonic bomber squadron. Of these claims 12,615 have been approved and paid thus far. This potential for damage has forced the Department of Transportation to promise that the plan will be used only over water routes where resulting damage will be limited to sailing ships and offshore islands.

Confined to transoceanic routes, one is forced to wonder how a $50 to $60 million plane can pay for itself. Is it really practical for an airline company to invest such a large sum of money in a plane of such limited use—a sum that exceeds the net profits of all the airline companies combined? Is it practical for an airline company to invest such large sums of money in a plane that will reduce the New York to Paris flying time from 5½ hours to 3 hours? I do not believe so. In fact I am convinced that economics will force admission of the plane to overland routes. Dr. I. R. Schwartz of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, NASA, has stated:

> It is the consensus of opinion that the SST's must be capable of supersonic operation overland to be a true economic success.

Recognizing the probability of overland flights, former Secretary of Transportation Allen Boyd told a congressional appropriations committee:

> Going out of Chicago to the West Coast, I think it will be entirely possible to operate a route over the plains area and possibly across the Canadian border to permit supersonic flight without discomfort or inconvenience to the people on the ground.

Although such statements are not official policy, they clearly indicate how economic necessity may well demand that

the proposed land restrictions be removed. One further point about the plane's utility, the 3,000 mile range of the SST will require all flights leaving California for Japan to stop in Hawaii to refuel. The Boeing jumbo jet, on the other hand, has a range in excess of 6,000 miles and besides crossing the Pacific with ease, will be allowed to fly over land along with the rest of the commercial jets in service today.

The third assumption made by the administration concerns the profitability of the SST. The administration has claimed unequivocally that the SST will strengthen our balance-of-payments position. Originally the FAA had projected the sale of 1,200 SST's by 1990, but the overland limitation has reduced expected sales to 500 or less. Furthermore, the FAA has failed to take into account the competitive effect of the 400 jumbo jets that will be flying by 1978. Projected foreign sales for the larger 747 are increasing monthly. When it is understood that most foreign countries are limited in the amount of money they are permitted to spend on U.S. exports, these purchases of the jumbo jet could seriously damage the SST market. In addition, the FAA fails to recognize that the availability of a practical SST would make foreign travel so attractive that there would be an increase in the expenditure of tourist dollars abroad, thus adversely affecting our balance of payments.

Probably the threat of the sonic boom alone is reason enough for abandoning the SST project; however, when considered along with the plane's other limitations discussed above, a decision to go ahead with the project seems absurd. If the supersonic passenger plane does prove itself a success, it would be at least 10 years before we could compete for part of the SST market. Would it not be more prudent to wait and see whether the present operational SST's prove themselves safe and practical? Our industry is not threatened. Our conventional jets will always have a market. Furthermore, our aircraft manufacturers have developed enough data to enable them to respond to the demand for an SST if and when the SST proves itself worthy of American investment.

The future of the SST must also be considered in the context of our national priorities, generally, and in the context of the priorities problems within the airlines industry, specifically. Concerning the latter, the SST will only bring further confusion in inefficiency to a system already plagued with an inordinate number of problems—Inaccessability of airports to the general public, congested air traffic requiring as much as an hour's holding time for each 45-minute trip, and outdated and unsafe airports. There is simply no way to justify spending $96 billion more on the SST in fiscal 1970 when we have spent a meager $30 million during that same period for the modernization and maintenance of the whole airway system. How can we justify spending close to $1 billion more during the next 5 or 6 years for one plane of questionable utility when Congress can authorize only $5 billion for future development of our airways and airport systems during the next 10 years? Our airports alone will require in excess of $15 billion just to catch up with presently available technological and scientific information. A recent report by air pilots has called 10 of our most heavily used airports unsafe and hazardous—these include JFK and Miami International. At least two-thirds of the fatalities on commercially scheduled flights occur on the ground at airports where landing and takeoff speeds rarely exceed 100 miles per hour. All these airport ills are compounded by an inexcusable dearth of adequate ground transportation facilities. A 45-minute flight to Washington entails a 45-minute trip to the airport on congested highways, a 45-minute wait in a holding pattern in New Jersey and finally 45 minutes of flying time. Before we open these outdated airports to 1,800 miles per hour jets with runway speeds in excess of 150 miles per hour, we must first solve the existing problems that make supersonic flights less safe than acceptable.

In the same vein our airway system has been begging for needed funds for years. Most of the commercial planes in flight today are directed around the available air spaces by antiquated control systems that are incapable of providing basic data on clearance and altitude. In 1968 alone there were nearly 2,400 near-mid-air collisions. Through proper funding all these ills could be removed. If I may repeat a phrase often used to describe military appropriations:

> We can afford anything we need, but we can't afford anything we don't need.

In light of all the problems that presently exist within our airway system, including our airports, we certainly cannot afford the additional burden of an SST.

The priorities problems within this nation generally have been discussed at length by both myself and many of my colleagues. Yet I must once again state that our lakes and rivers, schools and hospitals, and poor and underprivileged are gasping for funds to retain some semblance of natural integrity. Should we not take care of them first?

Can a public expenditure close to $2 billion for an inefficient plane that promises to destroy peace and quiet throughout most of the world be justified when funds for medical research are being slashed by as much as 20 percent, when the money squeeze has made it impossible to secure the desperately needed money to wage an effective fight against pollution, and at a time when the President has attempted to cut $1 billion from Government aid to education. The answer is obviously no. I will vote against this request and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. Chairman, in a commencement address to the class of 1963 at the U.S. Air Force Academy, former President John F. Kennedy said:

> It is my judgment that this government should immediately commence a new program in partnership with private industry to develop at the earliest practical date the prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built in any other country.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are voting whether or not to continue that development.

We are at the crucial junction. There are those who say we should not have an SST. To them, I say we are vividly in an era of supersonic transports, with both the Russians and the British-French consortium way ahead of us technologically. Economically, it is obvious that we must compete, but we lose our technological supremacy and our American dollars to the Communists or the British and French.

But, more than this, Mr. Chairman, we have today the opportunity to create a minimum of 50,000 new skilled and unskilled jobs across our land. American labor will be watching what we do here today. I, for one, am determined in my view that the development of the best SST in the world be accomplished by American laborers.

To those who continue to want private financing, I join their desire, but as has been proved time and time again, this financing is not available, and the investment we make in the development of the SST is, under contract, to be repaid with royalties to the U.S. Treasury from sales of the aircraft.

In total, Mr. Chairman, the continuation of prototype development of the SST in America is vital to our economy, our technology, and to our labor market. I strongly urge my colleagues' support for an American SST.

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

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the amendment—and the gentleman who offered the amendment is one of the most sincere Members of the House—you would or might come to the opinion that this airplane—and when I say "this airplane" I mean the supersonic transport airplane—will not be built. But anyone who thinks about that at all knows that that just is not so. A supersonic transport aircraft will be built. It is just a question of who is going to build it.

Many of you, I am sure, have read Mr. Halaby's remarks in the Washington Post just a few weeks ago or a few days ago. Mr. Halaby is president of Pan American Airways. He said it would be unthinkable that the Russian airline could cross the Atlantic from east to west in 3 hours, and it would take them 7 hours. They are required to have supersonic aircraft regardless of where they get them, whether it is from Russia or the British-French Concorde.

Of course, if the Boeing plane is available, it will be the choice of U.S. airlines, for it will be a far superior plane.

The gentleman from Illinois spoke of noise. If we go back and read a little in history we find that every mode of transportation generally as it moved along had all these bogies thrown up. The steam engine was too noisy and it frightened horses, and the automobile did the same.

I would call the attention of the House to the fact that in air transport the fast drives the slow out of business. That has been so from the very beginning. All the

Members must remember the C-47 or the DC-3, the workhorse of the airlines in the forties. The DC-3 cruised at about 140 miles an hour. Then along came the DC-4 and the DC-6, cruising at 240 miles an hour, and they drove the DC-3 out. Then along came the turboprop, cruising at 400 miles an hour, and that drove the DC-4 and DC-6 out. Then came the jet, cruising at 600 miles an hour, and it drove the turboprop out—at least for the long-haul flights. That is exactly what will happen when the SST comes along.

So there is not any question we are going to have the supersonic transport. The question now is who is going to build the SST.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, let me briefly cover about four of the questions that have been raised here. First, on the matter of economic feasibility, I think the proof of economic feasibility, at least in the judgment of the ultimate customers of this airplane, is already proven by the fact that we have 122 orders from the airlines themselves, some of them placed for as long as 2½ or 3 years, and we have had no cancellations whatsoever.

Second, one of the gentlemen who spoke previously on this subject has somehow or other come up with the idea that when we sell anything overseas, it can hurt the balance of payments. I would like to have somebody explain to me how we can export a product and hurt the balance of payments.

Third, on the matter of the sonic boom, it has been clearly stated by everyone involved—the FAA, the airlines, and the Secretary of Transportation—that the aircraft would not be flying over the populated part of this continent, or of this globe, at supersonic speeds. All of the airline companies have planned their routes in accordance with this. I have talked to representatives of Lufthansa, of Germany, and they plan to use the supersonic transport plane to fly around the world, but they plan to fly it at subsonic speeds across the United States. I talked to their representatives. They have purchased two of the aircraft.

There has been an implication that the entire amount of money which has been spent up to now on this project has been wasted. This simply is not true. In Cincinnati, Members can find the SST engine has been built and is complete, and one of the engines has been on the test block for approximately 1,000 hours.

On the matter of noise of the engine, the approach noise, the test shows it already is within the limits of the FAA regulations. The takeoff noise at 1 mile is within the limits. Yes, we still have the matter of the problem of the airport noise itself, but in the surrounding neighborhoods near the airports the noise at 1 mile on the approach and at 1 mile on the takeoff is presently less than the 707-320 we use throughout the country today.

The question has been raised about the postprototype financing. This was brought up by the gentleman from Illinois. There have been several proposals, one of which I think looks very attractive, that immediately upon completion of the prototype and testing of it—there will be proposals, I do not know whether they will be accepted or not, for the formation of a Comsat-type corporation, a public corporation to take this project over completely at that time. I happen to be one of the people who think this should have been done in the beginning. I was against the variable wing in the beginning, but I do not think we can cry over spilt milk at this point. We do have now an engine and we have capability.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, on the balance-of-payments question, I will advise the gentleman I take my advice from the Treasury Department, who say that while, indeed, the selling of the SST overseas will add to our balance of payments, that will be immensely outweighed by the increased tourism from this country to Europe, where Americans will spend more money, and the net to our balance of payments will be a minus.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, when the Concorde is built, those same people from the United States will be going to Europe on those foreign-built planes, will they not?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. This is absolutely true and in addition, we find now that tourism into this country is now increasing at a greater rate than American tourism overseas.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly believe that his remarks on tourism are appropriate, and particularly on a day the President has presented to the Congress his message calling for a trade policy which I believe most will agree is sound, though certainly likely to aggravate in some aspects our balance of trade problems.

I should like to take a moment to correct a misapprehension I feel was given by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) just a short while ago. The General Electric plant at Cincinnati, in my opinion, has been one of the outstanding leaders in training the underprivileged. Anybody who came to our community and looked at the situation would rapidly find that this plant, in which the SST engine is to be built, has been a leader in programs of training the underprivileged and has done a good job. I think we should not let the record stand uncorrected on that point.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to thank the gentleman for the very helpful statement he is making.

President Nixon took a lot of time to determine his policy with respect to the SST. I am sure he did not want to ask Congress to spend the money at this time of fiscal stringency, but he decided it was inevitable in our own interest that we proceed with the SST.

I, for one, am supporting the President's position that we move forward. I am convinced it is vitally important to labor and to management and to the Nation as a whole.

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

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I should like to add. In addition to the statement made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS), who quoted the chairman of Pan American Airways, Mr. Halaby, there is one thing he did not mention which I believe may be one of the most important things the gentleman from Pan American said. That was that he was considering the possibility of looking at and purchasing the TU 144, the Russian aircraft which is flying and has flown supersonically. We have reasons to believe it will be as successful, or possibly more so, than its counterpart.

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

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

Mr. YATES. With respect to the comment made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), I was reading from the statement made by the Under Secretary of Labor to the Ad Hoc Review Committee on the SST. It was not my statement with respect to the number of jobs available to the underprivileged. It was his statement.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I believe the gentleman who represents the district of Cincinnati, Ohio, would know more about his own district than the Under Secretary of Labor.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have heard some rather peculiar arguments around here this afternoon about why this amendment should pass.

I want to make crystal clear I am against the amendment. For the life of me I cannot see why anybody could take much credence in the argument that people are not going to ride the SST when the jumbo jet is available. If any of the Members have flown on a regular jet lately, either interstate in the United States or internationally, and if they have carried any baggage, which is a mistake, it takes an hour to get the baggage. Now, when they get the jumbo jet, that is going to take three times as many people, and it has got to take three times as long, which means 3 hours. I cannot figure that anybody is going to ride that, if they have another airplane which will get them there and will give them the 3 hours to get their baggage, and still do it in the same time as it is done today. That is one argument that goes down the drain.

The other argument, that it is going to hurt the balance of payments, is about as much nonsense as I have heard on this floor in a long time.

The point does not lie at all that people who ride airplanes are going to ride

foreign airlines. One of the single biggest dollar earners we have in this country right now is the foreign airline purchases of American-made jets.

It does not make much difference which country makes the jet; people are going to ride them. If they are faster they are going to ride those, and especially if they are faster at the same price they are going to ride those.

They are going to spend their money on whatever airline has it. So not only are we going to lose the money that they would pay for the jets, but we are going to lose the money of the passengers who ride on them if American airlines do not have them. So what you are going to have, really, is foreign airlines buying foreign jets and American airlines buying them and you will have the same division of passengers you have now. So the net loss is going to be a loss in the balance of payments. Therefore I think it is the better part of prudence, if you are interested in the balance of payments, to defeat this amendment.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, you know that there were people who, when the Model T was invented, said "the darned thing will not work; the horse and buggy is here to stay." They were wrong. And there are people who are saying now that the SST will not work. However, I think it will work. It may have some annoyances and noise problems that they will have to solve.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talked about air pollution. All you have to do is get to some vantage point where you can see planes landing at National Airport, present-day jets. I doubt that the SST will pollute the air any more than they do and maybe not as much. I understand that they are going to lick that problem, too. The FAA has ordered that by a certain date they must have engines which do not give out but about 10 percent as much air pollutants as the engines that they are flying today. So I think that is an argument that falls by the wayside.

It seems to me—and it is a pretty simple proposition—that we have the advantage. Every airline in the world, with the exception of the Russian Aeroflot, is using American-built planes—every single one, including BOAC. I do not think we should give up that advantage and that billion dollars or so a year that we would lose in the balance of payments.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of serving on the Commerce Committee when the question of building a prototype SST was first discussed. As I recall it, the team who proposed it was composed of former director of the precedent agency of the FAA, Mr. Pyle, and former Lieutenant General Quesada. Those gentlemen presented a proposal which envisioned the development in an orderly fashion, to meet the needs of competition, the needs of commerce, of an aircraft with a distribution of cost of 90 percent private funding and 10 percent Federal.

Mr. Chairman, I noted in the newspapers yesterday the fact that the testimony of General Quesada had been released where he voiced very strongly his conviction that we should develop this plane in an orderly fashion to meet the demands of competition.

Now, let me tell you that it has only been a few weeks ago that we passed legislation through this House creating more than a $5 billion trust fund to meet the lag existing in airport construction in the United States. We have not successfully digested the present generation of aircraft in our airports, and we have an entirely new generation coming into service, the first to be delivered to one of the major air carriers before the end of the year, if they overcome all of the problems they are having with motors, and the others to be delivered on an accelerated scale during the next few years.

Those are going to impose a very heavy doubt upon the facilities of this Nation to handle the commerce they generate.

And, Mr. Chairman, another very important fact—and I think I have gone into this about as carefully as any Member of this body—a suit was filed in the Federal Court here just about a week ago against the Civil Aeronautics Board. The fact is that we are not using effectively the seat capacity now available.

The whole emphasis of the air industry is to advertise not air transportation but the first-class cabin, the attraction of stewardesses, and gourmet meals without any effort to broaden the base which is so desperately needed to support the industry.

All of you know that you have had your ticket go up since the 1st of October. Perhaps you do not realize that part of that increase since February—and we have had that portion of the ticket which is described as terminal just go from $2 to $9 on every ticket and that is exclusive of the revenue that you voted into a trust fund here just a few weeks ago.

Now, I am not at all worried about the Concorde. It is totally uneconomic. There are some very well informed experts not now producing aircraft in this country, impartial experts, who will concur. I am not worried about the Russian Tupelov aircraft. The Russians have not been overly successful in attracting any industry to buy their aircraft. They have a few captive countries that must rely upon their production. But it does not meet the needs of our travelers and I think that I am going to go along myself, however the House goes, and support as I did when he first came before the Commerce Committee, the views of General Quesada. I think he was well informed then. I think he presented a logical case for the logical development of this aircraft. He has not called for its deferment at this time, but he has said let us meet the needs of competition.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. I would like to hope that one of his statements will be borne in mind while we are considering this matter:

> I gag, if I may use my own term, at the Federal Government by its positive action replacing economic demand. Our free enterprise system at least in my opinion has been a very successful system and I would hate to see it replaced by something else.

Well, in the case of the SST you are replacing it with something else, something different than you have done for any other generation of aircraft. I think it would be a major mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I have been lobbied as effectively as anyone on this floor by economic interests in my own district who came to me to tell me that they would get a slice of this great big pie. But I have an obligation to some taxpayers out my way and in this case I am going to heed the voice of the taxpayers.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the SST, and we need it. As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) said, travel to the outermost parts of the earth and there you will see the inventories of the American genius. Everywhere you go, you see an airplane outside of the Iron Curtain it says "Made in U.S.A."

To this day—and I do not travel as much as I used to, but I have committees traveling equally as much as I used to, and they are going to continue to do so—you will see the old DC-3's, the pioneer of pioneers, made in America.

What has blazed the trail more for America than the American products? Do you think for one moment that this Russian plane is being paid for by private industry? They are building an SST just like they are building a bomber—like we need the AMSA—they are building a supersonic bomber. And you are getting this from the horse's mouth. And they are using the know-how from that as a windfall for the SST. And they build good airplanes, and let nobody kid you.

Now, you know who is paying for the Concorde?—the British and the French Governments. Maybe we were smart and did not know it when former President Lyndon Johnson decided not to push the SST; we can use some of the know-how of the French and the British—if they have anything worth using.

Now, we have the know-how of the 707, and the DC-8, and the military aircraft, the jet fighters, and the B-52's. I know the great engines that we have built, the great United Aircraft, and the great General Electric—and Allison has not done so badly, only they do not make a pure jet, but they do have a cross-license from a foreign manufacturer, and this could be a good thing. But they are made in America. In the Falcon jet made by the Dassault Co. in France, they have GE engines in them, made in America.

Now, they selected a contractor who had done a good job. I guess Boeing still has the job. If they do not have it they should have it. Boeing has made great airplanes.

We need a good airplane. Private industry cannot build it, and you know it. How on earth could they finance it? Who on earth could stand the R.D.T. & E. to build this airplane if the Government did not help them? It will be paid back 10,000-fold. Do not worry about the pollution from the engines. They have this licked, and if you want to talk about pollution we have a billion things polluting

the atmosphere more than these jet aircraft, and they are stopping this.

But we need this airplane, and we need it now. It is easy to say, oh, you have so many other things of priority—they are just about "prioriting" the military out of business on some of these things that they should not be spending money on. This country can afford the SST, with a GNP heading for a trillion dollars—I am not an economist, thank God, but I have sense enough to know one thing, and that is that this country needs now to set about keeping America first, keeping the planes that America builds first. Everybody has got his pocketbook full of money. If you do not believe it, go over to NATO where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and I just left. They are getting fat, dumb, and sassy now, and they are riding all over the world and they are going to demand that they go first class.

And he who comes out without an SST in the decades ahead, comes out second. In this business when you come out second, you come out last.

Now, we have a lot of military know-how on titanium and the sophisticated alloys that will go into this plane. Let us build it. We need it. America can afford it—do not let anybody kid you. Already we are late.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get some agreement on time and how many Members would like to talk on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since so many Members have risen, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have been debating here and most of the debate during general debate was on the SST. A lot of the Members were not here then and I think it is unfair to the committee to have 20, 25, or 30 Members standing up now to get in on the debate on the SST amendment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

So, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto close at 20 minutes after 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has noted the names of Members standing and each Member will be recognized for 1¼ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

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

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have seen the British-French Concorde and discussed the TU-144, the Russian plane, with their designers can guarantee you that these planes will not only fly but that both nations fully intend to use it to obtain the first-class trade over the North Atlantic. They will be landing in the United States in 1972.

The British-French Concorde will be here in the spring of 1973, and when this occurs you will find that people will ride it because the time factor is going to be approximately one-half the regular time.

To those of you who have objections to the effect on the environment, I would state to you—prepare your bills now for the SST that will arrive. Do not plan to knock out the American SST because the British-French model will be here approximately 4 years in advance. The Russian model will be here 5 years in advance.

I have a telegram that Mr. Halaby sent to the committee indicating that they expect to purchase the Russian plane, if we do not have one.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the chairman for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, a year ago an opponent of the SST said in debate on this floor that the only thing the supersonic transport has to recommend it is speed.

That is what the man said: "The only thing the SST has to recommend it is speed." While he didn't intend it as such, it was the most concise argument I heard in favor of the SST.

In 11 simple words that Member of Congress summed up the history of commercial transportation.

When the first caveman, thousands of years ago, captured a horse and trained it for riding, about the only thing the horse had to recommend it was speed. Man could travel faster on horseback than on foot.

When the first man hoisted the first sail on a boat, about the only thing to recommend it was speed. Man could travel faster over water by sail than by paddle.

When James Watt invented the steam engine, the only thing to recommend it was speed. Trains move faster than horse and buggies.

When the Wright brothers invented the airplane, the only thing to recommend it was speed.

When the subsonic jet was developed, the only thing to recommend it was speed. Subsonic jet speed is wiping out the propeller-driven transport plane. Very soon we will find propeller-driven commercial planes only in aircraft museums, a relic of transportation history.

I am grateful to the Member who said the only thing to recommend the SST is speed. As a strong supporter of the SST program, I would change just one word from that sentence. I would change the word "only." I would say: "The primary thing the SST has to recommend it is speed."

The quicker movement of men and materials from one place to another is what transportation progress is all about.

The other great powers recognize that simple fact—Great Britain, France, and Russia.

They are building their versions of a supersonic aircraft. They recognize the financial value of faster methods of transportation.

Those of us here who recognize that same profit-making, job-creating potential are voting for the SST appropriation to build a prototype model of the next generation of air transportation vehicles.

Let me stress once again this money—$96 million—is basically a loan. It is the seed money that will be repaid to the Government out of later sales of Commercial versions of the SST.

We are asking the American people today to lend less than one-half cent each to this enterprise. The total investment will be higher, perhaps 6½ cents.

Certainly there are risks. Any new venture is fraught with danger. But no man, no corporation, indeed, no nation ever attained greatness without taking chances. It is the story of our life as a nation.

After weighing all the evidence, both for and against, the SST, including the fact that the supersonic aircraft will be built somewhere by somebody—it is my conclusion that the United States should proceed with the building of the SST.

In addition to many other benefits I would say: "The thing the SST has to recommend it is speed."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, how much time is allotted to each Member?

The CHAIRMAN. One and one-quarter minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the time to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), if he wants it and I ask unanimous consent that the time be allotted to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR).

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Since 1966 I have felt that funding of the SST should be through private sources and not by Federal Treasury financing. Mr. Bow and I have offered a program of alternate financing. That program envisages further SST development financed by private investment with a measure of government guarantee.

If the Boeing-General Electric SST will be the great success its backers claim, surely private investment can build it. If it is merely a prestige item, the taxpayers should not be paying for it. In our free enterprise society, why should government finance a commercial vehicle whose utility is uncertain?

At a time when funds for such high priority needs as pollution control, education, housing, job training, inner city transport and rural revitalization are in such short supply, I cannot vote $96 million for the prototype development and flight testing of a supersonic transport aircraft.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have given the matter of major Federal appropriations for development of a supersonic transport a great deal of thought.

I do not question the desirability of

keeping America at the forefront of aviation technology, as we have in space technology.

I do not question that the remaining technological problems of noise and sonic booms will be given considerable attention by the builders of the aircraft and its engines.

I am not unsympathetic to the claim that $1.5 billion is a great deal of money for private industry to ante-up on its own.

Because of the relatively few people who will eventually benefit from the development of this plane, however, and because of far more pressing and unanswered budgetary demands, I cannot support the more than $95 million in this appropriation bill for SST development.

Last week, the Congress sent to the President a continuing resolution to which Congress overwhelmingly had added needed funds for starving aid to education programs. The President has already announced that he will not permit the expenditure of any of these additional education funds because of the precarious state of the budget.

Within a budget so constrained as to cause the President to overrule Congress on the level of educational aid, I cannot, in conscience, approve this expenditure of nearly $100 million for the SST in this fiscal year.

However, I do not believe that failure to approve this request for SST development funds should preclude the progress of this plane on schedule.

I propose that the various companies involved in building the SST work out a capital funding arrangement whereby the necessary $1.5 billion can be raised through the sale of federally guaranteed bonds in the private sector. These bonds would fall due in the decade between 1980 and 1990, when the sales of the U.S. SST should put developers in a position to repay the bonds.

The development of an SST cannot be undertaken without Federal assistance. It is too big a project. But I do not believe this assistance must come in the form of current appropriations. I do not believe this airplane should preempt tax dollars that are more desperately needed now in other areas.

Why could not the Federal Government stand behind these SST bonds with a guarantee equal to the total amount requested as the Federal share of SST development—$1.2 billion?

In this way, the Government would encourage immediate production of the necessary capital by attracting private investors, who in turn will rely on a Federal guarantee of repayment to lessen their risk. In this way, if the SST is the financial success its proponents say it will be, the Federal Government will substantially reduce its direct dollar investment in the plane's development, and may eliminate it altogether if all of the bonds can be repaid by corporate borrowers. At worst, the Federal investment is postponed a full decade, with far less disastrous effects on the Federal budget.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote for the amendment to eliminate the current fiscal year appropriation for the SST.

But I propose an alternative method of SST financing which places greater emphasis on private development, less strain on the immediate Federal budget, but which still puts the full financial support of the Government behind this important program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the expenditure of $96 million on the supersonic transport. This program should be deferred until there is some evidence that the supersonic transport can practically be flown over the land without damaging the countryside—until there is more certainty of recoupment of the American taxpayers' investment—until a better case can be made for going ahead with it.

It is difficult for me to justify this kind of priority for spending $96 million on the supersonic transport.

We had no special message from the President of the United States to support our Nation's needs in education. We had no special message from the President on fighting the problems of pollution and the deterioration of our environment. We had no special message from the President on plans to meet the housing crisis which confronts the millions of young Americans who are today entering family life.

But we did get a message on the supersonic transport requesting an open-ended commitment, leading undoubtedly to the expenditure of billions of taxpayer dollars. And we did get a message on a multibillion-dollar increase in subsidies for our merchant marine.

When we appropriated judiciously for education and for the preservation of our environment, we were admonished by the President that our actions were inflationary and that he would consider possible vetoes.

Well what about the inflationary impact of the billions of dollars which will be committed by this appropriation?

I do not believe that we owe any special obligation to the supersonic jet set who will probably use the time they have saved in supersonic flight to write letters to their Congressmen urging a reduction in Federal expenditures for other things which may be more essential.

I believe it would be good sense to pause for a better judgment on the supersonic transport.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for his very well reasoned separate views which appear in the report which point out very clearly the public questions involved. I do not believe that at this juncture in our history, when our priorities are so out of balance, Congress should commit funds for another installment on what eventually will be at least a $1.3 billion Federal expenditure for the SST. With all the implications, including the adverse effects on the environment and the sonic boom, it is unwise to approve this SST appropriation today.

This bill provides for almost $96 million for the supersonic transport program.

In 1963, at the start of the SST program, President Kennedy said that the cost to the Federal Government would not exceed $750 million.

So far, $623 million have been appropriated for the SST, and according to Department of Transportation estimates, an additional $662 million will be needed. Thus, the promise of President Kennedy has all but been forgotten.

It has been estimated that development of the SST through the prototype development phase will cost at least $1.52 billion of which the Federal Government's share is about $1.29 billion.

I should like to call attention to the views of the President's National Science Adviser, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, as set forth in his letter of March 20, 1969, to the chairman of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee in which he said:

> On the whole, I come out negative on the desirability for further government subsidy for the development of this plane and would suggest that the possibility be explored of turning the remainder of the development and, of course, all the production expenditures over to private enterprise. Any technological benefits which would accrue from its further development, either for civilian or military purposes, would seem to be minimal.
>
> Granted that this is an exciting technological development, it still seems best to me to avoid the serious environmental and nuisance problems and the Government should not be subsidizing a device which has neither commercial attractiveness nor public acceptance.

President Nixon, when he announced his decision to proceed with the program, said that his decision was based on the need to keep the United States No. 1 in the field of air transportation. This is not a question of American preeminence in the air affecting national defense. Instead, it is a program to benefit the commercial airline companies. At this point the responsibility to finance the SST should be turned over to the aircraft companies.

Funds for the SST should rank far back in our national priorities. If the administration is interested in cutting spending, it should do so by cutting funds for the SST, not by cutting funds for housing, education, health, pollution control, and other imperative domestic needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many statements by those who have interests, either because they live near airports and are concerned about noise or pollution, or because of the fact that those who will be working on the SST are in their districts. Let me say at the outset that I come from Connecticut, where we have the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Co., which lost out in the competition. So we have nothing to gain from developing the SST. Nevertheless, I believe the United States must develop the supersonic transport, because the super-

sonic transport is a reality and will be in operation very shortly and people are going to fly in it. The only question will be whether or not we fly as Americans on American supersonic transports or on those of the Russians or of the French and British combine. We enjoy a near monopoly in aviation today. Throughout the world people are purchasing American airplanes, American engines, and American equipment.

I want to see this continue. I want to see the United States remain paramount in aviation. In our difficult trade relations with the other nations of the world, we must remain paramount in aviation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

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

We have started on this venture and we have been in it for some time. There has been a great deal of money spent on it, many hundreds of millions of dollars. I do not think the American people like to start on a venture like this, and then want to stop when they are part way through. The slogan of America in the past has been, "Press on." That has been the reason why we are the leaders of the world in so many ways.

Mr. Chairman, I say we should press on now with this project and make the SST a reality.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe everything has been said that might be said.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike funds for the development of the SST.

I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

The economic advantages of development are questionable. President Nixon's science adviser has stated that further development would seem of minimal technological benefit. There is a serious question about the usefulness of the SST because of the sonic boom produced. Our airports cannot absorb the aircraft flying today and the new airplanes on order.

We in Congress are daily concerned with national priorities—with what should get done first and what can be postponed. It seems to me that a higher priority should be given to safe, fast, clean commuter rail service for hundreds of thousands of American wage earners, than to an expensive airliner which will benefit only a few. Let us spend the money on building a mass transportation system for our people.

We are being asked for $92 million at present. This is an installment toward additional appropriations of at least $662 million in requests to come. Now is the time to call a halt. Now we have an opportunity to reconsider our priorities.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment to delete further funding for the development of the SST. The case against proceeding further with Government subsidies at this time is overwhelming. Rosy predictions of the SST's likely financial success are based on faulty and incomplete economic analysis. The only thing the experts can say with certainty is that the SST will add noise and pollution to our beleaguered environment.

We have heard much about national priorities and national prestige, and these considerations merge in the question of the SST. I, for one, will not take much pride in seeing commuters still struggling to work in decaying cities by the time the SST flies, benefiting the few at the expense of the many. And I hardly think the development of the SST will make this Nation stand taller in the eyes of the rest of the world. The millions who witnessed our landing on the moon need no reminder of our topflight scientific and engineering capability. I think it is time we demonstrated that we have the maturity to resist spending scarce resources on tantalizing technical gadgets and the will to devote them to restoring an environment hospitable to healthy and civilized human life. A nation that sets sane priorities will not lack prestige.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Yates amendment.

As an economist, I have given considerable study to the balance of payments implications of our decision to continue or defer the supersonic transport development program.

Commercial aircraft have made a substantial contribution to total U.S. exports during the past several years. In 1968, for example, sales abroad of our civil transport aircraft amounted to $1.2 billion. This, in effect, accounted for 121 percent of America's $990 million trade surplus last year.

In 1946 I returned from my military assignment in India in a C–54, the military version of the DC–4. This model subsequently was replaced on transoceanic flights by the DC–6 and the DC–7, both four engine, propeller-driven aircraft.

The decade of the 1950's saw the inauguration of transoceanic jet service. The 1960's introduced new jet models with increased capacities and greater economy of operation. Next year will mark the beginning of commercial jumbo jet flights.

This dramatic metamorphosis in commercial aircraft design during these past 23 years will not end with the jumbo jet.

The next logical development is the supersonic transport. This represents the market of the late 1970's and the 1980's.

In a study entitled "SST Economic Feasibility Report," issued in April 1967, the Federal Aviation Agency concluded that the SST market by 1990 should be at least 500 airplanes under sonic boom flight restrictions. The Boeing Co. already has received orders, with accompanying downpayments, for 122 of its supersonic commercial jet, the B–2707. The French-British consortium producing the Concorde SST has delivery position reservations for 74 of that aircraft.

The forfeiture of this market by U.S. aircraft producers would place this country's international trade posture in double jeopardy.

First, we would lose the overseas commercial aircraft market which our firms now dominate. This would reduce the export—or "plus"—side of our balance-of-payments statement.

Second, U.S. airlines, in order to compete with their international rivals, would be required to purchase supersonic jets from foreign markers. Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, president of Pan-American World Airways, already has expressed his possible interest in buying the Russian TU–144 if Boeing cancels delivery of its 2707. Such action by American carriers would increase the import—or "minus"—side of our balance-of-payments statement.

If we proceed with the development of the SST, the Federal Aviation Agency predicts a favorable balance of payments import by 1990 of approximately $17 billion. To terminate the program may have the reverse effect.

The SST ad hoc review committee, appointed by President Richard M. Nixon, concluded that if the overall balance-of-payments picture is considered, there is substantial reason for delay in proceeding to prototype production. The reason, as outlined in the committee's report, is the adverse effect which the SST would have on the U.S. travel deficit.

The committee, in effect, is saying that the SST will generate American tourism abroad. Ergo, it should not be produced.

This same reasoning, of course, could have been applied to the new jumbo jets which will begin traversing the oceans this winter. Do not build these jets, so the argument goes. They will carry to many Americans abroad.

Using this same logic, a case could have been made against the development of the first aircraft by my fellow Daytonians, Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The simple fact is that Americans will continue to travel abroad. It not carried on a U.S.-produced SST, they will ride on the Concorde, the TU–144, or subsonic aircraft.

If, indeed, the development of the SST generates more tourism, this fact, in itself, make the market for that type of aircraft more attractive for U.S. airplane producers. All the more reason for them to proceed with the SST.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments for proceeding with the development of the SST at this time simply are not very convincing. Of all that have been advanced, those concerning the stimulus to the economy come closest to making sense, but even these begin to pale when it is realized what a high-risk undertaking it all is, not only from the standpoint of the technical development but

from the standpoint of the favorable world market we expect to find with the finished product some conservatively estimated $4 to $5 billions later.

And in the wake of our second moon landing, the prestige that would be added to the incontestable technical excellence of U.S. science and industry is, in my opinion, so much icing on the cake—and totally unnecessary.

The lavish funding of this project is another manifestation of how badly awry our national priorities have gotten.

We have competed with the best technical competition the world has to offer in a race to the moon, and we have won twice over.

For a change, let us now compete in making life more abundantly complete and meaningful on this planet.

Let us, as a logical place to start, compete in the excellence of educational opportunities to be afforded our citizens so that they themselves can find their own fulfillment.

It is doubtful that most of those taxpayers who are being asked to underwrite the cost of SST development will ever fly in one. It is more probable that they will look with envy at those able to fly above this polluted planet, to which this miraculous transport will make a negative contribution in noise and noxious fumes. With a little diligent effort on our parts, most will be able to find a seat in educational programs they are supporting with their tax dollars.

And what about our elderly and needy citizens who have contributed so much to our progress to this time? What consternation they must feel at this very moment as we respond with alacrity with a billion or so dollars for this dubious project, even as we tell them the time is not propitious to give them more than a bare subsistence social security benefit.

Thus, I repeat, let us compete in something rational and socially meaningful for a change. The choices are as broad as they are rewarding—education, a clean environment, and a meaningful life to tens of thousands of needy senior citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, throughout this whole controversy there has been a theme, I have detected. It is that the human, economic, and environmental values must somehow be subordinated to the thrust of technology, and the Congress and the American people must somehow adjust to technology—in this case foreign technology.

Mr. Chairman, I agree we can build bigger and faster airplanes, and we can build bigger and faster trucks, and we can build bigger and faster lots of things. But I wonder, do we want to especially if they adversely affect human beings and man's environment?

I think this is a good time to reassert our mastery over the technology that is thrusting us willy-nilly forward.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I spoke at great length during the general debate. I would like first of all to answer the gentleman from California. I do not have one job in my district in this particular field. I passed and voted present in both the subcommittee and the full committee, before I made the decision after thorough study.

I just notice on my desk part of that study, which indicates that President Kennedy in June 1963 sent this message to the Congress of the United States.

He said:

> Our determination that the national interest requires such a program is based on a number of factors of varying weight and importance:
>
> A successful supersonic transport can be an efficient, productive commercial vehicle which provides swift travel for the passenger and shows promise of developing a market which will prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator.
>
> It will advance the frontiers of technical knowledge—not as a by-product of military procurement, but in the pursuit of commercial objectives.
>
> It will maintain the historic United States leadership in aircraft development.
>
> It will enable this country to demonstrate the technological accomplishments which can be achieved under a democratic, free enterprise system.
>
> Its manufacture and operation will expand our international trade.
>
> It will strengthen the United States aircraft manufacturing industry—a valuable national asset—and provide employment to thousands of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us is whether to go ahead with the supersonic transport. There has been $623 million appropriated to date. Some $662 million more will be needed—$96 million of which is provided in the bill before us today.

This is a very complicated question once you throw away emotional preconceptions and get down to the meat of it, and I did just that.

This is also a question upon which reasonable men may differ. But it is a question that we in this body must answer here today.

Mr. Chairman, as you know I have as yet taken no position. I have kept my mind completely open to all the arguments, both pro and con. I have read everything I could lay my hands on. And I have finally come to the conclusion that we should go ahead with the SST.

This was not an easy decision. I think the critical questions I raised during our hearings reflected my doubts at that time. I must admit that the ad hoc committee report did not help these doubts any.

But I did not stop there. In going on with my research, I concluded that many of the questions raised by the ad hoc committee and other critics of the SST could be answered.

For example, the sonic boom is not really an issue because the SST will fly at subsonic speeds over land. In addition, it will make no more noise during takeoff and landing than the 707.

The threat of radiation or ozone poisoning is less than it is in today's jets.

The Concorde will most likely be commercially viable, and therefore we would lose $15.8 billion in our balance of payments if we did not proceed with the SST. On the other hand, we would improve our balance of payments by $10.1 billion if we did proceed.

Mr. Chairman, I am also impressed by the fact that the exact same arguments were raised in the fifties about the technological feasibility and commercial viability of passenger jet aircraft. And when I say the same, I mean the same.

It was alleged that the jet airliner market would only support, at the most, two companies.

It was also alleged that in the race for jet supremacy, the market was less certain than the technology.

The U.S. airlines were so skeptical that the general outlook on jets was described as "bearish."

And the jet's noise—yes, its noise—raised serious problems.

To be sure, there were reasons to question the jet then, just as there are reasons to question the SST now. But look at what happened when we went ahead with jet aircraft. I hate to think how it might have turned out had we not. In this regard, it is worth looking at what did happen to our merchant marine. We are now sixth in the world behind Russia in tonnage. And worse than that, while 80 percent of our ships are at least 20 years old, 80 percent of the Soviet ships are 10 years old or less and 50 percent are 5 years old or less.

As my colleagues well know, the experts have been wrong. Their crystal balls are just as cloudy as anyone else's. I will never forget what Adm. William Leahy said in 1945:

> That is the biggest fool thing we have ever done. The (atomic) bomb will never go off, and I speak as an expert in explosives.

It would not be difficult to find dozens of similar predictions about things that just did not work out the way the experts said they would.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the emotional question of budgetary priorities. The SST makes good sense economically. The Federal investment will be returned when the 300th plane is sold. However, it is more likely that 500 will be sold, so we should make an additional $1 billion profit to boot. Besides that, the project will create more than 150,000 jobs directly and indirectly.

I do not call that an inversion of priorities. On the contrary, I call it good business for the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL).

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have talked at some length during general debate. I should merely like to point out to the Committee that most of the members of the subcommittee have spent literally hundreds of hours listening to expert testimony about the SST program.

It boils down to four factors: One, economic feasibility; two, technical feasibility; three, noise level; and four, balance of payments.

Yes, there are arguments pro and con, but in the great balance the big plus is for going ahead with this program.

I certainly hope that the Committee

will support this program. President Kennedy was for it. President Johnson was for it. Now President Nixon is for it.

Every succeeding Congress since 1963 has approved this program. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the message of President Kennedy delivered in 1963 in favor of the SST. None of the proponents of the program has pointed out that at the time in that same eloquent message President Kennedy said the total cost to the United States for this program would not exceed $750 million.

The cost through only the prototype phase, Mr. Chairman, will be twice that; it will be $1.5 billion. And this does not take into account the amount that will be necessary to provide through Federal financing, the $2 billion that might be necessary through the production phase.

My good friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) talked of the potential inconveniences of the 747. He pointed to the difficulties that will come with travelling in that huge plane with so many passengers. Whether that is true or not is beside the point. I believe we who travel are going to have to ride the 747 because it is going to be the No. 1 moneymaker of the airlines, and the airlines are interested in making money. They are not nearly as anxious to buy the SST's.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the cost for the SST will be $52 million. The cost for the Concorde will be $21 million. The airlines will be able to buy two Concordes for one SST. I ask my friend from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) who spoke about the economics of the situation, will the airlines prefer to buy two Concordes or one SST for the same price?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

As has been pointed out here, three Presidents have recommended that we go ahead with the SST.

On June 5, 1963, President Kennedy made the initial decision to go ahead. Let me quote his remarks. What the gentleman from Illinois said was true; President Kennedy did at that time indicate that the Government should not exceed $750 million. But that was in 1963. He also anticipated that the program would be completed in about 6 years.

This is what he said:

> The cost of such a program is large—it could be as great as one billion dollars for a development program of about six years.

The development program has already been going on for 6 years, and it will continue until 1972. Obviously, the costs have risen as the time has been extended.

Listen to these words of our late President. He said:

> This is beyond the financial capability of our aircraft manufacturers. We cannot, however, permit this high cost, nor the difficulties and risks of such an ambitious program to preclude this country from participating in the logical next development of a commercial aircraft.

President Johnson agreed with that position, and so does President Nixon. President Nixon said in his message:

> I have made the decision that we should go ahead. I have made it first because I want the United States to continue to lead the world in air transport, and it is essential to build this plane if we are to maintain that leadership.

Mr. Chairman, references have been made here to various reports that have been studied by the President, four reports in particular. These reports were available to the committee. They include the Ad Hoc Committee report on which Mr. YATES and others have hung their hats in opposition to this program, but there were three other reports that said, "Go ahead with the SST." On the committee desk here, in fact, there is a ream of reports, a 5-foot shelf of reports, which indicate the feasibility of the SST and express confidence in the ability of our scientists and technicians to solve the sonic boom and other problems connected with the SST.

Mr. Chairman, this committee gave this matter considerable study, as our 348-page hearing on this matter alone indicates, and we recommend that the United States go ahead with the SST, and I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it was a little precipitate to put a 20-minute limit on debate on this vital amendment which I support.

We have heard a great deal about leadership this afternoon; that we must maintain leadership at any and all cost in the production of airplanes. Let me remind you of one area of leadership that the United States has that none of the Members should be envious of. That is the $365 billion of Federal debt, and it is more governmental debt than the rest of the world combined by some $40 to $50 billion. To continue construction of the SST will help assure U.S. leadership in the debt of the entire world.

How much more is proposed to be spent on this plane? It is interesting to read something of the hearings on this bill, especially the report of the ad hoc committee. I do not see how anyone can read the report of that committee and still support a $100 million continuation of this experiment. The committee cast all kinds of doubt on the future of this plane.

Where is it proposed to sell this aircraft, and what are the foreign countries who buy it going to use for money? It is almost unbelievable to read a discussion in the hearings of the suggestion, apparently made by Mr. Vierling, Acting Director in the Department of Transportation, for the development of the SST, that this huge supersonic aircraft will be sold to Pakistan and India. What are the Pakistani and the Indians going to use for money to buy this plane at $50 to $60 million a copy? How silly can anyone be in advocating or suggesting or believing that we are going to sell these planes for cash, for hard money, to Pakistan and India of all places?

Of course, if we give them the money, they may buy them. But what then happens to the international balance of payments?

Now, just stop and think again about this leadership business. What would be wrong with letting someone else somewhere in this world take the lead in something while we do something here in this country about the $365 billion of debt, the $18 billion of annual interest payment on that debt, and the inflation that is ravaging our economy. Let someone else take the leadership in something and let us try to save the hides of the American taxpayers.

It is about time a third party spoke up around here every day on the hour in behalf of the taxpayers.

As the gentleman from Illinois said a few moments ago, some $750 million has already been expended on this aircraft and all we have is a prototype. How much more? How many billions will this plane cost before it is flying 9 years from now? Is this plane going to be restricted to flying only the Atlantic and other oceans at supersonic speeds? It might be nice for the junketing Members of Congress. They could get to Europe in a matter of about 3 hours or less, and I suppose they could get to all the fleshpots of the world in a matter of hours, and at taxpayers' expense, of course.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. This costly experiment ought to be stopped dead in its tracks.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

I am sorry that I did not hear all of the oration of the gentleman from Iowa, but I did hear the last few sentences.

The gentleman is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. If this method of getting somebody to Europe in a hurry would induce him to go so he could find out more about the committee business, I think we ought to pass it. I think it would help to get him aboard one of these planes and get him over there.

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

Mr. HAYS. At your own peril. You and I are working together, you know, and I do not want to upset you because we have this foreign aid bill coming up tomorrow. So, maybe, I should not yield.

Mr. GROSS. This will not make any difference with respect to the foreign aid bill. But I would say to the gentleman if he had an armload of SST's he could not draft me to take one of those junkets to Europe.

Mr. HAYS. I think it would be most helpful.

Mr. GROSS. On the serious side, let me ask the gentleman this question: What does he think the Pakistanis and

the Indians are going to use for money to buy the SST?

Mr. HAYS. Whatever they used before. They got the Boeings. I do not know what kind of script it was, but they got them. They got it some place.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps from the $9 billion which we have poured into India in the last few years?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Iowa is a pragmatist. He knows that two of the biggest recipients of foreign aid are Pakistan and India.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. And the gentleman also admits that that bill is going to pass day after tomorrow?

Mr. GROSS. I suppose it will in view of the spending habits of the House.

Mr. HAYS. And, maybe, we will get some of that money back if we let them have the SSTs. We will give it to them anyway.

Mr. GROSS. There is little reason to believe they will pay us for them.

Mr. HAYS. I think Boeing will get it one way or the other.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think Boeing will be making the sales. I suspect they will be sales which will be guaranteed by the U.S. Government.

Mr. HAYS. I think we will get some of their money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 64, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOCH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOCH: On page 16, line 18 strike "$220,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000" and on line 19 strike "$25,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000".

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk to my colleagues about mass transit, and my amendment which deals with an appropriation which had originally been requested by the administration of $250 million, and has been reduced by the Appropriations Committee to $220 million.

If the $30 million is put back, it would not be an increase above what was requested; it would merely give the administration what it requested.

Twenty-five million dollars of that amount would be for R. & D., and $5 million would be for other programs.

Let me try to put this into perspective. In this country, in the cities in particular, we are strangling in traffic jams, and what I am appealing to you to do now is to assist your constituents and do equity in this area of need.

If you look over the years during which we have provided funds for mass transit and provided funds for highways, you will find that we have provided funds at the rate of 30 to 1—30 to 1 in favor of highways. I do not question at this moment the appropriations for highways, but I want to urge you to appropriate this small amount that we are asking for mass transit, which meager amount has been reduced by the Committee on Appropriations.

What will happen if the amendment is not accepted is this: $25 million that could be used for R. & D. will not be included in the bill.

Possibly in this year and surely in the years to come, whether it is a Nixon bill or someone else's bill—and there are 107 of us who have joined together on one mass transit bill—there will be a mass transit bill and it will provide billions of dollars either over the next 4 years or over the next 12 years.

It would be wrong not to provide the research and development funds now to help develop programs which would enable us to use those moneys wisely.

What is the amount that we are talking of? We are talking about a total request for fiscal year 1971 of $250 million. In that same period we will spend $5 billion for highways. Is not that small sum of $250 million worthwhile spending? Ought we not provide those moneys for your constituents and for my constituents?

Compare that with other R. & D. programs: We are providing $96 million for research and development for the SST; we are providing $41 million for the FAA.

We are providing $1½ billion for research and development for NASA, not including the Apollo program.

All that I am urging you to do is to provide the very meager sum of $250 million for the people who live in the cities—and we are talking not only of the people who live in the major cities, but in all of the urban areas. This is not a sectional bill—it does not apply just to cities like New York and Chicago. It applies to almost every city in this country, all of which are strangling in their traffic jams.

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman on his amendment.

The needs are just tremendous in every city in the country for these mass transit funds.

I agree with the gentleman that the priorities of the country are very much disturbed through the failure to take care of this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KOCH. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate my colleague for his energy and thoughtfulness in offering this amendment.

I would make the point that this not only affects the cities but it affects the entire metropolitan area. It affects the suburbs too because most people who live in the suburbs work in the cities and part of their way of life and part of the amenity of their existence is getting to their place of work easily.

Mr. Chairman, this affects the vast metropolitan areas.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I should like to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment.

I would point out, as I understand it, this amendment increases the appropriation by $30 million which is a small enough amount to invest in the future of mass transportation compared to the disproportionate amount of money constantly being spent on the Federal aid to highway programs.

For sometime I have introduced legislation to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for the purpose of mass transit—H.R. 48 in the 91st Congress.

This country has one of the most extensive highway systems in the world. Every year, the Federal Government pours billions of dollars into this system. At the same time, the transportation systems of our cities become more and more clogged because funds are unavailable.

The committee has seen fit to cut the request for mass transit from $250 to $220 million. The area that has suffered most from these cuts is research and development, where funds have been cut from $50 to $25 million.

I support the amendment to restore the $30 million and to make available $50 million for mass transit research and development.

The transportation needs of the cities cannot be ignored any longer.

Mr. KOCH. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with and echo the remarks that the gentleman has made.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman in taking the lead in this effort.

Mr. KOCH. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I want to say I appreciate the efforts made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH). His ideas are very salutary and I certainly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KOCH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to further point out that the research and development funds will be used to develop the gravity tube transit system and to deal with our overwhelming vehicular pollution problems.

The funds will be used to develop express bus systems and bus lanes, and to develop moving sidewalk systems. Eighty percent of America lives in our cities. Some attention must be paid to their needs.

Having briefly outlined the scope of the problem and the nature of my amendment, I would like now to go into greater detail.

President Richard Nixon sent to the Congress a budget recommendation of $250 million for the Nation's fiscal year 1971 public transportation program. This compares with the projected expenditure of $5 billion for highways during the same year.

Two hundred and fifty million dollars for all of the Nation's transit needs is not a large sum; nevertheless the Appropriations Committee has recommended that the President's budget be cut back by $30 to $220 million. The cuts have been directed primarily at UMTA's research, development, and demonstration program. The President had requested $50 million for this program, but the committee has recommended that no more than $25 million be spent for R. & D., $5 million below the fiscal year 1970 level.

It seems to me that this is not the time to cut back on either capital improvement programs or research. Today's public transportation networks are already behind in meeting the needs of our people, and with the projected growth of our urban centers, they will have to assume an even greater burden.

During the past few decades, mass transit has suffered tremendous economic problems. People do not ride the trains the way they use to, and many transit systems are inefficient and cannot compete with other forms of transportation. One reason for their failure has been the fact that they are laboring with old technology. For example, our rail cars are not much different from those built by Pullman in the 1850's.

One of the R. & D. programs pursued by the UMTA has been the development of a prototype car for the BARTD rail transit system in the San Francisco Bay Area. Further research is needed on the air cushion vehicle, the monorail, and the proposed vacuum tube transit concept. When one looks around at the transit systems in the United States and then compares them to those in the rest of the world, one sees that we are behind in the application of modern technology in public transportation.

One of the reasons we have not been able to move ahead in the development of a gravity tube transit system is that today tunneling is a slow and costly process. Little progress has been made in the science of tunneling since the development of the Brunel shield in the early 1880's. The Department of Transportation estimates that approximately 3,000 miles of tunnels will have to be built between now and 1990; and one of its R. & D. projects is in modernizing tunneling technology.

I know that the committee has tried to limit total expenses by cutting back research and development programs. But, I would submit that the apparent savings in this field would in the long run be a loss, for it would be just that much longer before our transit systems catch up with the times, that much longer before they shed their handicap of stale technology.

Efficient, clean and rapid mass transit is a critical need in our urban areas where large masses of people need to move from one place to another. Let us look for a moment at our metropolitan areas' population statistics. Approximately 80 percent of the country's 200 million people live in urban areas today. By the year 2000 we will have another 100 million people and 90 percent of all the population will live in our cities and suburbs. Surely $50 million in fiscal year 1971 for research for tomorrow's transportation to serve over 250 million people is not too much to spend.

Compare this figure with the fiscal year 1970 appropriations for other R. & D. programs. Today we have discussed the $95,958,000 recommended by the committee for continued development of the supersonic transport. We already have spent $623 million for its initial development as compared to a total of approximately $80 million to study public transportation problems; and it is estimated that we will spend $662 million in the future—a total of $1.3 billion for this one airplane.

In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration is being given $41 million for its fiscal year 1970 research and development program, $14 million more than the previous year's level.

On June 24, the House approved NASA's $3 billion research and development budget for NASA; half of this will go to the Apollo program and the rest for NASA's other research programs; one item is labeled "physics and astronomy," and it has been given $117 million.

The House Appropriations Committee is now working on a $7.3 billion request for research, development, testing and evaluation for the Department of Defense.

Compared to these other programs, surely $50 million is not too much to appropriate for research in public transportation.

I might point out that on August 7 when the President set forth his 12-year public transportation assistance program, he recommended that $300 million be spent on transportation during fiscal year 1971. Fifty million dollars of this would be for research and development.

I have introduced a bill which would provide for an expenditure of $10 billion on public transportation in the next 4 years. Whether we spend $10 billion in the next 4 years or $10.1 billion in 12 years as recommended by President Nixon, we should move rapidly ahead now with research so that the Federal Government and our Nation's cities will be able to purchase the best buses and rail equipment that today's technology is capable of producing. We have sent three men to the moon and back, and we pray for the safe return of those three astronauts now in space. Let us devote some of this same commitment to harnessing 20th century technology for mass transit so that our Nation's people can get to work and back speedily and comfortably.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at this time to propose any amendments or otherwise oppose the appropriation for highway safety, but I do feel compelled to warn my fellow Members that the $30 million appropriated in this bill is totally inadequate. If the highway safety program is to have any meaning it will have to be adequately funded, and as chairman of the legislative subcommittee responsible for this program, I must say now that I intend to make a serious and determined drive for proper funding in future years. A cut from the $75 million authorization to $30 million is simply not tolerable.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the committee appreciates the position of the gentleman from Illinois. We are aware of your dedication to the highway safety program and I think I can offer the gentleman the assurance of the subcommittee that we would like to take care of you and your committee in future years.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I thank the gentleman. I know he is a man of his word.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I commend the gentleman on his statement and indicate that, as a colleague from the State of Illinois, I realize there is a need for additional funds for these purposes, and I support the gentleman's position and will in the future when the matter comes to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I thank the gentleman. We are slaughtering 56,000 people on the highways, and it is about time we put some money into the program for highway safety.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by my able colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), calling for the restoration of $30 million to the appropriations for the urban mass transportation fund.

The original budget request for fiscal year 1971 was $250 million, but the committee has chosen to reduce this amount to $220 million, with the major cut being in research money.

Mr. Chairman, the restoration of the complete amount requested is the least this body can do to assure some forward momentum in an area which is grossly underfunded. Over 70 percent of our population lives in urban America, and yet we continue to appropriate billions for roads and very little for mass transit. Since 1956 the Federal Government has spent $44 billion on highways and ultimately will spend, during the course of the highways trust fund which now expires in 1974, the sum of $60 billion. The current annual highway expenditure reaches almost $5 billion, while the present proposed allocation is hardly 5 percent of this amount.

But the challenge in urban transportation is not a contest between highways and mass transit.

We need both. We need balance.

I would have preferred what would have given a really fair share to urban mass transit—an urban mass transportation trust fund which would be funded in part through the use of present auto excise taxes. However, if we cannot have this, certainly let us not accept anything

less than the highest level of funding possible at this time.

I could not agree more with the committee's call for "action," but let us make no mistake about the necessary basis of research upon which action is based. Urban mass transit is a highly technical area involving numerous different alternatives—from subways to minicar systems. We must continue to allow in-depth examination of all feasible alternatives.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, let us not be unrealistic in the name of economy. Mr. KOCH's proposal is not exorbitant. Urban mass transportation is a vital problem which needs the fullest concern of Government. We cannot afford to slice the pie any thinner if we are going to have any effect at all on the traffic jams that are strangling most major cities today.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 21, line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 309. None of the funds provided under this act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs for the construction of any airport in the State of Florida until it has been shown by an appropriate study made jointly by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Transportation, that such an airport will not have an adverse environmental effect on the ecology of the Everglades."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simple. It is to protect the ecological balance of one of our Nation's most unique wilderness areas, the Everglades. The amendment requires that a study be made of the environmental impact of the proposed jetport. I think that the amendment is a reasonable safeguard against the possibility that one of our greatest wilderness areas will be destroyed by the unthinking construction of an airport.

H. G. Wells has written that "human history more and more becomes a race between education and catastrophe." That is certainly true in regards to the Everglades. Unless we learn to value wilderness areas for their own sake and to take the time to understand the complex ecology which keeps them alive, we will witness their disappearance.

In all fairness Secretary of Transportation Volpe has said he doubted the jetport would not be constructed. The jetport which is proposed will have some 39 square miles—more than the combined area of Kennedy, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington National Airports combined. It will spawn air and water pollution on a huge scale. It will interfere with the fresh water supply so essential to maintaining the environmental integrity of the Everglades. We simply cannot stand by while this natural wonderland is pillaged unnecessarily.

The whole chain of life in the Everglades, from algae to alligators, will be threatened by the inevitable pollution which will accompany the jetport and the facilities which support it.

Noise from takeoffs and landings, estimated eventually at two per minute, will be intolerable not only to the wildlife population but to the million annual visitors to the park, whose opportunity for a wilderness experience will be gone forever.

It is important that the Department of Transportation, as the Nation's airport and roadbuilder, take the lead in recognizing the importance of preserving our natural heritage. Section 4(f) of the Department's statutory authority states:

The secretary shall not approve any program or project which requires the use of any land from a public park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl, or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative use of such land, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from such use.

Though the proposed jetport will not be located in the Everglades itself, its impact on the park lands is unquestioned. This amendment would serve to extend the principle of section 4(f) so as to provide some real assurance that the threat to the Everglades will be minimized. I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from Illinois has discussed the amendment with me and with other members of the subcommittee. As far as this side of the aisle is concerned, we are willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I joined with the gentleman and the subcommittee in asking Secretary Volpe some questions on this matter. I think he did say he had no intention of building a jetport. I agree with you. I would like to see this in writing as a part of the bill. I agree with the amendment, and urge its adoption.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman's amendment is a good one, and I suport it.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee about funds in this bill for the highspeed ground transportation demonstration site. The question might seem a bit incongruous after we have spent an hour or two on the SST. But I am concerned to see if any action has developed in the matter of high-speed transportation, such as the selection of the demonstration site and money to carry it forward.

Mr. BOLAND. In response to the gentleman from Texas, let me say there is no money in this bill for a high-speed ground transportation demonstration site, nor was any requested for it in the budget.

Mr. PICKLE. No money was requested in the budget?

Mr. BOLAND. No; there was not. They have now been engaged for a period of almost a year in site selection, but they have not come up with any determination as to where the site ought to be.

Mr. PICKLE. We were hoping that site selection might have been made at the end of this last fall. It was not. They were close to it. We have gone 11 months now, and no site selection has been made.

So if it has not been made at this hour, then we can assume that for at least this year and possibly next there will be no progress in this field.

Mr. BOLAND. I think that assumption would be correct.

Mr. PICKLE. Have they made any indication they are going to send up any request for funds in the supplemental?

Mr. BOLAND. No, there was no indication made to the committee during our hearings that there would be any supplemental request for the site. I think if the request came up for the site in the supplemental, we would perhaps turn it down. That is not the way to get funds for this kind of project.

Mr. PICKLE. I am very disappointed the Department of Transportation has not made a site selection. That should have been done in this last 18 months, and they have not done it. Whatever we do in this field of high-speed ground transportation, it has been set back a year or two because nothing has been done on the site selection. I hope immediate action is given to this.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman. I am glad he raised this. Whatever influence this committee has and can bring to bear, we will, so we will have the site selection made as soon as possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to page 14 of the bill, lines 7 and 8, where I note $4 million for the Lyndon Johnson superhighway in Texas and ask if this is the last $4 million for this enterprise?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is the last $4 million. This $4 million makes a total of $8 million. We provided $4 million in 1968, none in 1969, and we are providing $4 million this year. This will complete the Chamizal Memorial Highway.

Mr. GROSS. I repeat, that is the Lyndon Johnson superhighway.

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

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the committee has increased funds for facilities and equipment for the FAA in the amount of $90 million. It is my understanding—and I would like to verify this

by discussion with the chairman—that these funds would go for long-range radar, terminal-area radar, communications, and new control towers.

Mr. BOLAND. That is correct. Page 15 of the report, the second paragraph, spells out the factors the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the committee and the members of the Appropriations Committee who supported the increase in funds for facilities and equipment for the Federal Aviation Administration.

The FAA had requested $134 million for fiscal year 1970 for facilities and equipment for the air traffic control centers. No specific request was made for long-range radar, terminal area radar, instrument landing systems, communications and new control towers.

The FAA had based its decision not to request funds for these most necessary items on the fact that the airport and airways improvement legislation was being considered in the Congress and the FAA anticipated that that legislation would be passed thus providing an additional $116 million in revenues for facilities and equipment.

I was shocked during hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to learn that no specific request had been made for these safety items, particularly in light of the FAA's own report that some 4,000 near misses of aircraft collisions were reported in 1968.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for their concern for the safety of the flying public, both in commercial and general aviation, and I support the increase for facilities and equipment for the FAA.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I express our appreciation for the gentleman's remarks. Also, we congratulate the gentleman, as a member of the Legislative Committee which does concern itself with air traffic safety, as a member of that committee who has shown a great deal of concern for the items we have here.

This is the first year, at least in my knowledge since I have been on the committee, that we have taken such action in the House. We did this after searching analysis.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This is excellent. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that we have not provided adequate appropriations for the staffing of the new Office of Environment and Urban Systems. I agree with Secretary Volpe when he said that one of the most important things he has done since he has been in office is to establish a new Office of Environment and Urban Systems.

This Office has set out to see that transportation is used wisely as a tool for helping cities meet their social and physical development goals. Very often nowadays, when we talk about urban activities, we think only of major metropolitan areas, the cities with millions of people trying to solve the problems of millions of people. I have been pleased to find that the Department of Transportation's new Office concerns itself with the smaller cities as well. In Greenwood, S.C., for example, this Office of the Department of Transportation is working with the city and with State officials to try to use transportation development as a tool for renewing the heart of the downtown area. I am very pleased that urban systems concerns itself with small towns as well as big cities.

I am very impressed by what this Office has been able to do in the short time since it was established early this year. I note that the personnel assigned to this Office are severely limited in number and am concerned that because of the size of the staff the Office will not be able to do what it has set out to do. Even worse, it will not be able to do what needs to be done—not just in cities but in small towns as well, hundreds of them, in terms of all transportation programs and their impact on the quality of life in America today.

I do hope that in the future we will give more consideration to an adequate staff for this particular Office because this Office is directly involved with the problems of hundreds of the smaller cities throughout the Nation which are concerned with social and physical reform in the downtown areas, where there are so many grade crossings and hazardous crossings, the same as those in the larger cities of our country.

So I want to commend Secretary Volpe for creating this new Office, which gives to many of us who represent the smalltown areas some hope for the future that our smaller cities will be considered, as well as the larger cities.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. As the gentleman indicated, this is a new Office in the Department of Transportation. It is the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. The Assistant Secretary is a former mayor of Seattle, Secretary James D. Braman.

We believe that since this program is just getting off the ground—I believe there was a request for 25 new positions in this area—a 100-percent increase. It has been funded, but not to that extent—it ought to crawl before it starts to run.

The gentleman can be sure it is an office we consider terribly important, as he has indicated. We will be happy to get further into this matter next year, and I am sure this Office will be funded to the extent that is warranted.

Mr. DORN. I commend the Secretary, the chairman and the committee for the work they have done along this line.

I am glad the gentleman mentioned Secretary Braman. I have had the pleasure of meeting him. I am impressed with Mr. Braman's sincerity and his knowledge and determination to solve our complex transportation problems.

Mr. Chairman, we are fortunate to have men like Secretary Volpe and Secretary Braman who serve our Nation in this complicated field where leadership and imagination are essential in moving our country forward.

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

I should like to join the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN) in expressing my concern to the distinguished subcommittee chairman that the Office of Environment and Urban Systems be given increasing attention by the subcommittee. I believe this Office has one of the most important functions of the Department of Transportation.

It is unfortunate, in a way, that the Department started its program in environment and urban affairs on so small a scale, because I believe their first request to the subcommittee may have seemed to be rather large, in seeking to double the number of existing personnel. In my judgment, however, the critical nature of the responsibilities of this Office fully justifies that request.

I am not offering any criticism of the subcommittee. I do hope we will be able to fully fund this most significant new Office of the Department of Transportation, headed by the very able former mayor of Seattle. I hope every opportunity will be given the Department of Transportation to provide necessary attention in our transportation policy to the development of a quality environment and to the solution of our pressing urban problems.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I believe the argument the gentleman from Washington uses is precisely right and correct. It is the intention of the subcommittee to look at this Office carefully. There is no question about its importance.

We join the gentleman and others who are congratulating Secretary Volpe on establishing this Office. It should have been established long ago, because the impact of transportation systems on the environment in our urban areas is very serious. We agree totally with the gentleman's position.

When we have more information on how it is proceeding, we will fund it so that it will be a very effective Office.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Washington.

I rise to express my concern over the lack of sufficient funding for personnel in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. Secretary of Transportation Volpe said in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee that the creation of this department was one of his most significant actions since taking office, and the committee in its report of the bill noted this action with approval. Yet in the bill before us, there is funding for only 25 staff positions.

This is inconsistent with their important responsibilities and entirely inade-

quate for the functions this Office is charged with carrying out. Environment and Urban Systems is an Office of extreme importance within the Department of Transportation. In the words of J. D. Bramen, the new Assistant Secretary:

The primary mission of this Office is to provide a bridge between purely transportation objectives and the broader and more fundamental social, economic and environmental goals of the Nation and the individual communities making up our 50 States.

This is the Office where the urban planners are going to be, where the sociologists and ecologists are going to be. This is the Office whose responsibility it is to tell us how the policies of the Department of Transportation affect the environment and the quality of life in our cities, and what can be done about it. No one else in the Department has the responsibility of responding to the needs of communities all across the country as they are affected by transportation systems.

There currently exists a plethora of problems to which this Office will have the responsibility of finding settlement. There must be 1,000 communities of all sizes across the country who are facing a transportation crisis or can see it coming over the horizon. Just a few of the communities that this Office has been asked to help in solving a transportation problem are Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Norfolk, Charleston, W. Va.; Palm Dale, Calif.; Philadelphia; and Miami. When the new Assistant Secretaryship was created this year, a staff of 25 was hastily assembled to work out procedures and the Office structure. Now, when virtually every urban problem caused by mass transportation crosses his desk, the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems must be given the manpower resources to handle these diverse demands. A staff of 25 was never meant to be sufficient in this regard.

It is also the task of this Office to answer the question concerning pollution that has been ignored far too long: "How can the deleterious effects on our atmosphere caused by transportation methods and systems be curtailed?" This important environmental research function is distinct from the technological, methods research carried on by the Office of Research and Technology. But the main objection of the Appropriations Committee to the proper funding of the Office of Environment and Urban Systems seemed to be the feeling that the specific responsibilities of this Office have not been clearly spelled out. It is my hope that the necessary clarification takes place when the Senate Committee holds hearings on these appropriations—because this is an important Office with important functions. It must be given the capability to fulfill its promise.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, before I cast my vote in favor of H.R. 14797, I would like to state that in my opinion this Congress is falling short of its responsibilities. I will vote for the bill because it includes necessary funds for worthwhile projects. Unfortunately, we were not able to defeat the appropriation for the SST, and my amendment to increase the funds for mass transit was unsuccessful. Today, I have stated on several occasions the need for the full funding of the urban mass transit budget request of the administration which itself was far too meager. I hope that we will remedy this situation by enacting in this 91st Congress urban mass transportation trust fund legislation which will begin to approach the needs of our people.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), has asked that he be associated with these remarks and that his vote for the bill is being cast with the same reservations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14794) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14794 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 25, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—361

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Betts
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Caffery
Camp
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rivers | Smith, Calif. | Wampler |
| Roberts | Smith, Iowa | Watkins |
| Robison | Smith, N.Y. | Watts |
| Rodino | Snyder | Weicker |
| Rogers, Colo. | Springer | Whalen |
| Rogers, Fla. | Stafford | Whalley |
| Rooney, N.Y. | Staggers | White |
| Rosenthal | Stanton | Whitehurst |
| Roth | Steed | Whitten |
| Roudebush | Stokes | Widnall |
| Ruppe | Stratton | Wiggins |
| Ruth | Stubblefield | Williams |
| Ryan | Sullivan | Wilson, Bob |
| St Germain | Symington | Winn |
| St. Onge | Taft | Wold |
| Sandman | Talcott | Wolff |
| Satterfield | Taylor | Wright |
| Scherle | Teague, Calif. | Wyatt |
| Scheuer | Thompson, Ga. | Wydler |
| Schwengel | Thomson, Wis. | Wylie |
| Scott | Tiernan | Wyman |
| Sebelius | Udall | Yates |
| Shipley | Ullman | Yatron |
| Shriver | Van Deerlin | Young |
| Sikes | Vander Jagt | Zablocki |
| Sisk | Vanik | Zion |
| Skubitz | Vigorito | Zwach |
| Slack | Waggonner | |

NAYS—25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Gross | Roybal |
| Bow | Hanna | Schadeberg |
| Brock | Kastenmeier | Schneebeli |
| Brown, Calif. | Kyl | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Latta | Steiger, Wis. |
| Edwards, Calif. | Lujan | Waldie |
| Eshleman | McCarthy | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Farbstein | O'Konski | |
| Goodling | Ottinger | |

NOT VOTING—45

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gray | Patman |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Griffin | Philbin |
| Ashley | Howard | Powell |
| Belcher | Hunt | Pucinski |
| Bevill | Jacobs | Rooney, Pa. |
| Blackburn | Jones, Tenn. | Rostenkowski |
| Button | Kirwan | Saylor |
| Cabell | Landrum | Stephens |
| Cahill | Lipscomb | Stuckey |
| Celler | Lukens | Teague, Tex. |
| Chappell | Mathias | Thompson, N.J. |
| Dawson | May | Tunney |
| de la Garza | Melcher | Utt |
| Denney | Morgan | Watson |
| Frelinghuysen | Moss | |
| | Passman | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mrs. May.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Button.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 14794, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and to include pertinent extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

## INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MILLS, pursuant to permission granted on November 17, 1969, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12829) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-656)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12829) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2, line 2, of the House engrossed bill, after "amended" insert the following: *, effective with respect to acquisitions made after September 30, 1969,*; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RUSSELL LONG,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT GORE,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12829) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 of the House bill amended section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the expiration date of the interest equalization tax from August 31, 1969, to March 31, 1971. The Senate amendment extended the expiration date of the tax from September 30, 1969, to March 31, 1971, reflecting the temporary extension of the tax which had occurred since House passage of the bill. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Section 4(e)(2) of the House bill added to section 4920 of the Code a new subsection (d), permitting a domestic financing company to elect to be treated as a foreign issuer or obligor for purposes of the interest equalization tax if it satisfies certain conditions; among other things the trade or busness in which it is exclusively engaged must involve one or more specified types of debt obligations arising out of sales of tangible personal property. The Senate amendments added language permitting this election in a case where the debt obligations involved arise wholly or partly out of the lease of tangible personal property if at least 85 percent of the value of the property subject to the lease is attributable to the use of property manufactured, produced, grown, or extracted in the United States or to the performance of services by a United States person or to both. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: Section 4(e) of the House bill, in its amendment to section 4920 of the Code permitting a domestic financing company to elect to be treated as a foreign issuer or obligor for purposes of the interest equalization tax, required that such company own only certain specified types of debt obligations arising out of sales of tangible personal property. The Senate amendment added a provision allowing a financing company to own other debt obligations acquired in the course of, and incidental to carrying on, its financing company business, without losing its right to make such election. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Section 4(e) of the House bill, in its amendment to section 4920 of the Code permitting a domestic financing company to elect to be treated as a foreign issuer or obligor for purposes of the interest equalization tax, allowed such company to treat its trade accounts and accrued liabilities as foreign funds out of which debt obligations may be acquired only in the case of accounts and liabilities which are payable within a period of 1 year of the date they were incurred or accrued. The Senate amendment added language extending this period from 1 to 3 years in the case of accrued foreign tax liabilities. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The Senate amendment added to section 4 of the House bill a new subsection (i), amending section 4914(c)(6) of the Code to provide an exemption from the interest equalization tax (similar to the exemption presently provided in the case of export sales involving nonproducing exporters) where a United States person acquires a debt obligation of a foreign person which arises out of a lease of tangible personal property to such foreign person, if either (i) such debt obligation (or any related obligation arising out of the lease) is guaranteed or insured by a United States agency or instrumentality, or (ii) at least 85 percent of the value of the property is attributable to the use of tangible personal property which was manufactured or produced in the United States or to the performance of services with respect to the leased property under the terms of the least by the United States persons (or an affiliated corporation) or to both. Thus, a United States person either could directly make such an export lease free of tax or could make a tax-free direct investment in a foreign corporation which engaged in such export leasing transactions. The new subsection (i) also amends section 4920(a)(1) of the Code to make it clear that an obligation arising under a lease entered into principally as a financing transaction is to be considered a debt obligation for interest equalization tax purposes; this provision would of course have no effect on the treatment or characterization of such a lease for income tax purposes. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 5, adding to section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 a new subsection (c) relating to ammunition recordkeeping requirements. Under the Gun Control Act of 1968 and regulations issued thereunder, a person selling ammunition is required to obtain the purchaser's name, address, date of birth, and some form of identification, and to note certain additional information in his records.

The new section 4182(c) in effect repeals these requirements in the case of sales of shotgun ammunition, ammunition suitable for use only in rifles generally available in commerce, or component parts therefor; purchases of ammunition presently interchangeable between rifles and handguns, such as .22 caliber rimfire ammunition, would continue to be subject to the recordkeeping requirements. The House recedes.

W. B. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

## PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11612, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 11612, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-657)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11612) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19, 24, 39, 41, 49, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48, 50, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 60.

And agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$131,802,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$935,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$90,809,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$114,006,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,412,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$133,595,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$610,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,437,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,657,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,354,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,229,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$66,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "fifty-two (52)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 12.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
FRANK E. EVANS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
ROBERT H. MICHEL
(with reservation on amendment No. 48),
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11612) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment No. 1: Deletes the Senate proposal for construction of a new animal disease and parasite research facility at Beltsville, Maryland.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $131,802,200 for research instead of $130,182,000 as proposed by the House and $134,452,000 as proposed by the Senate. The following tabulation indicates action of the conferees on items which were in conference:

| | |
|---|---|
| Improve methods to control avian leukosis in poultry | $875,000 |
| Food and nutrition research: | |
| (a) Food and nutrition research studies | 478,500 |
| (b) Update handbook on nutrition "Family Fare" | (1) |
| Cane sugar refining research | 50,000 |
| Bovine mastitis and abnormal milk research | 554,200 |
| Wholesaling and retailing research | [2]($100,000) |
| Research acceleration: Development funds for the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center, Clay Center, Nebraska | 967,100 |
| Research on sunflowers to improve varieties with high oil content and to breed disease resistant and improved varieties | 100,000 |
| Improve research methods and controls on aquatic weeds | 324,900 |
| Completion of financing on Israeli oat research on Avena sterilis, and on oat foliage | 82,000 |
| Acceleration of cooperatively financed basic surgarcane research in Hawaii | 60,000 |
| Acceleration of sterile codling moth release program (3-year program) | 308,200 |
| Acceleration of research on Caribbean fruit fly | 133,000 |
| Upgrading quality of processed peaches | 92,500 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Pollution research concerned with animal waste management | $661,800 |
| Acceleration of special cost-cutting research program on cotton | 2,761,000 |
| Facilities: | |
| Construction and modernization of research facilities, Beltsville, Maryland | [3] 525,000 |
| Senate additions for construction and improvement | 0 |
| Senate additions for planning | 0 |

[1] To be completed with available funds.
[2] From contingency research fund.
[3] Additional funds for modernization only.

Amendment No. 3: Provides that $935,000 of the appropriation for research shall remain available until expended instead of $710,000 as proposed by the House and $2,306,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: *Plant and animal disease and pest control.*—Appropriates $90,809,750 instead of $89,493,000 as proposed by the House and $92,126,500 as proposed by the Senate. On items in disagreement between the two houses, the recommendation of the conferees provides for one-half of the Senate increase in each case. With reference to the cooperative fire ant eradication program, the conferees expect the Department to take every step possible to obtain matching funds. The conferees are in agreement with language in the Senate report stating that at least $1,000,000 of funds in the contingency fund be reserved for control of plant and related insect pests.

Amendment No. 5: Provides that $1,500,000 shall remain available until expended for construction of facilities instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes the Senate proposal with reference to the purchase or application of chemical pesticides.

Amendment No. 7: *Salaries and expenses. Special foreign currency program.*—Appropriates $5,000,000 instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $55,189,000 for payments and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $53,854,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Provides $2,000,000 for contracts and grants for scientific research as proposed by the House instead of $2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Restores House language providing $1,000,000 for grants for facilities.

Amendment No. 11: Provides $376,000 for expenses of the Cooperative State Research Service as proposed by the House instead of $426,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide a total amount of $62,510,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 13: *Payments to States and Puerto Rico.*—Provides $83,621,000 for payments for cooperative agricultural extension work as proposed by the Senate instead of $82,006,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement with the directive in the House report for the use of $7,500,000 for professional workers to promote 4-H type programs in the depressed areas of our cities.

Amendment No. 14: Provides $375,000 for payments under the District of Columbia Public Education Act as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates a total of $114,006,000 instead of $112,391,000 as proposed by the House and $114,131,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: *Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents.*—Appropriates $10,240,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: *Federal Extension Service.*—Appropriates $3,838,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,338,000 as proposed by the House.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $1,500,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,635,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $6,209,000 for watershed planning as proposed by the House instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the language of the House report directing that not less than 100 new plans be started during the coming year.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $63,873,000 for watershed works of improvement as proposed by the Senate instead of $57,873,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that not less than 80 new construction starts should be undertaken.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that $5,000,000 in the direct loan account of the Farmers Home Administration shall be available until expended for loans instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: *Resource conservation and development.*—Appropriates $10,252,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,452,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Provides that $3,300,000 shall remain available until expended for loans under subtitle A as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $13,450,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $13,562,000 as proposed by the Senate.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $15,412,800 for salaries and expenses instead of $14,950,000 as proposed by the House and $16,375,600 as proposed by the Senate. Included in the amount allowed is $103,500 for probability surveys of farm grain stocks, $358,000 for research to improve agricultural statistics, and $160,300 to reinstate a number of crop and livestock estimates. The sum of $250,000 is also provided to initiate a multiframe sampling program to improve the accuracy and reliability of livestock estimates; in addition, not to exceed $250,000 is authorized for transfer from other livestock funds.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 26: *Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs.*—Appropriates $133,595,500 instead of $130,867,000 as proposed by the House and $134,695,500 as proposed by the Senate. As for items in disagreement between the two Houses, the amount allowed will provide $6,923,800 for market news service, $80,000,000 for meat inspection, $28,000,000 for poultry inspection, and $2,896,500 for increased pay costs.

Amendment No. 27: *Child nutrition programs.*—Makes available $252,441,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $247,441,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Provides $15,000,000 for special food service programs as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29. *Food stamp program.*—Appropriates $610,000,000 instead of $340,000,000 as proposed by the House and $750,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: *Special milk program.*—Appropriates $84,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 31 and 32: Insert language proposed by the Senate relative to the distribution of milk to children.

Amendment No. 33: Deletes the proposal of the House to provide $120,000,000 from Section 32 funds for the special milk program.

As a result of action on Amendment Nos. 30 to 33, inclusive, a total of $104,000,000 will be available for the special milk program as proposed by the Senate instead of $120,000,000 as proposed by the House.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $23,437,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $22,937,000 as proposed by the House and $23,937,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional $500,000 is for new export market projects.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $2,321,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the House.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $146,000,000 for necessary administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $147,420,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees take note of the restrictive standards established by the Department for the Farm Storage Facilities Loan Program, effective last May 30, and expect the Department to carefully review this program prior to next year's operations with a view to more adequately meeting the needs of producers. This program has been very effective in enabling farmers to step up their farm storage capacities and to assist in the stabilization of the rural economy.

Amendment No. 37: The House recedes from disagreement to the Senate amendment. This provision would apply only to crops planted in fiscal year 1970. The limitation provisions would not apply under the words of the House provision to sugar and wool and, since winter wheat has been planted, it was the view of the conferees that exemption from the limitations would have to be provided for winter wheat. Cotton would, in effect, be exempted by reason of the snapback provision, paragraph 12 of section 103(d) of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, as amended, which provides:

"(12) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, as a result of limitations hereafter enacted with respect to price support under this subsection, the Secretary is unable to make available to all cooperators the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection for any crop of upland cotton, (A) price support to cooperators shall be made available for such crop (if marketing quotas have not been disapproved) through loans or purchases at such level not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate. . . ."

This would leave the House limitation where it would apply only to feed grains and spring wheat, which would be most inequitable. In agreeing with the Senate amendment, it was the belief that this subject matter must of necesssity have the consideration of the appropriate legislative committees and the Congress prior to December 31, 1970, the date of the expiration of existing agricultural legislation.

Amendment No. 38: *Sugar Act program.*—Appropriates $93,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $89,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: *Agricultural conservation program.*—Sets a 1970 program for

$195,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $185,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the Department should give increased emphasis on practices to promote permanent soil and water conservation.

Amendment No. 40: *Cropland adjustment program.*—Appropriates $78,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $78,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Deletes the Senate proposal for a cropland adjustment program of $99,300,000 for the calendar year 1970 and restores House language prohibiting additional agreements for the fiscal year 1970.

Amendment No. 42: *Conservation reserve program.*—Appropriates $37,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $37,500,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $13,657,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $13,389,000 as proposed by the House and $13,925,000 as proposed by the Senate.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $3,354,650 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,200,000 as proposed by the House and $3,509,300 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $5,229,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,459,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $3,226,750 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,200,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $3,025,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,050,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 48: Provides loan authorization of $340,000,000 for electrification loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $320,000,000 as proposed by the House.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 49: *Direct loan account.*—Authorizes $83,000,000 for real estate loans as proposed by the House instead of $69,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: *Rural water and waste disposal grants.*—Appropriates $46,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 51: *Rural housing for domestic farm labor.*—Appropriates $2,500,000 instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the program should be directed toward housing for transient farm labor.

Amendment No. 52: *Mutual and self-help housing.*—Appropriates $2,125,000 instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: *Self-help housing land development fund.*—Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: *Salaries and expenses.*—Appropriates $66,250,000, instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment Nos. 55 and 56: Provide reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses in the fiscal year 1968 of $2,948,217,859 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,698,217,859 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57: *Limitation on administrative expenses.*—Provides for not to exceed $32,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $31,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: *Public Law 480.*—Appropriates $420,000,000 for sales for foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms (title I) as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $500,000,000 for commodities disposed of in connection with donations abroad (title II) as proposed by the House instead of $515,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: *Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile.*—Appropriates $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are agreed that all of the funds are to be used for liquidating existing contracts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 61: Permits the purchase of 552 passenger motor vehicles instead of 530 as proposed by the House and 566 as proposed by the Senate.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
FRANK E. EVANS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
ROBERT H. MICHEL
(with reservation on amendment No. 48),
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

---

## THE VICE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS ON THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF MR. HARRIMAN

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, recent remarks by the Vice President, especially as they attempted to downgrade and tarnish the record of a man who has given some 40 years of diligent service around the globe in behalf of our country, including the successful negotiation of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, emphasizes once again how important it is in a democratic society to try to maintain respect for a given public high office, no matter how difficult the conduct of the person who temporarily occupies that high office might make it.

Many of us in both political parties would like to give this administration all the support we can, consistent with the dictates of our consciences and what we can see to be in the best interests of the United States. But that task is made difficult by the surly and graceless conduct of the Vice President.

The difficulty with this administration is that it seems to be hell-bent on forcing each and every American citizen to choose between it and its views and other prominent Americans with somewhat differing views—on Vietnam and many other matters. This is a strange tactic for an administration with the avowed goal of "bringing us together again."

I, for one, feel that it would be better if our people were not forced to draw hard lines, were not forced to choose between such fully divided camps. I feel it would be better to enable them to support the best ideas and the best programs of both the administration and others who in good faith present various alternatives.

However, if I must choose between expressing support for the public service of our Vice President or the public service of Mr. Harriman, the Vice President leaves me little alternative but to choose Mr. Harriman. I believe the editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Post, which I should like to include at this point, indicates the sensitivity and judgment of the one man and the graceless disregard for that man's contributions to our country by the other, who by virtue of the office he occupies, if nothing else, should know better.

The editorial follows:

FOR THE RECORD

". . . a very carefully thought out speech by the President of the United States. I'm sure he wants to end this war and no one wishes him well any more than I do. He approaches the subject quite differently from the manner in which I approach it. Let me say, though, that I'm utterly opposed to these people that are talking about cutting and running. I'm against the Republican Senator from New York's proposal, Senator Goodell, to get out our troops in a year willy-nilly. I think we should have a responsible withdrawal.

"I think he's (the President) got the full support of the people. He certainly has got my support, in hoping he will develop a program for peace . . . this (speech) is about what I thought he would say from the positions he had previously taken."

The passages quoted above are just about all that Mr. W. Averell Harriman had to say directly about President Nixon's famous Vietnam speech on Nov. 3, when he was interviewed directly afterward by commentators for ABC. He had other things to say, of course, about the way he thinks we ought to try to get out of the war, things he had said many, many times before, things critical, largely by implication, not only of the current administration's efforts, but of the efforts of the previous administration for which Mr. Harriman served as chief negotiator in the Paris peace talks. If anything, he was tougher on the old crowd than the new, harder on Democrats than Republicans, which does not come easily to this, shall we say, intense political partisan.

For this Mr. Harriman became, in the Vice President's phrase, an "Ancient Mariner . . . under some heavy compulsion to justify his failures to anyone who will listen." As Mr. Agnew put it, in his own inimitable way, and *en passant* in his assault on the television networks the other night, "Mr. Harriman offered a broad range of gratuitous advice challenging and contradicting the policies outlined by the President of the United States."

All this was by way of trying to establish the bias in television news presentation and we have already had something to say about Mr. Agnew's approach to this issue, and will doubtless return to it. For now it is enough to take note of how the Vice President performs when *he* holds forth on television from *his* privileged sanctuary. Raised eyebrows, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast, these tricks he ascribes to the TV men are not for the Vice President. Better the sweeping rewrite of history "A word about Mr. Harriman. For 10 months he was America's chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks—a period in which the United States swapped some of the greatest concessions in the history of warfare for an enemy agree-

ment on the shape of a bargaining table." Where to begin untangling it—with the fact that a two-stage halt in the bombing had nothing to do with the dispute over the shape of the table? With the fact that final renunciation of this rather dubious military instrument was made in exchange for an understanding that the Demilitarized Zone would not be violated, that indiscriminate shelling of major cities would stop, and that four-way talks, including the South Vietnamese and the North Vietnamese, would begin? Does Mr. Agnew not know that the argument over the table shape was precipitated by the Saigon government and settled with the active behind-the-scenes collaboration of the incoming Nixon administration in the closing days of Mr. Johnson's term? The most generous answer that we can think of is that he does not.

## CONGRESS MUST CENSURE THOSE WHO THREATEN FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the recent attempts of the Nixon administration to stifle disagreement with its policies and to attack the freedom of the press to report such disagreements.

The freedom to criticize our Government by individuals and the press is fundamental to our democracy. We are quick to express our outrage when other governments trample these basic rights. Indeed, one of our major complaints against Communist societies is their repression of dissent and their harnessing of the press.

I call on the President to repudiate statements by his Vice President equating disagreement and disloyalty, by his Secretary of Transportation calling dissenters Communists or Communist-inspired, and actions by his Vice President and the chairman of the FCC attacking the radio and television networks' freedom to criticize. By his acquiescence in these actions, the President assumes responsibility for them and participates in their insidious threat to democracy.

It is no answer to say that the Vice President and Dean Burch were only calling upon the television networks to reform themselves. Attacking network commentaries on the President's Vietnam speech and demanding transcripts of the news analyses of that speech were acts of blatant intimidation. Indeed, from the lack of live network coverage of last week's Vietnam protest events, it is quite clear that their intimidation already has had its effect.

If the President will not act to stop his lieutenants from trampling on our basic freedoms, the Congress must. I hope all my colleagues, whatever their views may be on the merits of the President's Vietnam proposals, will unite in calling forcefully for an end to these attacks on our free institutions.

Not since the days of Senator Joseph McCarthy have we seen such a concerted effort to condemn disagreement and criticism of Government policies.

In the end Senator McCarthy was censured for his excesses by the Senate. Since the threat to our freedoms comes now from the highest levels of Government the censure by Congress must be all the more swift and certain.

## TRANSPORTATION AND THE NATION'S PARKS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill is under debate this week; apropos of that, an article in the November 16 issue of the Washington Post deserves careful attention. Wolf Von Eckardt points up the dangers facing the nation's parks, recreation areas, and historical shrines unless DOT Secretary Volpe learns to temper the freeway fanatics in his agency. The article focused in a recent and symptomatic DOT decision which would pave over two parks, a stadium, a college, a zoo, a sunken garden area, hiking trails, and other recreation areas in San Antonio, Tex.

Irrespective of the 1966 Transportation Act provisions designed to protect public lands threatened by the almighty bulldozer, Secretary Volpe has caught the pave-or-perish virus and appears willing to flatten our national and natural treasures under ribbons of gleaming highways. Perhaps now is the time, when DOT is pressing its claim on the National Treasury, to get it straight, once and for all, ground rules for highway building. One of those ground rules must be the human and environmental necessities which transcend the need for asphalt avenues to and from urban areas. Another ground rule should be established which would require developers to pay a fair market value for any land proposed for highways and that funds received from such sales be deposited in the land and water conservation fund for the purchase of additional or new park and recreation areas. If something is not done to slow down the headlong rush to pave America solid, no public lands will be safe from the bulldozer blade.

The Von Eckardt article follows:

### PAVING OUR PARKS

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The 10-month-long seesaw battle for the heart and mind of Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe seems lost.

Volpe reportedly has decided to approve a long controversial freeway in San Antonio which would pave some 150 acres of Brackenridge and Olmos Park, the Alamo Stadium, Incarnate Word College, a zoo, the famous Sunken Garden area, hiking trails and other recreation areas.

Volpe's decision is to be announced in the next few days. And if he indeed approves the destruction of parkland in San Antonio, conservationists fear that Washington's Glover Archbold Park, Minneapolis' Minnehaha State Park, Santa Barbara's Goleta Slough Estuary and the parks of other cities will also be bull-dozed into freeways unless the courts come to the rescue.

Just a few days ago Volpe decided to sacrifice Overton Park in Memphis, Tenn.

Court action, already pending in Washington and dormant in San Antonio, would essentially be based on Section 4(f) of the 1966 Transportation Act. It provides that the Secretary of Transportation shall not approve a freeway that uses any land from a public park unless there is no feasible alternative and unless everything has been done to minimize harm to the park.

The section was written into the law by Sen. Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.) primarily to save the San Antonio Park.

A decision to build the freeway anyway with minor and, according to preservationists, insignificant modifications, would mean a clear victory for the militant highway builders, led within the Department of Transportation by the uncompromising Frank Turner, the federal highway administrator.

It would spell defeat for the valiant efforts of James D. Braman, DOT's assistant secretary for environment and urban systems and the big-city mayors and conservation groups across the country who are cheering him on in his struggle to tame the freeways as they enter the cities.

Some of Braman's friends say that Braman may resign over the San Antonio issue. Braman himself just smiles and says he has not yet given up and is still trying to get Secretary Volpe's ear.

A former mayor of Seattle and Republican businessman, Braman is no antifreeway hothead. But he strongly believes that while the highway builders have done a good job in the country, their zeal must be subordinated to human and environmental values when they approach downtown and that good public transportation must be given a chance in this country if our cities are to survive.

At times it has seemed that Volpe agrees. He is in a better position to curb freeways and advance public transportation than his predecessor Alan S. Boyd who, of course, attempted to do so.

But Boyd is a liberal and was thus suspect with the highway lobby, while Volpe is conservative and, as a former building contractor, knowledgeable enough about engineering matters to turn Turner off when he claims "technical infeasibility" of human considerations.

But Volpe is said to be overly susceptible to political pressures. Early in his regime, for instance, he seemed all agreed that a proposed highway along the Hudson, at Tappan Zee Bridge near Ossining, N.Y., was a clear violation of the park protecting Section 4(f).

When Gov. Nelson Rockefeller called to ask him to approve the highway, however, he did so instantly, without even consulting his legal staff.

At San Antonio it also first seemed that Volpe would decide in favor of preserving an irreplaceable heritage.

Alan Boyd had been forced to approve the San Antonio freeway, but did so only on condition that the damage to the parks be minimized. After Volpe replaced him, the Texas State Highway Department submitted its old plan again without the changes Boyd wanted.

DOT seemed inclined to disapprove, and Braman went to San Antonio to look for alternatives. He found one, acceptable to conservation groups. It would save the park but take four high-priced suburban homes on the outskirts of the Olmos Park community.

The owner of one of these homes is said to be a heavy campaign contributor to Sen. John G. Tower (R.-Tex.). Tower, at any rate, suddenly and energetically supports the old plan. So does San Antonio Mayor W. W. McAllister, also a Republican. Other prominent Republicans, however, are opposed to bulldozing the park.

Just where Volpe stands on the Washington freeway fight is unknown. While Boyd sided more or less openly with the freeway opponents and the March 1966 report by Arthur D. Little, Inc., the renowned systems analysts, who found Washington's proposed freeway system "inconsistent and incompatible with urban transportation needs." Volpe has kept his own counsel in his negotiations with Congressman William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) who insists on building the system.

It is clear, however, that the fate of San

Antonio's Brackenridge Park will have its effect along the Potomac. Now that it is to be routed across the Three Sisters Bridge, Virginia Route 66 traffic is poised directly at Glover Archbold Park and the area north of it up to the Beltway.

So far the District Highway Department has only published a plan that would sharply turn this traffic east along the Georgetown Waterfront into the city.

This obviously makes little sense. And people who have watched freeway politics over the last few years predict with some certainty that as soon as the bridge is built, the highway militants will start pressuring for a Glover Archbold route. They have taken a piece of it already.

The loss of Brackenridge Park and Volpe's disregard for Section 4(f) can only encourage them.

So transportation planning, like school integration, appears now to be left to the courts, which, historians and political scientists feel, may not be quite what the American system of government had intended.

Lawyers who filed suit in the Court of Appeals on behalf of Washington citizen groups are optimistic, however. The Three Sisters Bridge, to be sure, is being built under an amendment to the 1968 Highway Act. It orders construction "not withstanding any other law," apparently past, present and future.

To these optimistic lawyers this seems too murky a clause to survive judicial scrutiny.

## HANDFUL OF BIG BANKS MAINLY RESPONSIBLE FOR INFLATION

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's Washington Post, discussing a speech by Federal Reserve Governor Andrew Brimmer, may well have pinpointed the reason why interest rates have risen to record heights and show every indication of going even higher. The article deals with a speech given by Governor Brimmer at the London School of Economics in England which, for the most part, discusses the increased use by American banks of Eurodollars, which are dollars owned by Europeans.

According to the article, Governor Brimmer said:

> Just a handful of American banks—14 to be exact—account for 95 percent of the Euro-dollar business. It is this group of banks—the giants in the field—that have been able to soften the impact of Federal Reserve monetary policy by substantial resort to non-conventional sources of funds.

The article further describes the Fed's attempt to restrict the supply of lending funds which, hopefully, would drive down interest rates. However, the bigger banks were able to find loopholes in the Fed's policy, particularly in the area of commercial paper and Eurodollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that our economy must suffer because a handful of banks will not abide by the spirit of the Federal Reserve's policy to lower interest rates. Until these banks join the battle against inflation, we are in for a long hard struggle.

I am including the Washington Post article in my remarks because, although it deals with a high-level economic subject, it, nevertheless, at the same time spells out quite clearly who is responsible for the high cost of money in our Nation:

BRIMMER OUTLINES EURO-DOLLAR BATTLE

(By Hobart Rowen)

A member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors admitted yesterday that the Board's effort to limit U.S. bankers' reliance on one unconventional source of funds had accelerated their efforts to find such funds in another direction.

This observation was made in a speech yesterday to the London School of Economics in London, England, by FRB Governor Andrew F. Brimmer. A text of Brimmer's detailed analysis, keyed to the Euro-dollar market, was made available.

Brimmer noted that on Oct. 29, the Fed had announced that it was considering applying interest ceilings under its Regulation Q to funds received by member banks from the issuance of commercial paper.

ABOVE BANK RATE

Commercial paper is a form of promissory note issued by non-bank corporations, sold far above the 6¼ per cent rate that banks, seeking lendable funds, can pay on large certificates of deposit.

Desperate because of the Fed's tight money policy, banks have been acquiring funds, in part, by paying high rates for commercial paper. Brimmer revealed to a top-level audience in London that when the Fed acted, some 58 banks had $3.6 billion of such liabilities outstanding "through their subsidiaries or related one-bank holding companies." Fully half of this had been issued in the three months prior to the Fed ruling.

But in response to the Fed move, Brimmer said, banks in the U.S. "substantially increased their bidding for Euro-dollar funds during the week ending Nov. 5.

"This development may well account for the sharp rise in Euro-dollar rates during the last few days of October. As the commercial paper outstanding matures, banks probably will not be able to renew it at the existing rate ceilings. Thus, some of them may attempt to expand their borrowing in the Euro-dollar market."

MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

On the other hand, Brimmer noted that the higher cost of obtaining Euro-dollars caused by the imposition of higher Federal Reserve margin requirements could dampen the banks, enthusiasms to pick up funds this way.

Using measures he said were comparable to those devised by the Bank for International Settlements at Basle, Switzerland, Brimmer estimated that the size of the Euro-dollar market at the end of June was $32 to $33 billion, up some $7 to $8 billion in the first six months of the year.

Thus Euro-dollar funds (dollars owned by Europeans) had about trebled since the end of 1965 by mid-1969.

The Fed Governor, in passing, revealed that just a handful of American banks—14 to be exact—account for 95 per cent of the Euro-dollar business. It is this group of banks—the giants in the field—that have been able to soften the impact of Federal Reserve monetary policy by substantial resort to non-conventional sources of funds.

At mid-year, U.S. banks had borrowed $13.3 billion in Euro-dollars through their foreign branches. By no small coincidence, the attrition in certificates of deposit from mid-December 1968 to October 29, 1969, was comparable: $12.9 billion.

## INTERESTS OF AMERICANS IN OKINAWA MUST BE PROTECTED

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending negotiations between President Nixon and Prime Minister Sato of Japan on the reversion of Okinawa, a matter of grave concern to American citizens now living in Okinawa was only yesterday brought to my attention.

While I am confident that President Nixon and his advisers will not have overlooked the private interests of Americans, individual and corporate, I offer for the RECORD a position paper on the reversion of Okinawa, presented to me by a representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Okinawa. The paper outlines effectively the case for Americans, now employed or engaged in business in Okinawa, and I include it in the RECORD following my remarks:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES IN OKINAWA

POSITION PAPER ON REVERSION

On September 4, 1951, in his opening statement to the San Francisco Peace Conference, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles used the term "residual sovereignty" for the first time. Although no definition has been supplied for this phrase, it has come to mean that at some time in the future Japan will again recover full sovereignty over the Ryukyu Islands. Successive administrations in Washington further underscored this intention to return the administration of the islands to Japan and effectively to abrogate Article III of the Treaty of Peace with Japan by mutual agreement between Japan and the United States.

Since the last mentioned date, the United States has returned to Japan full sovereignty to the Oshima and Bonin Islands. Now the time has come to concern ourselves with the effects of return of Okinawa to Japanese administration.

With reversion approaching, the United States Chamber of Commerce in Okinawa, an affiliate of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., invites your attention to certain areas of great concern to American and other non-Ryukyuan investors, who by their work and investment of their capital and talents in Okinawa, have contributed to the raising of the status of Okinawa from a small war-beaten island of less than 400,000 people to 1 million people operating a semi-industrial economy with a gross national product of 644.4 million dollars in FY 68.

The Government of Japan has made certain demands and pronouncements concerning the reversion of these islands to Japan in 1972 or before. There has been no dialogue between the foreign business community of Okinawa and the Government of Japan concerning the effects of total reversion upon the foreign business community here. We now must bring to your attention, as our proper representative in dealing with the Japanese Government, these areas of concern which must be included in any conversations or negotiations between Japan and the United States upon the terms of reversion of administration of the Ryukyu Islands to Japan.

AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS IN OKINAWA MUST BE PRESENTED AS A SPECIFIC ITEM ON THE AGENDA OF THE REVERSION NEGOTIATIONS WHICH TAKE PLACE BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND TOKYO

Through newspaper accounts we have learned that various levels of government of the United States and Japan have been conducting informal negotiations concerning

the basic position between the United States and Japan on the issue of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan. In an effort to build a viable economy, American and other foreign business interests were invited to come to Okinawa to invest their money and skills in promoting the economy. A multimillion dollar investment has occurred over the years since the battle of Okinawa ended. The foreign business community in Okinawa, as well as the military establishment, is responsible for upgrading skill levels of Okinawans to the point that Okinawans now function effectively in all areas of the professions, business management and trade skills. It is our position that we have a justifiable interest in the reversion negotiations. We are unable here to establish liaison with the Japanese Government. There appears to be no agency of the Japanese Government interested, willing or able to advise the American and foreign business community of Okinawa as to what it may expect, either as a result of reversion or after reversion to Japan. So far as we can determine from the available evidence, the Japanese Government appears little concerned with the welfare of the foreign business community in Okinawa. It is our hope to excite such interest.

SPECIFIC WAIVER OF RETROACTIVE TAX CLAIM BY JAPAN

In Okinawa, foreign businessmen pay personal income tax under the provisions of Civil Administration Ordinance No. 114. Foreign corporations and other foreign business entities pay corporation income tax under Civil Administration Ordinance No. 115. We believe that unless there is a specific waiver on the part of Japan against retroactive tax assessments, the foreign business community of Okinawa may be faced with additional taxation from the Government of Japan back to its statute of limitations, several years before the date of actual reversion. We believe that any taxes to be claimed by Japan should not commence until the actual date of reversion. Japan should waive any claim for taxes against any persons of the Ryukyu Islands prior to the actual date of reversion. This waiver should be expressed and specifically set forth in the final documents providing for the reversion of Okinawa to Japan.

REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF EXISTING FOREIGN INVESTMENT LICENSES

Most American and foreign business activities in Okinawa operate by virtue of foreign investment licenses granted under Civil Administration Ordinance 11. We believe that the United States Government, in its negotiations with Japan concerning reversion, should require Japan to give full faith and credit to these licenses. It is suggested that the way this should be done is for Japan to expressly adopt and hold as legal all acts of the United States Government done during the years of its administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the first day of April, 1945 until the date of reversion. Such provision will permit all existing foreign investment licenses to continue according to their own terms and be treated as if they were licenses of the same character issued by the Government of Japan.

CLARIFY AND MAINTAIN WORK PERMITS OF THIRD COUNTRY NATIONALS

In Okinawa there are a substantial number of nationals from countries other than the United States and Japan. These third country nationals should be given the same authority to continue their jobs and professions as they now enjoy in Okinawa. The United States should insist that Japan recognize as legal and continuing all acts and policies as they pertain to third country nationals, of the United States during the time of American administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

PROTECTION OF REAL ESTATE LEASES OVER PREFECTURAL LAND

Several foreign business entities in Okinawa occupy Japanese prefectural land by virtue of leases between the particular foreign entity and the United States Civil Administration. Since the end of World War II, the land formerly owned by the Japanese Government has been under the custody of the Property Custodian of the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyus (USCAR). During that time USCAR has issued leases of varying lengths to public and private lessees. There are many private individuals and corporations who hold such leases. The Japanese Government should be required to recognize these leases as being in full force and effect according to their own terms.

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN RYUKYUAN AND JAPANESE CORPORATIONS TO DO BUSINESS THROUGHOUT JAPAN AFTER REVERSION

The Government of the Ryukyu Islands has permitted the establishment of Okinawan corporations by several foreign companies. There are now in existence many Ryukyuan corporations that are wholly owned by Ryukyuans, wholly owned by foreigners, partially owned by Ryukyuans and partially owned by foreigners. These corporations (Kabushiki Kaisha) were established under the Corporation Code of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands which is identical to that of Japan. It is certain that all Japanese Corporations will be permitted to do business in Okinawa after reversion without any requirement of additional licensing. Therefore, the rights of shareholders of Ryukyuan corporations should be protected by reciprocity. The United States Government should require Japan to recognize and treat as Japanese corporations all those corporations organized under the Government of the Ryukyu Islands Corporation Code. All such Ryukyuan corporations should be treated as Japanese corporations for all purposes.

FREE CONVERSION AND PROTECTION OF DOLLAR ASSETS

Under the administration of the United States Government, the currency in Okinawa is the U.S. Dollar. The U.S. Dollar circulates freely in the international commerce. Japanese Yen, although a highly respected currency, does not circulate in the international commerce, and therefore, it must be considered a "blocked currency." After reversion, the currency in Okinawa will be the Japanese Yen. At the present time in Japan, an investor of U.S. Dollars is permitted to open a "free yen" bank account, and is authorized to repatriate his investment in U.S. Dollars. There is no evidence that any such protection will be allowed for U.S. Dollar assets, bank accounts, currency or other property in Okinawa after reversion occurs. The Government of the United States should insist that the Government of Japan permit the withdrawal of profits, capital and assets from Okinawa in U.S. Dollars with no time limitation. To do otherwise amounts to an agreement by the United States Government to the confiscation of dollar assets by the Japanese Government through no fault of Okinawan and foreign investors. Also, sufficient conversion of currency should be allowed to permit the purchase of raw materials, machinery and spare parts from the United States.

EXISTING PROFESSIONAL LICENSES SHOULD BE CONTINUED

In Okinawa, as in Japan, nearly every person who holds himself out as a technician or professional must be licensed. Licensing in Okinawa concerns the highly skilled surgeon, lawyer, architect, pharmacist, dentist, electrician, plumber, stationary boiler operator and on and on for many categories. Japan does not accept GRI licenses of professional personnel in Okinawa as meeting Japan's requirements for such professions. However, the Japanese Bar Association has carried on a dialogue with the legal profession in Okinawa in an attempt to solve their differences. The Government of Japan has been silent as to what it intends to do with persons who hold licenses to practice law in Okinawa but do not hold such license in Japan. This applies to all other professional licensing. There is no reciprocity in professional licensing between Japan and Okinawa. After reversion, should the Government of Japan refuse to accept existing licenses as valid, such nonacceptance will effectively destroy careers of hundreds of professional and technical personnel in Okinawa. At the same time, the economy of Okinawa will be unable to operate in the absence of trained and licensed professionals. The United States Government should insist that Japan recognize all professional and technical licenses issued by the United States Government or the Government of the Ryukyu Islands as valid and continuing as if the same had been issued by the Government of Japan itself.

EXCLUSION OF RESTRICTIVE DUTIES AND QUOTAS WHICH WOULD PREVENT THE CONTINUING OPERATION OF EXISTING BUSINESSES

Many foreign firms in Okinawa require extracts, flavors, medicines, equipment and spare parts imported from the United States and elsewhere. Without these items their business cannot operate. Japan restricts the importation of many of these items by means of a system of duties, quotas and embargo regulations. Should these same restrictions be applied to existing American business firms in Okinawa it would be impossible for the subject firms to manufacture their products or to maintain their equipment, and otherwise continue business activities. Therefore, Okinawa should be excluded from the enforcement of these trade restrictions and the final agreement between the United States and Japan on reversion must expressly and specifically contain the protection required.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall just concluded I was unavoidably detained in my office on business. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during the call of rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## RHODESIA

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

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1965, Rhodesia declared unilateral independence from Great Britain. Since that time this valiant nation has—even in the face of threats, economic sanctions, attempts at subversion from within and without, and other forces—continued to maintain its independence. In the past 4 years, Rhodesians have fought off the pressures

against their government and have built an even more enriched economy, diversified by necessity, and a higher standard of living for all her citizens.

During these 4 years the policy of the United States toward Rhodesia has been inexplicable. The threat alleged on the part of Rhodesia certainly does not warrant the actions we have taken. We have pursued an incredible double standard in our foreign policy. We have shunned and attempted to degrade a friend and ally. We have blithely perverted the charter of the United Nations and have allowed that body to be used in a way which was never intended. We have meddled in the affairs of two sovereign nations like some international busybody and we have pandered to the questionable whims of black African states. We have, I am sure, alienated many valuable friends.

No one is apt to argue that any of us agree fully with the Government of Rhodesia on all issues and all of their methods. By any relative standard, however, Rhodesia is the jewel of Africa. If there were common, widespread knowledge of Rhodesia, her people, her goals and her progress, I think there would be widespread agreement that U.S. policy toward this nation has approached the absurd, and that it should be changed through removal of economic sanctions and through recognition of the sovereignty of this state.

I have followed the Rhodesia issue since they declared independence, UDI it is called, in 1965. I have visited Rhodesia, I have studied events of both before and after UDI. I have met and talked with Prime Minister Ian Smith and other Government leaders. And it is an understatement to say that I have opinions which vary drastically from those of the State Department promulgators of our Rhodesia policy.

In 1966, only 3 months after UDI, I journeyed to this country in southern Africa along with Columnist Ralph de-Toledano and Dr. Max Yergan. From a report which the group subsequently prepared and from my own impressions I addressed the House on March 8, 1966. As I said then: I liked what I saw and I believe the average American has not gotten a true picture of the Rhodesian. I added that the same was probably true of Members of Congress. I found the Smith regime secure and the nation a model for peace, stability, and racial harmony. Moreover, I found increasing rather than decreasing understanding between the races.

This is the key to whatever success Rhodesia may achieve, understanding, and education. Rhodesians are attempting—and succeeding—at great expense, to educate the tribal natives, to train them and bring them into the civilized world.

The policies of the United States and of the other nations that follow the British instigated sanctions in the United Nations are working to destroy a nation which holds great promise for all its people. As I said after visiting this country, this is an exciting country and its most exciting aspect lies in the promise that its policies hold for the future of white man and black man alike—an evolving multiracial society in which both races increasingly will share in the political, economic, and social development of a pioneer land. I have visited something like 40 nations around this world. I have observed and compared and it is my opinion that Rhodesia is one of the finest countries I have ever visited.

U.S. policy today is an attempt to foist upon this Nation an immediate plan for one man, one vote. But what will this mean? What will the end product be? If we force the African out of his tribe and culture and into some sort of parliamentary system he may not want, does not understand and even less desires to perpetuate, what have we really done? Have we helped him? Have we fed the apparently gluttonous national appetite for our own brand of political philosophy at the expense of those we say we are helping?

The Rhodesians are, at their best, a sophisticated people. They have built magnificent cities, luxurious gardens and parks, and a growing and stable and free economy and they are not about to watch idly as it is shattered by foreign hands. They are more than willing to work for and pay for the education and training that will further open their society to the black Africans. Their is no Iron Curtain in Rhodesia. Blacks do not leave Rhodesia, they come there.

We have joined in a complete boycott of Rhodesia and refuse to buy or sell according to the United Nations "rules" of economic sanctions. However, the question of Rhodesia has not, under any stretch of the imagination been fairly presented to the American people. The press has shown a stilted and false view which the Government officials in Washington for 4 years have supported and fostered.

Prof. W. H. Hutt has noted:

> The extent to which, through press, radio, television and pulpit, the American public has been misinformed on this issue is fantastic. I can illustrate by . . . hundreds of examples. . . . The number of people outside Rhodesia who know the facts about the country is almost infinitesimal, and the occasional attempts of these few to correct misrepresentation have had little success. For instance, during the year 1966. I can recall seeing only two really unslanted references in New York newspapers to the policy of the Smith government . . .

Professor Hutt, incidentally, has been dean of the faculty of commerce at the University of Cape Town, and also has served as visiting professor of economics at Wabash College. He is an authority on the origins and impacts of racial legislation in South Africa.

Perhaps this slanted presentation by the press has accounted for American acceptance of the U.N. sanctions, up to a point. But what caused us to fall for this line? Certainly there is not unanimity. As Dean Acheson put it:

> The United States is engaged in an international conspiracy, instigated by Britain, and blessed by the United Nations, to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one. This is barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle.

Former Secretary of State Acheson has also noted:

> How fortunate were the American colonies to have no United Nations to confront in 1776!

The mechanics of United Nations intervention are the mechanics of rationalization. U.N. action swings only on the frail hinge of a "threat to international peace." After 4 years of peace, security, and prosperity, even this tenuous link is unable to support the actions of economic warfare. Rhodesia remains a tranquil nation, interrupted only by the forays into its territory by Communist trained and equipped guerrillas.

At the same time, the colorblinded U.N. sees no threat from Communist tyranny or blood baths. When people are killed trying to flee East Germany to go to West Germany, for example, the U.N. sees no threat to peace.

Even with the added pressure of economic hardships, there is still no threat. There never was. Other nations are not threatened; there is no uprising, and, in fact, when terrorists invade Rhodesia, the Africans have been strong in their support for the Government and avowedly antiterrorist.

We hear most often that we are pressing for a policy of one man, one vote. All Africans are, overnight, to be made voting members of the Rhodesian society. Let us look at the people to whom we are asking the sophisticated Rhodesians to give their Government and their Nation.

As short a time ago as 30 years a large percentage of Africans in Rhodesia were clothed in little more than loin cloths; witchcraft and superstitions prevailed to a great extent and still do; some 2 million and more still live in tribal territories; thousands of others speak only a tribal dialect and have no written language at all. The progress that has been made—and it has been considerable—is due to Government-promoted programs of education and training. Even today, the Government is continuing to attempt to change such barbaric customs as the killing of one of twins.

Yet, we are told that a crash program must be followed to give immediate rule to all Rhodesians. Some say, give the vote to all now; teach them to use it later.

To those who counsel crash programs to bring the tribal Africans to a level where they are politically, educationally, vocationally, and culturally efficient and proficient enough to assume full control of a sophisticated nation, I suggest that they study the difficulties encountered by the richest and most advanced nation in promoting "crash" programs to hacksaw through the bars of poverty, and illiteracy, and ignorance.

The Government of Rhodesia is attempting to pull the tribal Africans out of a neolithic age into the modern world. It will take many years unless they are prepared to destroy their society in the process. They are not. The position of the Rhodesian Government was well stated several years ago by the Minister of Information. He said:

> In Rhodesia there are two distinct societies. One is western, parliamentary and

democratic. The second is an African tribal society. This tribal society is authoritarian and hierarchical. . . . the Africans must be the arbiters of their own destiny. It would be morally and pragmatically wrong for Western society to impose its own mores. On the other hand, we will put no obstacle in the way of those who wish to leave the tribal society and join the Western system.

We in the West cannot transplant democracy, nor can we transplant Western culture. We can encourage their acceptance and we should, but culture, and a Western system of government cannot be given to the African any more than they can be forced upon him. They can, however, be taken away from the Rhodesians who have them now. Our present policies are working only to take away.

Those persons in this Nation who favor the U.N. attempts to bring Rhodesia to her knees should also realize that this position carries with it the rejection of the present system in that country which extends the right of suffrage independent of race or color and based on educational and property qualifications.

OUR DOUBLE STANDARD

Especially interesting to the observer of our foreign policy is our unconscionable double standard. We are shocked, as the line goes, by Rhodesia, but we casually dismiss the captive nations of Europe; we throw barriers at the Rhodesians, yet we continue to condone British shiploads of materials flowing into North Vietnam; we express a concern for the freedoms of Rhodesian Africans, yet, where is a similar statement on the freedoms of Czechoslovakian citizens, much less sanctions against the Warsaw Pact nations; we refuse to trade with Rhodesia, yet continue to trade with the Communist bloc nations which supply the very forces to Hanoi which kill Americans; we refuse to buy Rhodesian chromite, and then buy the same product from the Soviet Union at 150 percent of the Rhodesian rate; and at the same time we place an unreasonable burden on the American investors in these Rhodesian mines.

Chromite is an important facet of this issue. The mines in Rhodesia account for most of the estimated total of $56 million of U.S. investments in that country. Major investors are Union Carbide Corp. and the Foote Mineral Co. Both have asked the Treasury Department, which implements the sanctions, for relief from the orders. Relief has not been granted.

Meanwhile, we continue to import chromite from the Soviet Union and from 1965 to 1969 the percentage of ore imported from the Soviets has increased from 27 percent to 45 percent. We are pursuing a ridiculous double standard and it has led us into a box. We are jeopardizing several large American industries, their products, and their work forces. And the problem is as great as the use of stainless steel across the Nation because chromite is essential to the production of stainless steel. Clayton Stephenson, president of Union Carbide's mining and metals division recently put the problem into perspective with these words:

There is hardly a major industry in the United States that does not utilize or benefit in some way from stainless steel . . . when we add, to stainless steel the alloy steels, high temperature alloys, castings, tool steels and special applications, we can see that chrome ore is fundamental to a broad area of our national economy and defense.

Then too, we must not overlook the critical hardships imposed on industries which use petalite, a lithium ore. Rhodesia is the only nation which can supply this high quality ore. Substitutes have not been devised for it and there is no national stockpile from which industry can draw. Rhodesia has an unlimited supply. Without it there is a distinct possibility that American workers will be thrown out of work, plants will be forced to close, and several important industries will be unable to supply products to consumers.

These are two of the most glaring absurdities resulting from our diplomatic double standard, a double standard which had been a hallmark of the Johnson years. I hope it will not continue during the Nixon administration. The people voted for a change. Policy regarding Rhodesia is one of those important areas where change is needed but has not been forthcoming.

After 4 years I think we should separate fact from fantasy. Prime Minister Wilson once said that sanctions would bring the Rhodesians around in a matter of weeks. It has been 4 years and the nation is strong. It has diversified; new industries have sprung up to fill gaps. Rhodesian Africans were expected to rise up against the Government. Instead, they are helping to defeat the sanctions and to defeat the terrorist infiltration into Rhodesia from neighboring nations. There is support to the Smith government without regard for race or color. There is Rhodesia, as in our country, a vocal black minority which in one fell swoop wants to claim what others have built. Their demands should be rejected there just as they should be rejected in our country.

The Government was expected to topple. It has not and it appears to be strong and supported by a wide base. Prof. Walter Darnell Jacobs recently noted:

The government in Salisbury maintains that it has earned the right to elaborate a constitution for the country. It has, it is argued, made good its revolution against Great Britain; it has established its sovereignty over the national territory; it has maintained domestic peace; it has been able to protect the state from outside enemies and it has won the allegiance of its citizens. These claims may be open to some dispute but few can deny that the government in Salisbury does meet the minimum standards of international law for definition as a state. Other members of the world community may disapprove of the Rhodesian type of government but they must admit the factual existence of an operating state system there. This operating state system is factually independent of the United Kingdom. It meets the norm necessary to be called a state.

Of the many points I might make, let me advance just one other. There is a serious threat that Rhodesia could become a battleground. Guerrilla warfare could break out in Rhodesia. But every indication is that this would not be an internal struggle, but a conflict promoted by and fought by terrorists trained by representatives of the Soviet Union and Red China. Is this what we want? Do we want a war in Africa? Tragically, our present policies are supporting those who do, and at the same time our economic clamps are making it even more difficult for the tribal African to advance into the modern world.

I propose that we end the economic sanctions against Rhodesia and admit the all-too-evident fact that this country that we have been trying to keep out of sight is entitled to full recognition.

Mr. Speaker, several dozen Members have advanced legislation directed generally at the Rhodesian issue. I am one of them. January 3, 1969, I introduced House Joint Resolution 112. It asks that the President notify the United Nations that the United States is rescinding sanctions against Rhodesia, and to void all executive orders relating to prohibitions against imports and exports.

More recently, on October 9, I joined with the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) in cosponsoring a concurrent resolution of similar content.

The Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Affairs Committee recently began hearings to investigate the sanctions and I would hope the able chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) would fully consider the legislation, in its various forms, which has been proposed and that a full discussion of it can soon take place on the House floor.

At this point I would like to insert the full text of House Joint Resolution 112:

H.J. RES. 112

Whereas the United Nations has acted illegally and in contravention of chapter 1 of its own charter, which prohibits interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations, in ordering economic sanctions against Rhodesia; and

Whereas the United States is involved in a bloody and interminable war in Vietnam against an enemy that is being supplied by Great Britain, which has refused our requests that it cease doing business with the enemy that is killing American boys every day; and

Whereas the United States has never sought economic sanctions from the United Nations against its enemy in Vietnam, and Rhodesia has refrained from engaging in trade with North Vietnam; and

Whereas United States trade with Rhodesia is in the best interests of this Nation, particularly in view of the fact that such trade in the past has been two to one in our favor; and

Whereas the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence is in the same honored tradition as our own such Declaration, and deserves the full support of every American who is proud of our great national heritage; and

Whereas the continuation of the United Nations illegal sanctions can lead only to a bloody struggle in southern Africa from which our enemies alone can benefit; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is vested with sole authority to regulate foreign commerce under article I, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution, while the only authority delegated by Congress to the executive branch to restrict trade concerns the control of trading with the enemy; and

Whereas the executive branch of the United States Government has undertaken to honor the illegal United Nations sanctions without seeking the advice and consent of the Congress; and

Whereas the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, in addition to being illegal under the Charter of the United Nations

and in contravention of the United States Constitution, since they have not been approved by the United States Congress, are clearly against the best interests of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to notify the United Nations and all other interested parties that the United States will not honor the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

SEC. 2. The provisions of Executive Order Numbered 11322, of January 5, 1967, relating to prohibitions against imports of certain commodities from Rhodesia, are hereby rescinded. All orders, regulations, and other directives and all decisions promulgated or made under such Executive Order Numbered 11322 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 3. All Executive orders, Presidential proclamations or other orders, regulations, or directives promulgated or made under the authority of the Export Control Act of 1949, which relate to the export of commodities to Rhodesia, are hereby rescinded.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for taking this time and I should like to join him in acknowledging the national day of Rhodesia. Four years ago, on November 11, the Government of Rhodesia, acting in the name of the people of Rhodesia, chose to follow our example of nearly 200 years ago and assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which it is entitled. Instead of welcoming this sturdy young Western-oriented country into the community of nations, President Johnson foolishly alined this Government with the British Government's futile claim to sovereignty over the territory of Rhodesia and joined this nation in applying economic sanctions against Rhodesia on the ludicrous pretense that she was a threat to international peace and security.

Four years later it is interesting, and it should be instructive, to survey the outcome of our folly.

Rhodesia has maintained its independence and by all accounts is growing in strength.

The futility of Britain's claim to sovereignty over Rhodesia has been more than amply demonstrated by her total incapacity to exercise it. The limit of her capability in this direction appears to be punitive action against individual Rhodesian citizens who choose to travel to Britain.

So far as threats to the peace are concerned, none has come from Rhodesia—which incidentally has one of the smallest armies in the world. Rhodesia on the other hand has successfully resisted guerrilla attacks over her northern border, carried out by marauders who have been trained and equipped in Moscow and Peking and given sanctuary and sustenance by member states of the Organization of African Unity—an ironic example of international morality standing on its head.

I am primarily concerned with the American interest in this situation. Not only has the American interest been badly served by this Government's imprudent actions, American industry has been damaged and American security has been gravely prejudiced. We are indebted to the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee for providing the opportunity for these facts to be aired in congressional hearings.

The subcommittee has been told by expert government and industrial witnesses that Rhodesia is the major free world source of chrome ore and the only commercial source of petalite—a lithium ore—both of which are vitally important raw materials for U.S. industry, including the defense industry; that U.S. sanctions against Rhodesia have brought about a total prohibition on the importation of these commodities into this country from Rhodesia; that we are now almost totally dependent on Russia for high grade metallurgical chrome; that the Russians are gouging us on price and quality; that the strategic stockpile of chrome is declining and that the Office of Emergency Preparedness sees no way in which the chromium needs of the United States can be met without importations from Rhodesia.

Wider awareness of this incredible situation may persuade the executive branch to revise this country's policy towards Rhodesia with an application of common sense to take account of our economic and strategic interests, just as other countries are taking care of theirs. Those of us who follow the situation know perfectly well that Rhodesia is doing business with many other countries besides South Africa and Portugal. It does not surprise me to find that Britain, because of her duplicity, is one of them, though I would not expect her to admit it. I understand that a sizable proportion of Rhodesia's imports in the last 2 years were goods of British origin.

Another factor of interest relates to the prohibition of air flights into or out of Rhodesia. The United Nations Security Council resolution provides that Britain, the United States and others are supposed to not only prevent their airline companies from operating in Rhodesia but also prevent them from linking up with flights originating in Rhodesia. According to my information, within the last few weeks the British Overseas Airways Corp., doubtless, with the connivance and possibly with the encouragement of the British Government, has introduced an additional service between London and Blantyre—in Malawi—to connect up with a flight from Salisbury to Blantyre and thereby virtually provide a direct service from Salisbury to London. I will insert with these remarks an advertisement from a Rhodesian newspaper, inserted by Air India, giving a schedule of connections to the Far East. No country is more sanctimonious than India in its condemnation of Rhodesia, but its airline company is obviously not averse to picking up Rhodesian business.

It makes no sense, in fact it is utterly insane for the United States to deprive itself of a free world supply of a strategic mineral, and to pay a ridiculously inflated price for an inferior substitute from Russia, in order to comply with U.N. sanctions requirements while other countries are flouting those requirements for a commercial advantage. It would be hard to justify such a policy if we were dealing with a real enemy. It is plain lunacy when we are dealing with a country that has been as friendly to us as Rhodesia. I urge President Nixon to take stock of this absurd situation that he has inherited, and promptly revoke the Executive order issued by Lyndon Johnson that put the United States into this shabby business of boycotting Rhodesia and in so doing increasing the deficit in our balance of trade to the profit of Communist Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point the advertisement to which I referred in my previous remarks together with two articles dealing with Rhodesia, one by the columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, and the other by Thurman Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council.

AIR INDIA—EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 11, 1969

NEW FAST SERVICE TO FAR EAST

Depart Johannesburg, S.A. 180, 08.40 Tuesday—Arrive Durban, S.A. 180, 09.35 Tuesday.

Depart Durban, S.A. 180, 10.20 Tuesday—Arrive Tananarive, S.A. 180, 14.25 Tuesday.

Depart Tananarive, S.A. 180, 15.10 Tuesday—Arrive Mauritius, S.A. 180, 17.45 Tuesday.

Depart Mauritius, A.I. 702, 20.30 Tuesday—Arrive Bombay, A.I. 702, 03.45 Wednesday.

Depart Bombay, A.I. 102A, 06.15 Wednesday—Arrive Calcutta, A.I. 102A, 08.30 Wednesday.

Depart Calcutta, A.I. 102A, 09.10 Wednesday—Arrive Bangkok, A.I. 102A, 12.55 Wednesday.

Depart Bangkok, A.I. 102A, 13.35 Wednesday—Arrive Hong Kong, A.I. 102A, 17.05 Wednesday.

Depart Hong Kong, A.I. 102A, 17.45 Wednesday—Arrive Tokyo, A.I. 102A, 22.10 Wednesday.

*Consult your friendly agent.*

GET GOING JET BOEING TO THE FAR EAST FOR EXPO 70 THROUGH MAURITIUS.

---

RHODESIAN SANCTIONS REVEAL DOUBLE STANDARD

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is Veterans Day in the United States, but it's Independence Day in Rhodesia, marking the fourth anniversary of Rhodesia's historic separation from the Crown.

The act of Nov. 11, 1965, was historic for two reasons: It marked the first time a British outpost had declared its unilateral indepedence since another small country, better known to us all, proclaimed the same intention on July 4, 1776. Second, Rhodesia's action produced within the United Nations the worst blunder in the U.N.'s brief history—a blunder that may yet prove fatal.

The U.N. was in trouble long before the Rhodesian incident came along. It was not blatant hypocrisy, perhaps, but it surely was transplanted deception to seat the exiled delegation from Formosa in the Charter seat assigned to "China." The seat should have been declared vacant, and the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek given chairs in the visitors' lounge.

The "China" seat has been so much make-believe. The punitive sanctions imposed upon Rhodesia have proved a far greater folly. As

Dean Acheson has remarked, the sanctions constitute a flagrant violation of the U.N.'s own charter. More than this, the sanctions stand as a continuing monument to the emptiness, the impotence, and the massive hypocrisy of the United Nations as an instrument of international order.

Manifestly, the sanctions have failed in their purpose, which was to bring Rhodesia to its knees. The sanctions have had precisely the opposite effect: Rhodesia survives; it flourishes; its economy is strong and growing stronger. And instead of whipping Rhodesia back to the arms of Mother England, these toothless mandates have succeeded merely in obliterating any prospect of reunion.

It is the purblind hypocrisy—the imposition on Rhodesia of a naked double standard—that reduces the U.N. to imbecility and contempt. Why were these drastic sanctions imposed? It was because the established government of Rhodesia, in the view of the General Assembly, had failed to provide for majority rule and for participatory democracy by all the Rhodesian people.

The notion that Rhodesia's independence constituted a threat to the peace was pure fiction. Rhodesia had failed to provide a system based upon one man, one vote; and Rhodesia, therefore, must be ostracized and her economy destroyed.

It is useful to glance at the news from Africa in recent weeks.

President Shermake of Somalia was assassinated on Oct. 15. A military junta seized power the following day. All civil liberties, including a right to vote, have been suspended. What will the U.N. say of democracy in Somalia? Not a word; not a single word.

On Oct. 19, the government of Burundi uncovered a "plot" and jailed 30 putative leaders of the opposition. Here, too, participatory democracy is a fiction. Will the U.N. reproach Burundi? Men will walk on Mars before that day arrives.

On Oct. 26, the government of Tanzania jailed six prominent politicians under the same kind of "preventive detention" that is so denounced in South Africa and Rhodesia. Tanzania has not even a pretense of majority rule. But the U.N. will remain as silent as the desert sands.

On Oct. 27, Jomo Kenyatta jailed his only political opponent, along with all opposition members of his parliament, and outlawed the Kenya Peoples Union. Democracy is a dead letter in Kenya. But you will not learn this from the United Nations.

The same picture obtains in Uganda. It obtains in Zambia. It obtains in Ethiopia. One-party rule is the almost universal practice of Africa. Participatory democracy, under the rubric of one man, one vote, is unknown. The only difference, when it comes to imposing sanctions and discovering threats to the peace, is that the ruling minority in Rhodesia is white; and the ruling minorities elsewhere are black. And so long as the United Nations adheres to this indefensible and hypocritical position, the U.N. is doomed.

---

RHODESIA AND REALISM

(By Thurman Sensing)

One of the reasons that Richard M. Nixon won the Presidency is that the American people wanted a more realistic foreign policy. During the Kennedy and Johnson years, U.S. policies overseas were based on emotion, not on careful calculation of American national interests and protection of orderly, capitalist societies.

In some respects, the Nixon administration has made progress toward meeting the demands of the people for a realistic foreign policy. Some of the ambassadors selected are thoroughgoing realists who are well equipped to implement the President's policies. The Nixon administration generally has downplayed emotional considerations. Nevertheless, there are some areas where no significant progress has been made and where liberal pressures on the administration apparently still have a powerful impact.

A case in point is the Nixon administration's handling of the Rhodesian situation. Rhodesia is not the biggest country in the world, but the manner in which relations with Rhodesia is handled is indicative of basic strengths and weaknesses in the administration's conduct of foreign affairs.

Many supporters of Mr. Nixon hoped and expected that on entering the White House he would abandon outright the vindictive policy the Johnson administration adopted with respect to Rhodesia. Specifically, they assumed that he would revoke the Executive Orders under which President Johnson prohibted U.S. trade with Rhodesia, a country that has offered to send a contingent of troops to fight the communists in Vietnam.

Many of Mr. Nixon's supporters have been cruelly disappointed on this score. The LBJ Executive Orders have not been revoked. It's true that the administration has retained in Salisbury, capital of Rhodesia, the U.S. consul, over the objection of militant liberals who have made an emotional cause of humiliating and destroying Rhodesia.

Yet there is no assurance whatever that the U.S. Consul will be permanently retained in Rhodesia, let alone that the United States will recognize Rhodesia as an independent, sovereign nation.

On the contrary, there was dismaying evidence in recent weeks that the Nixon administration is bowing to the fanatical liberals who want to cripple Rhodesia because it is a symbol of stable, civilized government on the African continent.

Assistant Secretary of State David D. Newsom, testifying before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, said the United States "is giving full support" to U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia. He added that "we have continued to recognize British sovereignty in Rhodesia and regard the Smith regime as illegal."

This is an extremely unfortunate and disturbing statement. It is completely counterproductive to constructive foreign policy moves made by the administration. There's no basis in realism for joining in the crusade of the Afro-Asian U.N. bloc against Rhodesia. France, Germany, Japan and other solid, progressive states are busily trading with Rhodesia. Giant Japanese ore carriers regularly transport Rhodesian chrome, in defiance of U.N. edicts and the British naval blockade in the Mozambique Channel of Africa's east coast. Rhodesia has been self-governing and self-supporting since 1923. It has been independent since 1965, and there is no sign that the U.N. trade ban will crack Rhodesian spirits—no more than the British assault on the 13 American colonies crushed the colonists' determination to be independent of the British Crown.

Assistant Secretary Newson's remarks to the congressional subcommittee were absurd to anyone who knows conditions in Africa. For example, he said that the administration's policy was designed to head off "increased racial tensions and possibly widespread violence."

For years, liberals have been predicting an explosion in South Africa, but it hasn't taken place. The explosions have come in the unstable, disorderly regimes elsewhere in Africa. Within recent days the president of Somalia, a leftist state on the Horn of Africa, was assassinated. Libya, in North Africa, recently joined the socialist Arab bloc and is forcing the U.S. to remove its air base facilities. Nigeria, in West Africa, is the scene of incredibly bloody tribal war, with the Biafrans threatened with extinction.

Rhodesia, on the other hand, is a land of tranquility and progress. Both white and black Rhodesians enjoy the blessings of peace and intelligent, free enterprise government.

The United States stands to gain from a world community of stable nations. Rhodesia is one of them. The Nixon administration, aware of the threats to civilized government and stability overseas and at home, should recognize Rhodesia. It should permit renewal of a normal trade with the Rhodesians. For one thing, such a renewal would free the U.S. of dependence on Russian chrome ore. The handling of the Rhodesian situation is, therefore, an important test of the Nixon administration's commitment to realism.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION) may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years have now passed since the people of Rhodesia declared their independence from the British. Yet, the United States continues in its refusal to recognize the Government of Mr. Ian Smith or engage in trade with it, even though our policy is clearly working to the disadvantage of our own national interest.

Rhodesia has prospered during the sanctions and has maintained continuous and stable control over its legal territory and population. In fact, according to current estimates, the Rhodesian gross national product will show an increase of 13 percent for this fiscal year. And only 2½ percent of that represents the inflation factor.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that this country will rush to any part of the world to accord de jure recognition to every shoestring, tin-horn dictator who can muster enough firepower to achieve a military coup. And yet, after 4 years of stable, civilized and prosperous control we still refuse to recognize the truly legitimate government in Rhodesia. Rhodesia's only sin appears to be that it is doing the very same thing to the British that we did nearly 200 years ago. Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we have played into the hands of those who use false racial politics as an instrument of national policy. Whatever the reason, the time has now come to abandon this ridiculous policy and get on with the business of reopening the channels of commerce and diplomatic relations with Rhodesia.

But the story of the United States' position in relation to Rhodesia does not end with the essentially legal and semantic argument over recognition. An issue far more critical to the United States is found in our stubborn refusal to recognize that the sanctions against Rhodesia will never bring down Mr. Smith's government. We continue, almost alone and to our great disadvantage in applying sanctions. The case has clearly been made, and particularly within the last month, that the loss of Rhodesia as a supplier of high-grade chromite ore has made us dependent on the Soviet Union

for this militarily and industrially strategic material. The Soviet Union has clearly exploited our blind adherence to these useless sanctions by using its position as the world's only other large supplier of high-grade chromite to charge prices which are at minimum 50 percent higher than those at which Rhodesian chromite can be purchased. Additionally, the Soviet Union now requires dependent American purchasers to take 1 ton of worthless low-grade chromite ore for every ton of high-grade ore which it supplies.

Recent testimony given before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by industry and Government officials has clearly revealed that if we do not immediately lift our sanctions and allow American firms to begin taking delivery on the products of their chromite mines in Rhodesia we will be faced with a complete exhaustion of our already dangerously small stockpile of high-grade chromite thus making us solely dependent on the Soviet Union for this vital material. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Emergency Preparedness has testified that we have no choice but to start buying Rhodesian chromite if we are to continue to meet our military and industrial needs.

The time has come Mr. Speaker for a return to a rational basis in our behavior toward the Government in Rhodesia. In the name of sound economic and military policy I today call upon the administration to take all necessary measures to reopen the channels of diplomacy and commerce with the legal Government in Rhodesia.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) for taking this special order today to bring to the attention of the world the situation in which we find ourselves today with regard to Southern Rhodesia.

Personally, I have been very concerned about our Government's position toward the Smith government in Rhodesia. My concern was carried to the President in a letter asking that he issue a new Executive order revoking President Johnson's previous Executive order declaring that it is not essential to our national defense to remain on the U.N.'s list of nations with sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

In addition, I have introduced a joint resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 388—calling for the end of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

Basically, our policy appears to me to be one of inconsistency in this regard. We refuse to purchase products from Rhodesia, even though they could be purchased cheaper, and we buy the same products from Russia at the higher price. All of this, of course, because of the sanctions Great Britain has invoked against Rhodesia and has received U.N. endorsement.

I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why we should buy from a country that has been supplying 80 percent of the arms and ammunition to our enemy in North Vietnam, arms and ammunition used to kill and maim our young men, while refusing to purchase from a country that has never, as far as I know, caused one problem, much less a death, to a single American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge cosponsors for my resolution and further I urge early committee consideration.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Rhodesia's National Day I am proud to join many of my colleagues in offering tribute to a friend. Concurrently, I rise to offer the suggestion that this Nation may learn to recognize just who its friends really are. Along with other Members of the House, I have sponsored a resolution calling for an end to American support of United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

Such sanctions and our support of them make little sense—on either moral or economic grounds. Rhodesia has long been on of America's firmest friends in Africa. In addition to possessing a stable, anti-Communist government, Rhodesia has offered her assistance to our country in our commitment to South Vietnam.

In our support of United Nations sanctions, we are aiding a deplorable exercise of the double standard. At a time when the United Nations has marshaled its resources and its rhetoric against "colonialism," this proud young nation has sought to escape the colonial rule of Britain. Our own historical beginnings demand that this contradiction be repudiated. This nation has a tradition of respecting the freedom and integrity of other nations, especially those new states seeking to find independence and their own place in the family of nations. We once asked this respect for our own emerging young Nation. Our Rhodesian policy represents a cancer on this tradition.

If moral argumentation cannot capture the heart of our leadership, let us delve in the pure economics of the question. Rhodesia represented our major source of chrome ore prior to 1967, the date when this country concurred in the imposition of sanctions. U.S. investment in this vital ore was precluded at that time and American firms with enterprises in Rhodesia were forced to surrender their operations to Rhodesian officials. To gain necessary chrome, we have been forced to turn to the Soviet Union as a supplier, now obtaining 60 percent of our needs from this Communist power. The price of that ore has also risen by 50 percent, with a further hike in price anticipated when our contract with the Soviets is renegotiated next year.

In dancing to the U.N. sanction melody, we have also forfeited our only commercial source of high grade petalite, used in ceramic and optical glass manufacturing. We have no national stockpile of this ore and attempts to develop a substitute have not been successful.

Commerce Department officials have, in recent days, expressed concern over American industrial problems created by our adherence to these United Nations sanctions. Thinking Americans are concerned with a policy which gives an economic smack of the hand to a good friend, forcing trade with a Communist state allied with the killers of American youth in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, its time that some common sense was called into play.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding to me. I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time on the fourth anniversary of the surprising, and I might say delightful, growth and resurgence of the Republic of Rhodesia. It may have had a struggle separating the umbilical cord from John Bull but it has not shown it insofar as its present resurgence is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I liken their struggle to our own revolution. In 1776 we brought about the great documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I particularly commend the gentleman on pointing out the strength of Rhodesia 4 years later and in doing it by inviting attention to the Members of the House and to the United States and the world at large to the double standards that we have applied. I can think of no better way to put it. Actually, it is worse than just a double standard applicable to any one sovereign nation or even a group of nations trying to control another sovereign nation.

We are building bridges, so to speak, in the West in spite of the Communists' intent in the Near East and toward Czechoslovakia. Of course, we are fighting a Red aggressor in the Far East. If this is not a double standard, I never heard of it. And, it, of course, has cost us 40,000 lives and over 200,000 wounded. But insofar as my observations of Rhodesia are concerned, my concern could be summed up in two areas and boiled down to two principal tenets and two problems well illustrated by the gentleman's statement of double standards.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) just referred to the Executive order placing us in the United Nations corner, and commitments based on the laws or statutes of our Nation in 1947. Actually, this prescribes almost exactly what the Chief Executive must do in reaction to certain decisions of the General Assembly and the United Nations in particular. This has been devastating to us, and I am sure it has to the growing young nation of the Republic of Rhodesia.

I believe we should give serious consideration not only to the repeal of the Executive order, but to repeal of the existing legislation that requires that if the United Nations or some other body says "frog" that we jump first.

Second, I am seriously concerned, as the gentleman from Ohio has so well said, about the embargo placed on Rhodesia, the emerging and growing young nation. It is not only a paradox that we would fail to buy chromium ore—in which we are short and in which there are just two world supplies—from Rhodesia in spite of the embargo and so-called blockade, and turn about and

buy it from the Russians or the Communist bloc. But even more paradoxical, those who requested the blockade in the first place have their own chromium ore runners, and I am advised that one ship a week runs the blockade and goes back to take chromium ore to Mother England, who is far too parsimonious to purchase chromium ore from the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time, and for stating so aptly, as he has throughout his content, the saga of this emerging nation which will indeed become a world power because of simple allegiance, stick-to-itness, will to do, and know-how properly applied. I wish we still had more of the same as we did during the time of our revolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I had the opportunity several years ago to visit Rhodesia. I have had the opportunity over the years to visit between 40 or 50 countries throughout the world, and I think you can gain a certain insight in spending time in a country. I would say as far as Rhodesia is concerned that it is one of the most peaceful, secure and progressive countries I have ever visited. For us to participate in this country in an effort to smear Rhodesia, to make it look like it is not a proper member of the world community of nations, in my opinion is not only a mistake; it is absolutely foolhardy.

For some reason or other we want to apply a different standard to Rhodesia than we want to apply to some of the other 125 to 130 nations in the world. I would say to our President that the people last year voted for a change, and this is one of the areas where I think we can effectuate a change which is long overdue and would be very proper, and I now call upon the State Department to review its relations with Rhodesia. I ask that our administration bring about changes in many areas, particularly in the area of our foreign policy dealings with the sovereign State of Rhodesia.

It is absolutely foolish to assume that Rhodesia is not a state, does not function as a state, and I would point out that in the body of my remarks I make reference to statements by the elder statesman Dean Atcheson and to the penetrating analysis that our former Secretary of State has made regarding Rhodesia, and regarding what he feels is a foolish policy of our country vis-a-vis Rhodesia, and I believe this certainly makes good sense.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) for the efforts he has taken to bring this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives. I am pleased to join with him today in a thorough discussion of Rhodesia and the economic sanctions placed against Rhodesia by the United Nations. I subscribe to the sentiments voiced by the gentleman and I, too, have voiced those sentiments on the floor of this House and shall continue to do so.

I submit that our present policy toward Rhodesia shows that we are legally wrong, and morally wrong in enforcing the boycott and sanctions imposed upon that nation. We are embarked on a foolish course. If we persist and are consistent in this policy, it will inevitably lead us to consequences in regard to foreign policy more dire than the situation in which we presently find ourselves in Southeast Asia.

On October 23, 1969, I cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 430, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States delegation to the United Nations, bring about the revocation of the United Nations economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. Speaker, the theory that supports the United Nations' boycott is that the U.N. is dedicated to "world peace through world law." If this lofty phrase means anything, it must mean that the U.N. stands for obedience to the law, first of all. But in order to adopt these resolutions against Rhodesia, the United Nations Security Council had to flout their own basic law. Former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, among other distinguished authorities, has termed the sanctions "patently illegal." I have often wondered aloud if we uphold these sanctions against peaceful Rhodesia, why do we not demand from the United Nations proper sanctions against the aggressor nations of North Vietnam, North Korea, Communist China, and others?

Is there a greater offender to the United Nations principles of peace and justice and self-determination than the Soviet Union which, by the way, has stymied the U.N. Council scores of times by exercising its veto? The Russian people are servants, not masters, of their government.

Clearly, the United Nations has in this case applied the double standard. It can afford to be sanctimonious in putting the pressure upon tiny countries, but has clearly shown that it lacks courage to stand up to a big bully right in its own membership.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the United Nations lacks the strength to punish an errant big power, inside or outside the organization. But need it be hypocritical as well as weak?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there are times when the foreign policy of our Government reaches the height of plain stupidity. And this is particularly true regarding our policy toward Rhodesia.

On July 4, 1776 the people of this area of the world determined for themselves that they were tired of being a colonial satellite of Great Britain. So, they simply declared themselves independent of Britain, established a unity of States, prepared a constitution and became an independent nation.

Four years ago, on November 11, 1965, Rhodesia followed a similar course. The Rhodesian people, for reasons satisfactory to them, determined that they wanted to be independent of British colonialism. They, like our progenitors, declared their independence and established their own government. The British Government shrieked "foul" and declared to bring Rhodesia to her knees via economic sanctions.

The United Nations, which is anything but "unified," projected itself into the British-Rhodesian issue and likewise voted economic sanctions against the youthful, independent nation of Rhodesia. It even went so far as to declare that this little country was a threat to world peace—a rather asinine and silly conclusion.

So, sanctions there were, with our own Nation joining in. We joined in the movement with our eyes closed to our own Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776.

Take a look at Rhodesia today. She is much stronger economically than ever before. Her industrial growth is steadily climbing. Her monetary system is sound. There is no inflation. There is progress, growth and stability. There is peaceful living within its borders.

No, Rhodesia does not govern or do everything as we do. But what nation does? Yet, because those who control the foreign policy of our Government dislike the government and policy of Rhodesia, we refuse to recognize and do business with her.

We bitterly differ with the Communist nations of the world. Yet, many of them, and more particularly the Soviet Union, maintain Embassy establishments right here in the heart of our Capital City and we do the same in their's. The Soviets are providing North Vietnam with the implements of war to kill American boys. But still our Government leaders exchange smiles and clink cocktail glasses with the Soviet foreign service personnel over in the Soviet Embassy. How, oh how, Mr. Speaker, can we do this and then turn our faces on little Rhodesia which has done us no harm and is actually our friend?

Mr. Speaker, I am among those who introduced the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. delegation to the United States, should take such steps as may be necessary to bring about the revocation of the United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia. I sincerely hope the resolution will soon have the immediate attention and approval of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress. And may I add, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of what action is taken by the United Nations, the time has come for us to recognize and do business with the brave little nation of Rhodesia.

---

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

---

## VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Montana (Mr. OLSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank and commend the gentleman from Montana for taking the lead in what will be a series of 1-hour sessions devoted to the subject of Vietnam.

Twenty-eight Members from both sides of the aisle representing a variety of opinions about American policy in Vietnam have agreed to join in a program I outlined in a letter to the Members on October 29.

In that letter I said:

Whatever our individual views are on the course of American policy in Vietnam I trust we can agree on the desirability of discussion and debate in the classic American tradition. Thus I wish to address the following proposal to all the Members whether or not you support the President's policy on the war.

Because Vietnam is the most important issue confronting the American people I feel strongly that debate among those with varying views on the war should be undertaken on a regular basis. We cannot escape from this issue; nor can we deny its importance in every phase of our activity. For this reason it makes good sense to have a continuing debate on Vietnam in the House.

Then in a letter to the Members on November 14, I reported:

To date 27 of our colleagues have agreed to take special orders on a rotating basis every Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday for an indefinite period. This way we will ensure that at least one hour is devoted to Vietnam on these days.

All Members are urged to participate in these discussions no matter what their view on American policy in Vietnam . . .

The purpose of these discussions is to bring to the Congress the debate that has been waged in the streets and in the media. It is time that the Congress assumed its position of responsibility regarding our policy in Vietnam.

So today we begin these discussions with the able and distinguished gentleman from Montana taking the lead. For the Members' information I shall be in the well tomorrow for 1 hour on the same subject and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) will carry on on Thursday.

I wish to emphasize that the purpose of these discussions will not be realized unless Members with different views participate. Our goal is not to advocate a single position but rather to promote debate and consideration of the views of others.

It seems axiomatic that the House would welcome this opportunity to become an appropriate forum for discussion of the single most important issue facing our Nation. In the past we have failed to live up to our responsibility and have abdicated congressional authority to the executive branch. The time is long past due to reverse this unhappy and dangerous trend and to reassert the rightful prerogatives of the Congress.

Tomorrow I shall devote my time directly to our policy in Vietnam; today I just wanted to describe the purpose of these discussions and thank the gentleman from Montana for his role in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the gentleman for taking the lead in leading these discussions and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, last October 14, I and several of our colleagues planned to conduct an all night session to coincide with the dawn of moratorium day. Unfortunately a majority of the Members present did not want us to do this and so adjournment was voted at 11:17 p.m. As a result of this negative action most of us who had prepared speeches and statements in support of the spirit of the moratorium of the 14th of October were prevented from doing so.

In the aftermath of that moratoriums day and through the events of the mobilization weekend just past a curious but definitely frightful new phase in the Vietnam controversy has been inaugurated. It began with implications, some voiced here in this Chamber, that those who participated in the moratorium of the 14th of October were somehow acting against the best interest of their country. This implication was emphasized and magnified by the administration's "unofficial" spokesman Vice President AGNEW, in his "effete snob" speech and in subsequent rhetorical pronouncements, the climax of which was his vicious attack on the radio and television industries and upon Ambassador Harriman last Thursday. All along administration spokesmen claimed that President Nixon knew nothing—nothing—in advance of the Vice President's attacks on those who even hinted criticism of our Vietnam policy and besides, they would have you believe, the President does not make foreign policy in the street and therefore he is not influenced by those who demonstrate in behalf of peace.

In the words of today's Washington Post editorial "Balderdash" to both points. It is simply not credible that the President of the United States would allow his next in charge to go around the country verbally attacking a substantial number of his fellow citizens without his consent. The proposition is unacceptable. Who among us Members of the Congress would permit someone on his staff to insult a large portion of the electorate without foreknowledge? The answer is obvious. No one would.

As to the contention that President Nixon is oblivious to demonstrations of dissent this is not beliveable either. There is one factor that is common to all but the extreme solutions to the Vietnam war and that is the desire to extricate our troops from the mess in that country. One thing common to us all is that we all want to extricate ourselves from that country. This is the message that I received from the events of moratorium day, October 14, and again the mobilization of last weekend. Personally I was most active in the moratorium of October 14, and the position that I advocated then and I have been advocating for over 2 years is that the President should develop an orderly timetable of troop withdrawals contingent on the ability of the Vietnamese forces to assume the duties of prosecuting the war and, of course, conditioned upon the welfare and safe being of our own troops. In other words, I recommend a systematic de-Americanization of the Vietnam war, and have been doing so for more than 2 years.

This position has a familiar ring, does it not? It seems that it is identical in substance to what the President said on November 3. I had no problem of identifying with Saturday's marchers nor partaking in the moratorium last October. Why is the President so rigid in his opposition to people who are in basic agreement? As former Vice President Humphrey said yesterday, the President is mounting a calculated attack on the forces of dissent. I ask why? Dissent is certainly more in keeping with American tradition. Our Founding Fathers were Europeans or descendants of Europeans who left their homelands because there was no room for dissent.

Of course, last weekend's march belies the charge made by some that dissent is no longer tolerated by the Nation's leaders. This simply is not true. However, there is a disturbing pattern of attempts to discredit and to muffle dissent. There are the Vice President's peculiar speeches. There are the letters and telegrams to the President bearing thousands of signatures of support for remarks which have not yet been made, and there are the polls emanating from the White House showing support for the President at percentages in the high seventies. It almost seems that the President is willing the opposition right out of existence, wishing the opposition right out of existence.

This is unhealthy. This difference of opinion and the right to express such are paramount to the existence of democracy. It is invariably the characteristic of a State under tyrannical rule that the winner of whatever elections are held are victorious by percentages in the high nineties. I do not believe for one moment that such a tragic state will ever exist here. Yet to avoid this we must always keep open the avenues of dissent. The administration must abandon its present course of implication and innuendoes. It is a great disservice to the cause of peace to imply that someone not in full agreement with the administration's position is something less than a loyal American.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the statement I prepared for delivery in this Chamber early on the morning of October 15, but was prevented from doing so:

In the last several years I have registered my misgivings and my personal recommendations on Vietnam policies to high ranking individuals in the Administration and I have joined in introducing legislation in the Congress which called for greater effort on the part of our government to place this issue before the United States.

I have never issued public statements regarding the conduct of the war unless I sincerely believed specific action on the part of our government was in the interest of the peaceful goal we all of us seek.

However, after years of frustrated involve-

ment in Vietnam, I believe there comes a time in foreign affairs, as in domestic, when the "people" must be heard. The mounting tension in American democracy between the "people" and their chosen representatives has reached the point which policies directing this Nation's efforts in South Vietnam fail to command respect in the conscience of the American people. When government policies no longer express the will of the people those laws lose their natural legitimacy and such is the case in Vietnam.

A 1967 Congressional poll indicated that 80.2% of the people in the Western District of Montana wanted to continue the then course of the war or escalate with 63% of these in favor of an all out military effort to win. Only 12.8% were in favor of withdrawal. One year later in 1968 another Congressional polling of the same area showed that those in favor of maintaining the status quo or stepping up our military effort had slipped to 55% and that those in favor of de-escalation had risen to 45%. A private poll of the Northwestern states, including Montana, which was completed in August of this year, indicated that 52% of those asked were in favor of withdrawal of American Troops and turning the fighting to the South Vietnamese. Another 22% recommended immediate withdrawal. Results of the most recent Gallup Poll show that the percent of Americans favoring complete withdrawal of Americans troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1970 to be 57%.

All of these poll results and the mail I received daily in my office have convinced me a significant trend has developed. It is a trend that must be reckoned with and the leaders of this nation should not turn a deaf ear.

President Nixon, in a letter to a Georgetown University student drew a distinction between "public opinion" and "public demonstrations" vowing government policy would not be "made in the streets." White House sources further pointed out that his reply to the student was directed not at the "shouters" but to the "concerned majority" of Americans who have remained silent. The results of the Polls I have cited, which polled not only people in the streets, but also the "silent Americans" or the "concerned majority" to which President Nixon was referring, has indicated their "will" overwhelmingly in favor of withdrawal of American troops.

Administrations past and present have been guided by military leaders who have shown many blatant and obvious cases of misjudgment: the tragic loss of 74 lives when a navy destroyer on routine maneuvers off the Philippines was sliced in two when it turned into the path of the Australian carrier: the navy sending the underarmed and tiny electronic spy ship, Pueblo, and 82 men into North Korean waters despite a high level intelligence warning of danger. Not long after the Pueblo and its crew were captured, an unprotected electronic "snooper" plane was shot down as it passed over the shores of North Korea with the loss of 30 lives: the Pentagon also authorized a secret contingency arrangement with Thailand, which, if mutually invoked, would have placed United States troops under Thai command; the testing of poisonous gas, resulting in the death of 640 sheep in Utah and the storage on Okinawa of gases which sent 26 men to the hospital not to mention the additional strains placed on Japanese and United States relations.

I say this series of bumblings, including the mishandling of our effort in Vietnam, had led the majority of the people in this country either to apathy or to outright opposition, in varying degrees across the country.

A very important point that is often overlooked is that the South Vietnamese have to take over the operation and defense of their own country—whether now, or one to ten years from now. Are we to leave more than a half million men in Vietnam while we wait for Saigon and Hanoi to come to some political settlement? I believe *that* is not our obligation.

Since the beginning of the cold war we have intervened on an average of once every 18 months in some foreign country. We have often looked at these interventions as our duty bound response to moral imperatives. We have somehow convinced ourselves and are telling the world that our interference in the affairs of other nations grows out of our determination for justice, self-determination, and freedom for all men. I am not saying these ambitions are wrong but that they are clearly not the major reasons for our interventions. It has been on the basis of cold war fears and our anti-communist diplomacy that we have continued to become involved in these crises.

Following the second World War we were cast as the protector of freedom. It is a role we took unwillingly but are now afraid to relinquish.

Ronald Steel made a similar observation in his outstanding book, *Pax Americana*, when he wrote "where a communist problem exists, as in Vietnam, we have found the defense of freedom to be an unshirkable obligation, even if performed on behalf of a regime which may be as indifferent to freedom as the communist one it opposes. When we decide to honor our moral duty, the label that the oppressor wears is exceedingly important."

The United States waded into Vietnam for no other reason than to prevent domination of the South by the Viet Cong. Surely we have always realized that we cannot *be* South Vietnam. We cannot govern South Vietnam. We cannot accept full responsibility for the war. Our commitment is limited. The outcome of that struggle depends now, as it always has, on the ability of the people of South Vietnam.

There have been many disappointments in our relations with the South Vietnamese and the government of South Vietnam. We had hoped that we could help the South Vietnamese to help themselves to build a nation and a government that could attract the support of its own people and to achieve a political victory over the Viet Cong.

Time and time again our hopes have been dashed by the corruption of our South Vietnam ally—a government, as Senator Kennedy said, that "has consistently proved incapable or unwilling to meet the demands of its own people, a government that has demanded ever more money, ever more American lives to be poured into the swamp of their failure."

The casualties are still coming home and the thought of more dead, more bombed villages, more children maimed and made homeless is increasingly repugnant.

From January 1961 to date, the war has taken 45,598 American lives and left 254,274 of our troops wounded. It has cost the taxpayers of this nation a total of more than 81 billion dollars with an additional 25.3 billion dollars to be spent in Vietnam in fiscal year 1970.

In addition to the tragic loss of lives, that is yet to follow, there is also the loss of the 2.1 billion dollars being spent each month in Vietnam which could provide, if used domestically, public libraries for 12 millions of Americans who have no library facilities; eliminate the backlog of need for: 169,000 school teachers; 125,000 nurses; and some 50,000 doctors by providing four years medical or teacher training for 344,000 young people and give a college education to the 100,000 young people who were not able to go on to college this year because of the lack of funds.

The cost of all housing and urban affairs programs of the federal government, including slum clearance and other efforts to make the nation's cities safer and more satisfying places of human habitation represent only 6 weeks of the cost of the Vietnamese war. Our entire contribution to the United Nations organizations comes to 80 hours or 3 days of war expenditures in Vietnam.

Our children may well wonder at the sense of values of a nation which spends $52,000 to kill one guerrilla on the other side of the world.

The United States began some time ago to take steps to persuade the South Vietnamese to take eventual complete control of the War. But despite the fact that never before in history has a nation done for another what we have done for South Vietnam, it has been to little avail. It seems to me that with our generous contribution of resources—human, monetary, and material—South Vietnam should have triumphed long ago if it had a government with the desire or capability to meet the needs of its people.

Perhaps we have performed a disservice to those we would help by holding onto the initiative of that conflict: by permitting them to depend to much upon the United States: and by looking the other way and sometimes contributing to the corruption of the South Vietnamese government.

It would appear a mistake to continue our present policy which allows things to drift on in the wild hope that some solution will be found. The time has come for the Congress to act within the limits of its power and recommend continuous and orderly withdrawal of United States forces as expeditiously as possible until all American forces are removed, the pace of withdrawal to be limited only by steps to insure the safety of our forces.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include the editorial from the Washington Post and the article containing former Vice President Humphrey's remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1969]

No

The effort by this administration to characterize the weekend demonstration as (a) small, (b) violent, and (c) treacherous will not succeed because it is demonstrably untrue. If citizens had had the opportunity to witness the weekend on television, they would know it to be untrue; as it is, they will have to ask those who were there—either kids or cops, no matter. For sheer balderdash it would be difficult to exceed Herbert G. Klein's estimate: "Had it not been for the highly effective work of the Washington police, of the National Guard . . . for the reserve forces of the Defense Department and the complete cooperation of all elements of the government . . . and the work of the Justice Department . . . the damage to Washington (Saturday night and the night before) would have been far greater than . . . the . . . riots after the death of Martin Luther King."

That statement is inaccurate on every count save the first—the enormously effective and professional performance of the Washington police department. Not necessarily in order of importance, thanks should be tendered to (a) the marchers, (b) the volunteer marshals, (c) the police and Chief Wilson, (d) the Mobe leaders, (e) Mayor Washington, and (f) the scores of organizations, churches and others, and individuals who went out of their way to exhibit what the mayor called "neighborliness."

What this administration, and the Attorney General in particular, does not seem capable of grasping is the simple truth that if the demonstrators had wanted serious violence they had the numbers to create it. Does anyone seriously believe that Washington's undermanned police force could contain 5,000 or 50,000 or 150,000 demonstrators bent on violence? The answer is No, and the demonstrators didn't want trouble. The fringe

groups—Weatherman, crazies—did want trouble, and got it. To the Attorney General, this is evidence that the Mobe lost control and broke its nonviolent pledges. Is it reasonable to hold the Mobe leaders (and, by implication, all those thousands who marched) responsible for the actions of 50 or 200 or 500 people? No, it is not. The Mobe does not control Weatherman—and that is not an apology, it is a fact. There is evidence now that Weatherman demanded $20,000 from the Mobe as the price for peace; the Mobe refused, and the wild ones marched on the Saigon embassy. What there is now a split between the antiwar moderates and the extremists; it is a serious split, but if John Mitchell tries hard enough he can probably heal it. He is one of the few men in the country who can.

"I do not believe that—overall—the gathering here can be characterized as peaceful," was the way the Attorney General put it. He places in evidence the fact that at the "major confrontation" at Dupont Circle "20 persons were arrested." If the arrest of 20 people then, less than 300 people overall out of a crowd of a quarter of a million, constitutes a "major confrontation" engineered by the leaders of that crowd—then, what we may have here is a failure of communication.

These men—Mitchell, Klein and others who have had a hand in making policy in this matter—are not dumb or weak but small, men who somehow naturally see themselves as beleaguered adversaries. It seems clear from their statements, and from the accounts of participants at the command post in the Municipal Center over the weekend, that the Nixon administration was less interested in trying to keep the march peaceful than in trying to make it seem less large and more violent than it really was, and in trying to scare the daylights out of that putative Silent Majority at the same time.

So yesterday, as is the fashion with this administration, we had the qualifying statement from the White House press secretary, Ron Ziegler. Yes, it was a pretty large crowd; yes, it was, when you think about it, fairly peaceful. More moderate, more generous, more truthful than the other statements—but there is no reason to think that what Ziegler says is what the President thinks. On Saturday and Sunday, the President by his own account was preoccupied with the football games. It was a fine afternoon for watching football, he is quoted as saying on Saturday, and for sheer piquancy, we have not heard the like of that since Marie Antoinette.

---

HHH SEES "CALCULATED ATTACK" BY ADMINISTRATION ON DISSENT

(By William Chapman)

Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey accused the Nixon administration yesterday of mounting a "calculated attack" on the right of dissent and on the news media.

If such attacks are not stopped, he said, they will "open up a Pandora's box of reaction, backlash and repression."

Humphrey was referring primarily to Vice President Agnew's recent controversial speeches criticizing antiwar demonstrators and television commentators, but he included others in the administration in his charge.

Such comments as Agnew's, said the former vice president, undoubtedly had Mr. Nixon's approval. "This wasn't just a case of the vice president having a lost weekend," he added.

(The White House reiterated that the President did not see Agnew's speech in advance. It was learned that Agnew's speech on the TV networks was largely written by one of President Nixon's writers.

In a free-swinging style reminiscent of last year's political campaign, Humphrey criticized the administration during a press conference following a meeting of the Democratic Policy Council, of which he is chairman.

The Council, which has been formed to prepare Democratic position papers on major issues, joined the skirmishing with a resolution accusing administration leaders of "appealing to fear and creating a climate of retaliation."

Also moving to the counterattack was former U.S. peace negotiator W. Averell Harriman, who was himself one of Agnew targets last week. The vice president said Harriman was chief negotiator at the Paris peace talk during a period "in which the U.S. swapped some of the greatest military concessions in the history of warfare for any enemy agreement on the shape of a bargaining table."

Harriman did not reply to that. Instead, he called the criticism of television commentaries an attempt to "intimidate."

"It smacks of totalitarianism and I don't like it," Harriman declared.

Humphrey's charges stressed that he considers Agnew's remark and others' comments part of a premeditated and concentrated administration plan.

The administration, he said, is not trying to "bring us together"—a phrase Mr. Nixon favors—but is engaged in a "polarization process" by attributing to war dissenters a lack of patriotism.

"I personally doubt that our country has seen in 20 years such a calculated appeal to our baser interest," he said. "I disagree with those who would create an atmosphere of suppression and call it patriotim."

Humphrey embraced in his counter-attack in addition to Agnew's speeches, the following specific Administration moves and statements:

The Justice Department's initial refusal to grant a Pennsylvania Avenue demonstration permit for the massive antiwar march last Saturday and the Department's claim the march would result in violence.

Federal Communications Commission Chairman Dean Burch's personal calls to television network officials requesting transcripts of commentators' analyses of Mr. Nixon's Nov. 3 speech on Vietnam—the analyses that first provoked Agnew.

A statement Humphrey attributed to the Republican National Committee. He apparently was referring to Republican Chairman Rogers C. B. Morton's comment in a Republican newsletter supporting Agnew.

Humphrey conceded that he had made "sporadic" criticisms of antiwar protesters who heckled him in the 1968 campaign and had occasionally privately lectured the news media for its coverage.

"But it's another thing to have a calculated, premeditated attack," he said.

At one point, Humphrey appeared to have some reservations about the warm support he gave Mr. Nixon's policy on the war during a White House meeting on Oct. 10. He said yesterday that he does not want to see U.S. disengagement in Vietnam conditioned either on approval by the South Vietnamese government or on the behavior of North Vietnam. Any disengagement plan, he said, should be formed on the basis of "our own best interests."

---

## SOME MODEST PROPOSALS WITH REGARD TO THE IMPENDING RETURN OF OKINAWA TO JAPAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Japanese Prime Minister Sato arrived in Washington to begin conversations on Wednesday with President Nixon looking toward the conclusion of an agreement to return the Island of Okinawa and its associated smaller islands in the Ryukyu chain to full Japanese sovereignty, reportedly by 1972. Although officially the only details that we in the Congress have on this impending transfer are what have been reported indirectly in the press, the understanding seems to be that this return of Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty, including the key American bases which are now located on that island, will be carried out under the same conditions that apply to those U.S. bases presently located on the Japanese mainland. Specifically, these limitations are two: First, that we will henceforth be unable to keep nuclear weapons on Okinawa, and second, that we will be unable to conduct combat operations from these bases in other parts of Asia without getting the prior approval of the Japanese Government, a condition that, as Members will recall, prevented our prompt response to the seizure of the *Pueblo* off Korea in January of 1968 with the rescue aircraft flown from Japan.

This projected reversion of Okinawa to Japan is clearly, from many points of view, not only politically but also militarily, one of the most important actions that our country will be taking in the next few years bearing on our own strategic position in the Far East, a position we established as a result of our costly participation in both World War II and the Korean war. Yet the surprising fact is that there have been virtually no official discussions on this matter on the part of the Executive Department with the Congress, certainly not with those committees of the Congress specifically charged with responsibility for our military posture. All any of us knows, as far as I can determine, is what we can read in the papers and this has been quite confusing, especially in recent days as the hour of decision draws closer.

Because of the importance of this issue I believe that we in this House, no less than those in the other body, have an obligation to be consulted on this question and to speak out our own feelings with regard to it. As the late Senator Arthur Vandenburg once said in the late 1940's, it is important that Congress be taken into the confidence of the executive branch in matters of foreign and military policy on the takeoffs, too, and not just on the crash landings. That wise statement would seem to be even more relevant today as we here in the Congress, and especially in this House, have lately been making a special effort to give the President of the United States wide bipartisan support as our Nation struggles with the complex task of disengaging from Vietnam without causing disaster to ourselves, to the people of South Vietnam, or to the cause of peace, stability, and mutual security in Asia and the rest of the world.

I notice that the Senate has already given expression to a similar desire for information and consultation over Okinawa. And although the other body does have, constitutionally, a unique position

in the development of foreign policy, the reality is that in today's world, where foreign and military policy are so closely intertwined, and where neither can really be implemented without necessary supporting appropriations, the House of Representatives also plays a very important role in any action with as much potential for affecting our world position as this one about Okinawa obviously has.

Before proceeding further let me just observe, so there will be no possible misunderstanding, that my remarks on the subject of Okinawa do not represent any Johnny-come-lately interest in the problems of the Far East. I have had a deep personal interest in Japan and the Far East generally for more than a quarter of a century, beginning with an intensive year studying the Japanese language at the start of my naval service in 1952, combat duty in the Pacific from Australia to Tokyo, 2 years as a member of the staff of the Far Eastern Commission, the international body which set the policy for the allied occupation of Japan from the surrender to the Peace Treaty of 1951, and 11 years service on the House Armed Services Committee, including three separate trips to the orient, all with visits to Japan.

So I believe I speak not only with some understanding of the Far East—including, incidentally, a conviction that the shape of the world in the next 50 years is far more likely to be determined by what happens in the Far East than what happens in Europe—but also as one who regards himself as a friend of Japan and of the Japanese people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the press reports on which we must so far rely with regard to this Okinawa matter suggest that within the next few days President Nixon and Prime Minister Sato will be releasing a communique, whose text has reportedly already been written, except for one or two key sentences, and which will provide that this country will return Okinawa to full Japanese sovereignty by the year 1972, with the understanding that our military bases on Okinawa will thereupon become subject to the same two restrictions that I have already referred to which already apply to all our bases presently located in Japan proper. Actually on the crucial issue of these two limitations, the press accounts are somewhat ambiguous. One account suggests that for political reasons, both here and in Japan, the communique will be a little "fuzzy" on details of both of these key restrictions, with a hint that the final decision will be spelled out in greater detail when the 1972 deadline is reached. The clear impression remains, however, that the United States has already reached the basic decision to concede both key points to the Japanese, although some nuances of phraseology will mask the full extent of these concessions in the text of the actual communique.

If these accounts are true, then the reversion of Okinawa and its bases to full Japanese control will clearly represent a substantial reduction in America's capacity in the Far East to defend not only ourselves but also the Japanese, who still, after all, depend for their own defense to a very large extent on us, especially on the security of our nuclear umbrella. Much as the Japanese may want Okinawa back; much as we may desire, for a variety of reasons, to oblige them; and much as the projected return of this island by a specified future date is expected to enhance the survival of a Japanese Government which is considerably more friendly to the United States than its major opposition, there is certainly a real question whether we can afford to make any such sweeping change in our own defensive posture in the Pacific without some very careful and sober thought on our part. Obviously there has been no opportunity for such careful and sober thought here in the legislative branch of our Government, including those committees most directly concerned with our military posture. And I would think it would be most unfortunate if this kind of sweeping decision were to be presented to this Congress within the next few days as already a fait accompli by the executive branch.

One can of course understand why the Japanese attach so much importance in connection with the return of Okinawa, to these two restrictions which represent an impairment in our Asian defensive posture. The ban on nuclear weapons is of course another instance of Japan's so-called "nuclear allergy" which stems from the fact that the only two nuclear weapons ever used in combat was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. This nuclear allergy extends even to such nonlethal nuclear devices as nuclear propulsion, at least when it is found in American ships and submarines. Oddly enough, the Japanese have now developed nuclear propulsion for a merchant ship of their own, something which does not seem to have provoked any great popular reaction in Japan similar to that occasioned by the arrival of an American nuclear-propelled submarine. And one might also observe that, for reasons which are not entirely clear, the Japanese Government has so far refrained from ratifying the pending nuclear proliferation treaty which bans the further spread of nuclear weapons.

The ban on permitting American military operations from American bases located on Japanese territory stems from the fact that there has been in Japan for a very long time a sizable and highly militant pacifist sentiment, which we must acknowledge has been undergirded and reinforced by an American-imposed constitution outlawing all Japanese armed forces. It was this militant, pacifist, and anti-American sentiment which prevented President Eisenhower from visiting Japan, as he had planned to in 1960, and which threatened to disrupt Prime Minister Sato's takeoff Sunday from Tokyo for Washington.

Yet, again, the fact is that although the Japanese are constitutionally prevented from possessing an Army, Navy, or Air Force, they do possess what are referred to as land, sea and air "self-defense forces" which actually exceed in their military capacity the armed forces of most other Asian nations. Indeed as far as the sea "self-defense forces" are concerned, they regularly operate thousands of miles beyond Japan's own immediate coastline.

So even with a full appreciation of the reasons behind this nuclear allergy and pacifist and even anti-American sentiment, the hard fact remains that as the world's third greatest industrial power today, after the United States and the Soviet Union, Japan has certainly not matched her phenomenal economic growth with a corresponding effort in providing for her own defense, putting only eight-tenths of 1 percent of her gross national product into defense expenditures. Indeed a good deal of Japan's swift and amazing economic growth has probably resulted from her freedom from having to worry about defense budgets, a luxury that has been made possible of course only by virtue of the fact that Japan relies for her own defense primarily on the United States, with defensive military forces based not only in Japan but in Okinawa. In short, in defense matters Japan has been largely enjoying a free ride.

Thus it follows that any degradation of American military power in the Far East must inevitably result in a corresponding impairment in Japan's own defense. And I do not believe that, much as we may understand and even sympathize with the Japanese point of view, we would be doing either them or ourselves any real long-run favor if the conditions under which we return Okinawa to their control undermine in any significant way our ability to protect her security, our own security, and our joint capacity to maintain peace and stability in Asia as a whole.

I think it would be a very grave mistake if we were to restore Okinawa to Japan under conditions that are bound in some measure to impair America's defensive power in the Far East without getting in return from them some kind of commitment to make a corresponding effort to increase their own contribution to their own defense as well as to the overall task of maintaining peace and stability in the orient. And therefore, I believe that as part of this Okinawa communique coming out later this week, we must insist at the very least on some such statement of intent on the part of Prime Minister Sato.

It will be argued that any such increase in defensive military capability is impossible for Japan because of the clearcut prohibitions in her present constitution. But as I have already noted, the constitutional provision against military forces has not prevented the development of armed forces that in many cases surpass those of most of the other Asian countries. If a hole has been found in the present constitution big enough to drive such effective "self-defense forces" through, then it certainly will be large enough to permit still other developments that could permit Japan to assume some larger share of America's current defense burden in the Far East.

Moreover, as I understand it, the present ban on American combat operations from bases located in Japanese home territory does not apply if those operations are clearly in defense of Japan itself. But where, exactly, does one draw

this local defense line? I have already noted that Japan's sea "self-defense" forces operate, in defense of the homeland, thousands of miles away from Japan's own coastline. Surely we are all sophisticated enough to realize that modern military defense extends well beyond fighting the enemy on one's own home beaches. Our involvement earlier in Korea and now in Vietnam are in a very real sense military actions undertaken in defense of our own country and our own security. Therefore does not defense against aggression in Asia, and the support of peace and stability in that essential part of the globe, likewise represent a very meaningful defense of Asia's most prosperous and productive country? Surely the operations we have so far carried out from Okinawa and might hope to be able to carry out from there in the future, are all related directly to the defense and security of Japan itself, no less than of the other free Asian nations involved. So much for the constitutional argument.

Alternately, it might also be argued that the vehemence of the political opposition to the Sato government is so great and so violent in Japan that no such increased defense commitment could ever be supported. Well, if this is really so, then I would think there might be a very real question as to how far the United States could wisely go at all in reducing our defensive posture in an area of the world apparently teetering so closely on the brink of control by an almost pathologically anti-American majority.

What I am proposing here is obviously not something that we can hope to be able to spell out in detail within the next 2 or 3 days. It would take time, and the political realities and the strength of the Japanese opposition cannot of course be ignored on this side of the Pacific. But there are still another 2 years, presumably, before the projected transfer will take place. And if we are not going to be entirely precise about how we propose to make the Okinawan bases nuclear-free and how we propose not to operate out of them except after "prior consultation" with the Japanese, until 1972, then I see no very great problem in a similar delay in spelling out with precision just what corresponding increase in her own capabilities Japan will be prepared to make to offset whatever degradation in American defensive power will result from turning over Okinawa.

All that is important, I believe, at this juncture is that the initial communique should clearly spell out Japan's intention to move in this cooperative direction. This, as I see it, must be the vital quid pro quo in this particular transaction. And unless we incorporate it at the outset, we shall certainly not get another opportunity to do so at any later date; that much is sure.

Actually, to a very large extent what I am suggesting here appears from some of the press accounts to be not so very far removed from what Prime Minister Sato himself has been hinting at on several recent occasions. Although insisting that the Okinawan bases, once they have reverted, must conform—in the letter—to the same restrictions that now apply to other American bases in Japan proper, Mr. Sato has left himself a certain amount of leeway. There has been an implication, for example, as I read it, that perhaps nuclear weapons might be allowed to be reintroduced in Okinawa in time of serious emergency. And there has also been a hint that Japan might even be willing to permit some military operations out of Okinawa without "prior consultation" in certain nearby areas, with even the added hint that if necessity still requires it by the time 1972 rolls around, the Japanese self-defense perimeter for Okinawan operations might even be stretched a bit farther to include South Vietnam.

Thus, to the extent that Mr. Sato is suggesting that reversion of Okinawa to Japan will not really reduce America's defensive capability in the Pacific as much as we might expect, there would of course be less need for any corresponding Japanese action to fill the resulting gap with efforts of their own. Nevertheless, in spite of some of these vague press hints, I take it that to get the communique accepted by the Japanese people there will almost certainly have to be some impairment in our capabilities in operating out of our Okinawan bases; and at this point, it seems to me that we must convince the Japanese that to get the deal accepted by the American people as well, what is needed is a basic expression of willingless on their part to pull a correspondingly greater share of the overall load, so that our common mutual defense in the Orient will remain essentially unimpaired and intact.

There are, I think, a number of ways in which this might be accomplished. There might, for example, be increased Japanese air patrols, or antisubmarine surface operations. Almost certainly we might hope to be able to look to Japan to supply some of the personnel that might be required in any international peacekeeping force that might someday be agreed to for South Vietnam. We would certainly want to look toward Japan to assume a greater measure of the financial costs of foreign aid, and new reconstruction and rehabilitation programs, not only in Southeast Asia, but in Korea, Indonesia, and other free countries in the Far East.

There is really nothing new or unique in this suggestion that in return for our willingness to give Okinawa back to full Japanese control we ask the Japanese to prepare to assume a greater measure of the burden we have thus far been largely carrying alone in behalf of peace, progress, and stability in the Orient. This is in fact the substance of our most important new departure in foreign policy in the Nixon administration, the so-called Guam Doctrine enunciated last summer. As we move to reduce our own overseas commitments, and to lower our world "profile," we seek to persuade others to assume a larger and more effective share of the common load, so that the sum total of the forces for peace and freedom remains firm. This is what we have been trying to do for some time—not too successfully, I am afraid—in NATO. It is what we are now in the process of doing in Vietnam, with our "Vietnamization" of the conflict there. And it is what we would hope to be able to do in the Pacific generally, by persuading the greatest industrial nation in Asia, our friend and ally, Japan, to take over an increasingly larger share of this common burden in her own particular section of the globe. If we are now to start backing away from the role of being the world's policeman, then at the very least we are going to have to get to work recruiting and training some auxiliary world policemen to take our place. Otherwise international law and order would collapse for want of effective enforcement.

My own feeling is that the best solution to this problem would be some kind of expanded or reinforced Asian regional defense arrangement, similar to the NATO structure in Europe, in which both Japan and ourselves could work as members in much the same way we have worked with West Germany and other regional allies in the mutual defense of Western Europe. Such an arrangement might be created, for example, by an expansion of either the present Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—of which Japan is not a member, or the rather informal Asian and Pacific Council—ASPAC—to which Japan belongs, but which as an organization has no present military mission.

If such an improved Asian regional defense organization were set up, with a standing military committee similar to the one that operates for NATO, a machinery would thereby be created in which consultation between the United States and Japan, as well as with all the other regional pact members, would take place on a regular, continuing basis on all the current and developing military problems and threats in Asia. In addition it is likely that, for normal military operations at any rate, both the Japanese and the United States Governments would delegate to their permanent representatives on this committee a measure of authority with regard to participation in such joint operations. Thus I can visualize that the requirement of "prior consultations" with regard to operating out of our Okinawan and Japanese bases after their reversion might turn out in the end not really to involve any appreciable delay—as was the case with the *Pueblo*—because the consultations had preceded the emergencies as well as followed them.

All that we would need to get this movement started, and what we should have made clear this week as part of the overall agreement between the President and the Prime Minister, would be a clear expression on the part of both the President and the Prime Minister to work toward this mutual cooperation in defense matters in Asia as part of the understanding relating to the return of Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty.

It is certainly ironic, but none the less true, in Europe and in Asia today, that our best hope for maintaining peace and stability lies in working cooperatively with two able and energetic countries who were our enemes a quarter of a cen-

tury ago. In spite of past differences and some current difficulties, the fact remains that lasting peace and prosperity in Asia requires that we work closely with Japan. The suggestions which I have made in these remarks will, I hope, be seriously considered at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Faced with a strong Japanese demand for the return of Okinawa, we have here today a unique opportunity to enlist their support, in return for our accession to their request, in the promotion of an absolutely vital common endeavor. If we let this opportunity slip through our fingers to achieve this very significant advance in constructing a framework for effective mutual security in Asia, we may never find another similar opportunity. But properly handled, we can use these discussions over the future of Okinawa to promote a new and unprecented degree of cooperation between the United States and Japan in pursuit of the peace and freedom which it must always be our principal objective to promote.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago I wrote my doctoral dissertation on American Far Eastern policy during the 1930's.

In my academic life, before coming to this great House of Representatives, I long preached to my students the same theme that my friend, the gentleman from New York, has been discussing this afternoon.

I commend the gentleman for his excellent and well-thought-out statement dwelling on our policy, one which should have been pursued by this Government of ours not in 1969 but back in 1959. I hope it is not too late and I want to commend the gentleman and wish to identify myself with his remarks.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the very generous remarks of the gentleman from Virginia who is a colleague of mine on the Committee on Armed Services. I am interested in what he says about a doctoral thesis. As one who never succeeded in getting his Ph. D. at Harvard, I am tempted perhaps to submit these remarks, if he thinks so well of them, so that perhaps I can make up for that omission.

I certainly agree with the gentleman that this is an area that does pose some important questions and while perhaps we should have pursued this earlier, I do not really feel it is too late. I gather, as I tried to indicate in my remarks, that there is going to be some ambiguity and fuzziness in the communique and that perhaps there will be continuing consultations between now and 1972.

Perhaps if we in this House spell out our feelings, and I think we have a very important right to be heard, it may reach down to the other end of the avenue and perhaps if not on Friday, at least on some later date, something along this line will be worked into the final agreement. At least I certainly hope so. I welcome the support of the gentleman from Virginia.

## WELCOME TO A BILLION-DOLLAR FARM CUSTOMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States today welcome to our shores the distinguished leader of our partner of the Pacific, Prime Minister Sato of Japan.

In the years since World War II, Japan has been our patient and loyal friend and a progressive influence in world economic development, especially in Asia.

The time has come to cement this relationship, and I express the hope that President Nixon will take the occasion of Mr. Sato's visit to announce plans to eliminate the two most prominent sources of potential difficulty—the status of Okinawa and the proposed agreement which would restrict Japan's textile exports to the United States.

The United States did not participate in World War with any thought of territorial expansion. Today, a quarter-century after the war's end, we should announce plans to restore to Japan at an early date political control over Okinawa. Further delay will serve only to intensify political feeling in Japan and possibly even jeopardize the survival of Mr. Sato's government, whose policies have been almost without exception entirely cordial to U.S. interests.

At the same time, the proposal voiced frequently by Secretary of Commerce Stans in support of restrictions on textile imports should be scrapped. It would threaten our billion-dollar farm market in Japan and also injure the interests of U.S. consumers.

On the occasion of Mr. Sato's arrival, it might be well for the Members of the House to consider certain actions that have been taken to facilitate improved relations between our two countries. The forthright steps taken by the Department of Agriculture to reprice certain agricultural commodities to meet world competition certainly must be included as significant. The Agriculture Department's action has resulted in a substantial increase in sales of many agricultural commodities to Japan, including soybeans, feed grains, and wheat. This aggressive market action was necessary because of the keen competition for cash markets.

There are many other nations anxious to get their hands on Japanese yen.

Further, our efforts in Japan to liberalize certain nontariff restrictions on our trade have met with some success. Japan is our No. 1 customer for farm commodities. While there has been a slight reduction in recent years, there is every reason to believe that projections calling for sales of agricultural produce of $1 billion this year will be achieved.

Specifically, liberalization of restrictions has been extended to grapefruit, prime beef, lemon juice, soybeans, and soybean meal.

However, while the trend in Japan is toward liberalization, a contrasting trend in some quarters in this country raises the specter of a reversal in our traditional role of moving toward freer trade. This is illustrated by an apparently ever-widening wedge of protectionist sentiment.

An example of this is found in the drive toward a textile agreement which, while supposedly voluntary in nature, would if accepted actually be mandatory. This move would limit Japan's potential sales of textiles in the U.S. market. It would be a step backward—not forward—in world trade relations.

We need look no further to prove the regressive, unjustified nature of the textile proposal than to examine a report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, which has affirmed that the U.S. textile industry has not suffered unduly as a result of imports from Japan. Indeed, an exhaustive and comprehensive report by the Commission, issued just last year, concluded that U.S. textile and apparel industries have enjoyed a period of unparalleled growth since the early 1960's.

There are some cases of hardship in the textile industry and persuasive arguments can be made for adjustments in existing arrangements. Since the issuance of the Commission's report, there have been substantial increases in Japanese exports to this country and certain realinements may need to be made. Nonetheless, an across-the-board limitation of textile sales to the United States could trigger a reaction in Japan which would jeopardize our trade, and particularly our agricultural markets.

President Nixon has indicated that he intends to pursue a course leading to an increase in trade. In view of the Tariff Commission's report, textiles should not be made an exception in administration policy.

Let us not force Japan to consider means of retaliation on trade matters. How she might retaliate—or whether she would at all—we do not know. But, we all are well aware that there is a surplus on world cash markets of virtually all farm commodities—and Japan always pays cash.

Japan and the United States are each the best foreign customer of the other. We should be careful lest hasty or thoughtless action be taken to interfere with this relationship.

My home State of Illinois is a principal exporter of farm commodities to Japan, supplying a major source of soybeans for export. In 1968, Japan's total soybean purchases from the United States amounted to $218 million.

But our entire Nation would suffer, not just Illinois, if any impediments to increased trade between Japan and the United States, such as textile import quotas, were permitted to remain in the path of negotiators.

One prime consideration must be the impact on our balance-of-payments position of a billion dollars in U.S. farm exports to the Japanese.

In the past quarter-century, Japan has made great strides forward in improving the diet of her people. Their great energies have helped their nation rise from the ashes of war to the position of the third most industrialized nation on the face of the earth.

Recently, Japan has initiated actions to implement a form of foreign aid to her neighbors in Southeast Asia. This most recent step is a sure sign of Japan's maturing approach toward the other nations of the world. We may expect this approach to be continually

broadened as the nature of the American presence in Southeast Asia changes.

As these developments occur, it is vitally important that the United States base its own policies upon a realistic evaluation of our own long-term interests. If we do so, I am confident that our trade policies will recognize the increasing significance and value of our great friend and trading partner, Japan.

## PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the time has come for an objective study of the problems facing American Indians—a study on a high level in which the Indians themselves will participate.

Accordingly, I am introducing legislation today, together with 24 of my colleagues representing 12 Western States, to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs.

Hopefully, this conference will be held sometime before July of next year and will provide a national forum for the consideration of pressing problems in the field of Indian affairs as well as recommendations for the solution of those problems.

While the Indian problem is national in scope, perhaps its most obvious manifestation is in those Western States having large reservation populations. For example, there are more Indians residing in Arizona than in any other State. One particular reservation in our State contains about one-fifth of the total Indian land in the United States.

But this bill was not introduced with the intent of benefiting only the Indians of Arizona or Alaska, or providing a forum for the Indians of Washington or Wyoming. It was introduced to stimulate new approaches toward meeting the problems of all American Indians, recognizing that they do not partake of the artificial homogeneity which we often tend to ascribe to them.

If the support that has been exhibited thus far is any indication, I am confident that the House will act without delay on this important legislation.

The bill referred to above follows:

H.R. 14859

A bill to provide for a White House conference on Indian Affairs

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That appropriations are hereby authorized, as set forth in sections 2 and 3, to enable the President to hold in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, before June 30, 1970, a conference broadly representative of interested citizens from all parts of the Nation, to be called the White House Conference on Indian Affairs, to consider and report to the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of Indian life, and to make recommendations directed to the solution of these problems.

GRANTS FOR STATE CONFERENCES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 2. (a) To assist each eligible State to bring together, prior to the White House Conference on Indian Affairs, interested citizens to discuss problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be allotted to eligible States on the basis of their respective population of Indians, whether or not subject to Federal administration, according to the latest figures certified by the United States Bureau of the Census, except that no State's allotment shall be less than $1,500. Eligible States are those having a meaningful Indian population.

(b) The Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall pay, through the disbursing facilities of the United States Department of the Treasury, its allotment to each eligible State which, through its Governor or other State official designated by the Governor, undertakes to accept and use the sums so paid exclusively for the purpose set forth in subsection (a), and to make a report of the findings and recommendations of the State conference for use by the White House Conference on Indian Affairs. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until January 1, 1971, and any such sums remaining unpaid to the States or unobligated by them as of that date shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 3. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this Act, including the expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in making available to the public the findings and recommendations of the Conference. The Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is also authorized to accept funds, equipment, and facilities donated for the purposes of the Conference and to use the same in accordance with such purpose.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

(2) the term "Indian" shall include Eskimos and Aleuts.

## THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this administration seems to be intent upon being the first administration to successfully suspend the workings of the first amendment to the Constitution.

The first amendment, among other guarantees, protects freedom of the press and of other forms of expression. But for the past few days, the highest officials of the administration, working in apparent close coordination, have launched an all-out attack upon that freedom—and they are making it perfectly plain that their only "beef" with the press is that it does not give the Nixon administration the "objective coverage" that Kosygin can expect from Pravda, Nasser from Al Ahram, or Hitler got from the Voelkischer Beobachter.

The campaign began, as everyone now knows, with Vice President AGNEW's speech of last Thursday, in which he denounced the television news commentators for "making sure the President's plea for national unity would be challenged."

The Vice President then clearly uttered an unmistakable threat, when he said it was time the television networks should be made more responsive to the sounds the Vice President keeps hearing from the silent majority.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, the Vice President did not content himself with urging the networks to be more responsive. He said they should be made more responsive. I also heard his disavowal of any thought of censorship, but what he said about making networks say what he wants them to say sounded so loud to my ears that I had some difficulty detecting any convincing guarantees against censorship.

But the Vice President was only the first salvo in the weekend barrage of threat and intimidation directed at the news media. According to some very scanty press reports, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development also expressed the view that the eastern reporters are adherents of some mysterious new culture which apparently renders them incapable of reporting accurately.

From the Vice President and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development the operation quickly escalated up the power ladder. The next, and most ominous voice thus far, was the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Dean Burch, former chairman of the Republican National Committee. Chairman Burch, armed with the FCC's vague but frightening power over broadcast licenses, seconded what the Vice President said—a seconding speech which would hardly be overlooked by the television and radio broadcasters.

Finally, moving to the top of the power ladder there came the broadest and most explicit threat of them all, from Herb Klein, the President's director of communications. Mr. Klein, presumably in expanding on the "open administration" policy we heard so much talk about, said:

> All the news media need to reexamine itself in the format it has and its approach to problems of news, to meet the current issues of the day.

Mr. Klein made it perfectly clear that he included the newspapers in this sweeping proposal, and then he removed the slightest doubt as to what he was proposing when he said:

> If you look at the problems you have today and you fail to continue to examine them, you do invite the Government to come in.

Mr. Klein made a very perfunctory genuflection toward the Constitution by adding that he would not like to see that happen, but the fact is that it was he who made the threat.

According to the news accounts—Mr. Klein later stated that any industry which fails to examine itself opens the door for unscrupulous politicians to move in.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest now, as I have suggested in a letter I have today written to the President, that he open the door to let at least one "unscrupulous politician"—Mr. Herb Klein—out. If the President's director of communications thinks that the Constitution of the United States, would for one second

support the kind of threats and intimidation that he and others in the Nixon administration are making toward a free press, then he does not understand that document, and he is manifestly unqualified to keep his oath to uphold and defend it.

The same can be said of the Vice President and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, but the President does not have the authority to remove the Vice President, and the views of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are barely relevant.

I have, however, urged the President to request the resignation of Dean Burch, since he, too, occupies a very powerful position in relation to the news media, and he, too, has demonstrated a total unfitness to occupy this delicate and powerful post.

The world, Mr. Speaker, has had recent experiences with a government which believed that "national unity" was so important that communications media had to be made to be more responsive to the "public will"—as interpreted, of course, by the national leader. On October 4, 1933, Nazi Germany adopted a press law which said, in part, that editors had to "keep out of the newspapers anything which in any manner is misleading to the public, mixes selfish aims with community aims, tends to weaken the strength of the German Reich, outwardly or inwardly, the common will of the German people, the defense of Germany, its culture and economy—or offends the honor and dignity of Germany."

I am well aware that Mr. Klein and the Vice President have both strenuously denied that they have any censorship in mind, and Mr. Klein has shed a few plastic tears about how he would "regret" seeing the Government move in. But, Mr. Speaker, whatever the good intentions of these gentlemen, they are the kind of good intentions which can only pave the road to repression, thought control, and a loss of our most fundamental freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say I do not want to be understood as suggesting that the news media have all been consistently fair in every word they have written or televised. Of course, there are human weaknesses displayed by the news commentators and the editors and the publishers in every single one of the media. They are human beings, and, like Vice Presidents and like presidential public relations men, they have their own individual views. These views color their work, just as AGNEW's views and Klein's views affect their judgments. The point which the Vice President and Herb Klein seem to have missed altogether is that in a free society, with a free press, Government officials should not expect the media of communications to be "neutral."

Criticism, even unfair criticism, is an essential part of the game. If they do not like to be criticized, they should get out of public life. If they are going to stay in public life, then they should get used to the basic facts of that life—and free vigorous criticism by and in the press is one of those facts.

If they do not like the heat, Mr. Speaker, then they should take the advice President after President has found valida, and get out of the kitchen—not try to bank the fires of democracy in order to make it cooler for the cooks we have temporarily hired.

No one has drafted Richard Nixon to be President, nor has anyone told these other gentlemen that they must serve their country in powerful and highly paid posts, whether they want to or not. Richard Nixon has striven and fought and campaigned for the office he now holds for most of the past 15 years. He finally won it, and I honor him for winning it. But in his own long political career, he certainly made ample and vigorous use of the right our system gives everyone to criticize those in public office.

Private citizen Nixon used his ample powers of analysis and description to castigate many an officeholder in his time, from Presidents on downward. I have never heard from him or from his associates before the notion that officeholders should be immune from criticism. The fact that he has finally won an election on his own does not mean that it is now time to end all the criticism, and cloak the Presidency in an invisible armor of immunity from dissent.

Freedom of speech is not something we guarantee to Republicans or to Democrats alone. It is not a right we reserve for use only when one part or the other is in office. It is more important than either party. It is more necessary to the working of our free institutions than any of our other rights. It is vital to our continued survival as a free nation.

If the leaders of the Nixon administration do not realize what they are suggesting and what the consequences of following their suggestions would be to our entire constitutional system, then they should, as Mr. Klein suggests, "reexamine their approach," and perhaps they should all get out of public life and go into some career where they will be happier.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 17, 1969]

NIXON AIDE WIDENS CRITICISM ON NEWS—KLEIN SAYS ALL MEDIA NEED TO RE-EXAMINE COVERAGE—DISCLAIMS ANY THREAT

(By Richard Halloran)

WASHINGTON, November 16.—President Nixon's director of communications, Herbert G. Klein, widened the Administration's criticism of news coverage today to include all news media, not just television.

Referring to Vice President Agnew's censure of news commentators on television networks Thursday night, Mr. Klein said: "I think you can go beyond that. All of the news media needs to re-examine itself in the format it has and its approach to problems of news, to meet the current issues of the day."

Mr. Klein, interviewed on the C.B.S. program "Face the Nation," said: "I include the newspapers very thoroughly in this, as well as the networks—if you look at the problems you have today and you fail to continue to examine them, you do invite the Government to come in. I would not like to see that happen."

Reached by telephone later, Mr. Klein said that any industry failing to examine itself "opens the door for unscrupulous politicians to move in." He said the Nixon Administration had no intention to do so and that his remarks were an observation, not a threat. He said he did not have a specific method of Government intervention in mind.

On the television program, Mr. Klein said, "I think there is a legitimate question to be debated within the industry, and I would be opposed to Government participation in it, but within the industry, as to whether we are doing a good enough job, whether we are being objective enough, and whether we ought not to spend more time in self-examination."

Mr. Klein, a former reporter and editor, said in the telephone interview that this was part of a theme he had expounded at various times over the past six years.

President Agnew was speaking on his own when he criticized television news commentators Thursday, but that the Vice President's speech reflected a widely held view in the top levels of the Nixon Administration.

Mr. Klein also said that the Vice President had informed the President that he was going to make the speech and told Mr. Nixon what the subject would be.

Time magazine reported last night that the President had ordered Mr. Agnew to make the speech and had assigned Patrick Buchanan, one of the President's speech writers, to write it.

White House sources said last night that they believed that Cynthia Rosenwald, who writes speeches for Mr. Agnew, had drafted the speech and that the Vice President himself had done considerable work on it.

On the Columbia Broadcasting System program, Mr. Klein reiterated Mr. Agnew's criticism of W. Averell Harriman, who had been President Johnson's chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks.

Mr. Klein said "it was obvious that he was the first voice and the only public voice which came on immediately after the President's speech, that it would be a form of rebuttal, that if you look at any statement he made, none have been in favor of policies that the President has had."

Mr. Klein was asked to specify what military concessions the Vice President had in mind when he said Thursday that the period while Mr. Harriman was the chief negotiator in Paris was one "in which the United States swapped some of the greatest military concessions in the history of warfare for an enemy agreement on the shape of the bargaining table."

SCOTT JOINS IN CRITICISM

Senator Hugh Scott, the Republican leader from Pennsylvania, appeared on A.B.C.'s "Issues and Answers" with more criticism of the news media and Mr. Harriman.

Senator Scott said of Mr. Harriman that "having been Ambassador at the time when peace efforts did not work and the war was escalated, it is very important for him, as a public official, somehow to convince the public that he really was more successful than in fact he was."

The Senator said, however, that he did not know what the Vice President was talking about in his charge of swapping military concessions for the shape of the bargaining table.

"He may have referred to the suspension of the bombing, for example," Senator Scott said. "He may have referred to this rumored drawback which may or may not exist in the limitation of our offensive operations. He would have more information than I do, but I don't know what that is."

Senator Scott generally supported Mr. Agnew's criticism of television news.

"What he said was firm," the Senator said. "It opened up a dialogue, it found the television networks very defensive on the issue. There are people who say, in a rustic way, that it is the pig that is caught under the fence that squeals."

He said, however, that "I don't think the networks or the press should be responsive to anybody's views and to that degree I disagree" with the Vice President, who had

called on television to reflect more accurately the views of the American public.

[From Time magazine, Nov. 21, 1969]

ACTIVIST AT THE FCC?

Soon after President Nixon delivered his Viet Nam speech on television two weeks ago, the three networks received an unusual personal request from Dean Burch, new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Burch wanted to see transcripts of the discussion programs that followed Nixon's address. Immediately. Since the transcripts would have reached FCC offices routinely within 30 days, the new chairman was obviously showing something more than casual interest. Last week broadcasters learned how much more. Endorsing Spiro Agnew's attack on network news as "thoughtful" and "provocative," Burch delivered a not-so-subtle reminder that the FCC has the potential—and in fact the duty—to wield enormous influence on U.S. television.

Burch shrugged off his display of interest as "the easiest way to get the information." Moreover, he carefully re-emphasized Agnew's disclaimer of any notion of Government censorship and, like Agnew, said that change should come from public pressure and the industry itself.

Burch is nothing if not adaptable. At Du Pont-Columbia broadcast award ceremonies last week, he declared in his first speech as FCC chairman that "the finest hour of television is in its news and public-affairs reporting." In fact, he came on more as the Hugh Downs of TV officialdom than a fighting critic. "Unthinking criticism, in my opinion, is a cop-out," said Burch. "We must not contribute to an atmosphere in which each party to an issue tries to outshout the other so that neither is heard." He frankly admitted that he did not have "all the answers to the problems of the communications industry" and suggested that no one else did.

Nor, until last week, did his appointment give any hint that the White House was unhappy with television's point of view. Nicholas Johnson, the commission's most outspoken liberal (who has also called for more public involvement in TV), recently critcized Nixon for clearing Burch's appointment with broadcasting honchos before announcing it.

The son of a federal prison guard, Burch worked his way through the University of Arizona's law school, graduating in 1953. Taking his first trip east of the Mississippi, Burch went to work for Senator Barry Goldwater in Washington a year later as an administrative assistant. Among other things, Goldwater taught the young lawyer how to fly an airplane. In 1964, Burch served as a deputy director of Goldwater's presidential campaign and later as Republican national chairman. His tall, rugged good looks (a colleague recently called him the "Marlboro Man from Arizona") and breezy Western manner made him one of the more personable figures in Goldwater's campaign. Burch has gained the reputation of being a skilled organizer and an imperturbable man in the face of ridicule.

His sudden change of tone on TV news broadcasting raises the possibility that in last week's statement Burch was simply backing up a political friend. Even so, if the friend happens to be Vice President and is determined to curb TV dissent, the implications are that the friend has the rightest man in the right job at the right time.

NOVEMBER 18, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Certain events of the past several days have given me deeper cause for concern about the future of our free system of government than anything else that has happened in the eleven years since I was first elected to the Congress. I have given considerable thought to how I should best describe my state of mind because I am not much attracted to the use of superlatives in situations where they might not apply.

But I am afraid, sir, that the attack that has been mounted in the past few days on the basic Constitutional freedom of the press needs precisely that kind of superlative to adequately describe it.

I am referring, of course, to the speech delivered in Iowa by the Vice President, to the remarks of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, to the very ominous statement of your Director of Communications, Herb Klein, and to supporting speeches by secondary Administration officials, such as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Of all of these remarks, the most dangerous were Mr. Klein's views that if the various news media do not "re-examine" their approach to the news, then they are "inviting the government to do it for them." Mr. Klein was careful to assure the nation that he would "regret" seeing this happen, but he subsequently re-emphasized his prediction by suggesting that any failure on the part of the industry to examine itself would "open the door for unscrupulous politicians to move in."

Mr. President, it takes a pretty unscrupulous politician to embark upon direct assaults on the Constitutional guarantees of a free press, and I hope you will open the door and let the unscrupulous politician who made that threat out.

I have no quarrel with anyone who wants to assert that this or that news commentator or newspaper or magazine has been unfair to him. I don't argue with those who assert that the press as a whole has a certain leaning toward the sensational and the oversimplified. No one can dispute this, and both parties have suffered from this at times, just as both have benefited from it at times.

But that is not the point, Mr. President, whether the press is fair or not, whether the press is accurate or not, whether the press is "responsive to the public will" or not, none of these are at the heart of the issue. The central point is that the press is free—Constitutionally free—and that any governmental attempts to "re-examine" its handling of the news, are flagrant attacks upon the spirit of the Constitution.

Herb Klein, Mr. President, took the same oath as a government employee, that you and I have taken, as elected officials. He has sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution includes the First Amendment. I am sure Mr. Klein would not deliberately violate his oath, but his ability to make the flagrantly unconstitutional suggestion he made, his inability to see that what he proposes would be fatal to our most basic freedom, serves as evidence to me that he is simply unqualified to fulfill the oath he has taken. I think you would be doing the nation, and yourself, a service by letting Mr. Klein leave the Federal service before he makes any further attempts to give further meaning to his title, "Director of Communications."

As for the Vice President, you of course, do not have the Constitutional power to remove him, and his gross error is probably not an impeachable offense. The Secretary of HUD could be removed, but I doubt that his impact upon this problem is very great. This leaves us with Dean Burch, whose confirmation as Chairman of the FCC was scarcely made formal before he began threatening television networks—who were hardly expected to be unaware of his power over broadcasting. I recognize there is some question about the President's legal ability to remove a Commissioner, but certainly you would be able to request his resignation.

Very truly yours,

JAMES G. O'HARA,
*Member of Congress.*

## ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES J. ROWLEY

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of our most respected Americans and outstanding public servants and a personal friend of mine, the Director of the U.S. Secret Service, the Honorable Jame J. Rowley, delivered remarks as the principal speaker at the first annual awards dinner held by the Northern Virginia Catholic Committee on Scouting on November 9, 1969, at the Knights of Columbus in Arlington, Va.

The dinner was an outstanding success and one of the reasons for it was the presentation of a speech by Mr. Rowley and his very timely and effective remarks on the question of the youth of our Nation. I commend this to the Members as a thoughtful and well considered statement on the position of youth in our Nation today.

I include the speech of Mr. Rowley in my remarks:

REMARKS BY JAMES J. ROWLEY

Thank you Bill, Bishop Flaherty, Monsignor Nott, ladies and gentlemen.

I appreciate being here with you this evening and having this opportunity to express my views on a vital national issue—an issue of interest to us all: *The Youth of our Nation.*

All of you have concerns for the young members of your own families and, quite evidently, you also have concerns for the youth in your community or you wouldn't be volunteering your valuable time to scouting.

In connection with these concerns, I want to first review some current facts about youth today. Second, state some of my views and those of others that are deeply interested in our youth. And lastly, talk of scouting and the value of your leadership.

My intention is not to be an alarmist; however, I believe that we all should have the knowledge of certain facts so that we can see more clearly the reasons for present day concerns.

The following information is taken from the Counter-Intelligence Activities Section of the FBI's Annual Report for fiscal year 1969.

"The New Left movement continued to pose a serious threat to the Nation's internal security. During the last year, this extremist minority group located primarily on college campuses, was involved in considerable violence, sabotage, and revolutionary activity. Major disorders erupted on some 225 campuses, causing over $3 million in property damage and resulting in over 4,000 arrests. Almost incredible situations developed whereby rebellious students armed with shotguns and rifles seized academic buildings and defied legitimate authorities. Some 61 campus bombings and arsons occurred."

All of us here are aware of what took place on college campuses across the country last year. I also realize that you are aware that the crime problem continues to grow; however, some of you may not be aware of the youthful involvement in this growing crime rate. For example, the 1968 Uniform Crime Reports reveal that over 75 percent of all those arrested for serious crimes were persons under 25 years of age, and almost fifty percent of those arrested for serious crimes were teenagers—17 years old or younger.

In his recent statement before the Senate Sub-Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, the Attorney General, John N. Mitchell, said that he could not overestimate the threat that narcotics and dangerous drugs pose to the

young people of this nation. The Attorney General said:

"Our young people look to drugs for various reasons: for excitement, for experimentation, for physical escape. All sections of this country are affected; the suburbs and the inner cities, the colleges and high school campuses."

No longer can we view this problem from a distance. All of us have read or heard of the increasing evidence indicating that high school and college students are using marihuana and dangerous drugs in the Washington Metropolitan area.

These current facts on crime and disorder concern us all. However, our concerns have not grown strong enough to encourage the needed active responses, that is:

Too many citizens spend little time on problems other than their own;

Too many citizens find it easier to talk about national problems than to work for solutions; and

Too many citizens find it easy to enjoy a complacency growing out of our present comfortable way of living.

In law enforcement, we have long recognized that lack of public action contributes to the problems we are facing today. Public inaction, in other words, helps crime and disorder to flourish throughout the country.

Now we have an opportunity to face this problem on two fronts: In the home and in the community.

In the home, we have an opportunity to lay a foundation for our youth—a foundation fostered by love and moral guidance. I also want to note that a significant rise in juvenile delinquency in our society has been occurring in families in the upper income group. Whether deprived or affluent—social and behaviorial scientists are in general agreement that the breakdown of the family, as the character builder, is the cause of growing delinquency.

A year ago, Cardinal O'Boyle, addressing the John Carroll Society in Washington, D.C., said:

"What is happening to us? Probably the whole trend is too complicated to explain in any simple fashion. But one thing seems clear to me. There has been too much permissiveness and too much of what I call 'groupthink'."

Cardinal O'Boyle, if I may paraphrase, is of the opinion that some parents in raising their children have adopted a policy of little discipline, have set few standards, and have made few demands that any goals be achieved. The Cardinal believes that there has been a tendency for parents to lose confidence in their own sense of values, to readily adopt to the mainstream of thinking, and to look to some kind of current trend to chart their personal courses.

With this in mind, is it any wonder that administrators and educators on college and university campuses are facing problems today—problems which may well have had their roots in the student's life within his family.

Is it any wonder that police throughout the nation are finding themselves continually abused by a portion of the younger generation who show little regard for law and order.

Last year, as you may know, the President and Congress directed the Secret Service to protect presidential and vice presidential candidates. While traveling throughout the country, we were ably supported by local police in each city and town we visited. Sadly though, it wasn't unusual to see young people shouting obscenities at the police and at the candidates. The saying: that respect for law and order must begin at an early age, is not a cliche—it's a fact.

If there is parental failure in the home, we must try to be helpful through community efforts by developing responsible citizens through appropriate educational, religious and civic programs.

In this regard, I know of no better opportunity to prepare our youth for the challenges of the adult world than through the programs of scouting. Scouting activities can accomplish a great deal toward the proper development of our nation's youth.

As scout leaders, you have probably had the experience of a scout pouring out his or her troubled heart to you, after not having been able to communicate at home. This type of situation speaks of the value of your role as a scout leader.

Therefore, your leadership and that of countless others like you can contribute significantly to the future of our nation, and I do not say this idly. When we consider that there are millions of boys and girls involved in scouting, the influence of your leadership can have a substantial impact on these citizens of tomorrow.

One of my associates suggested that I look at a book by William Oursler called The Boy Scout Story. I recommend this book to you.

Mr. Oursler has written many articles and books regarding juvenile delinquency and youth and believes that youth problems—growing delinquency and mental breakdown of the young—can be answered through scouting. His book is replete with examples of the values of scouting and scout leadership.

One example involved a problem to which many of us can probably relate. A scout had prepared a speech to present before an audience of parents and friends. As the boy stood up to speak, he panicked and consequently, as you might well imagine, his mind went blank. The scoutmaster, sitting behind the speaker, had to prompt him with the words of his speech until the scout had completed his agonizing ordeal.

Some people might consider this a failure on the part of the scout. The scoutmaster didn't—he turned it into a victory by explaining to the audience that the scout could have easily quit and not completed the speech. In fact, the scoutmaster stressed the point that this young man had shown great personal courage in finishing the speech before an imposing audience of over two hundred adults. That scoutmaster had the leadership qualities which brought that scout through a difficult moment in his life.

Moving from an individual example to a more complex problem, a scout leader—as told by Mr. Oursler—faced a tense situation in Los Angeles, California, several years ago. A Mexican-American and a Negro youth, each belonging to a rival gang were fighting, while members of the two gangs watched. One youth fatally stabbed the other. This tragic incident created a tense and explosive situation among the young people of these two minority groups in that neighborhood.

Months before this tragedy, a project worker for the Boy Scouts was instrumental in starting scouting programs in that area in an attempt to suppress the rise in delinquency.

After the tragedy, this same scout leader convinced the slain boy's mother that more hatred and violence should not result from the tragic fight. After talking with the woman, the scout leader then summoned scouts in the area and asked them to pass on her wish that there be no further hostilities. The result was that the leader was able to convince the two gangs to end their rivalry.

These are just two examples of many individual and group problems that have been solved by scout leaders.

I might add that this type of leadership is vital today in solving the problems which exist among our Nation's youth.

And obviously, you wouldn't be involved if you didn't feel strongly about the value of scouting—the opportunity it offers to prepare young people for the adult world. It must be extremely rewarding.

In law enforcement, we are encouraged by responsible leadership which promotes the true concept of law and order. We are encouraged by the Law Enforcement Explorer Scout Program and hope that it continues to gain support. This program, as many of you know, offers a young man the opportunity to gain an insight to the problems confronting law enforcement on all levels and the means toward solving the problems. Through this program, the young man has an opportunity to form his own opinions about law and order. They will be first hand impressions—not tarnished by rumor or propaganda.

In the Secret Service, we know well the value of scouting. Many of our Special Agents were scouts and a number are involved in scouting today. Scouting builds the type of character that we look for in recruiting our agents.

Over the years, the Secret Service has witnessed the participation of Boy Scouts in ceremonies attended by the Presidents of the United States. Personally, I can well remember escorting the late President Dwight David Eisenhower to Boy Scout Jamborees at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania in 1957 and Colorado Springs, Colorado in 1960. More recently, scouts from all over the country participated in the 1969 Presidential Inauguration.

Another tribute to scouting is the support and respect it receives from the American people.

The American people know that scouting teaches respect: respect for oneself and respect for God and country. If all the youth of our Nation had this respect, there would be no need for our concern today.

I have appreciated being here with such a dedicated group and wish you continued success in your future endeavors in scouting.

Thank you.

---

## INTEGRATION SYNDROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, there is an ever-increasing resentment from concerned mothers and dads over the forced integration in public schools by unelected Federal judges and other appointed bureaucrats.

Archibald Edward Roberts, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army (retired), renowned author and constitutionalist, clearly demonstrates that the source of the instigated racial unrest in the schools lies in the United Nations Organization, and the failure of American elected leaders to act in arresting its usurpation of Government powers by foreign agents. Colonel Roberts' latest article is called "The Integration Syndrome."

In the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 6954 to amend section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code. This bill would protect American citizens from deprivation of their constitutional rights by officials claiming authority under UNO orders, rules, laws, statutes, et cetera.

During the arguments on H.R. 2516, to provide penalties for interference with civil rights, I offered the text of my bill as an amendment to the act, only to have it ruled not germane.

While it has been made a Federal crime for a State official to violate the civil rights of an American citizen, our colleagues lacked the foresight to understand that a State official, or a Federal official, or an individual operating under the orders of an international bureaucracy could likewise deprive an American

citizen of rights guaranteed under the Constitution. I have reintroduced this bill as H.R. 1318, on January 3, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming more and more aroused. They are looking for answers and they are not receiving them. They are not going to like what they find when they come face to face with the truth that their country has been stolen from them—their Constitution supplanted by the United Nations organization.

Mr. Speaker, I include Colonel Roberts' article, and pertinent portions of the debate on H.R. 2516:

THE INTEGRATION SYNDROME

(By Archibald Edward Roberts)

The immediate cause for the mounting constitutional crisis over forced integration of State schools is the failure of State governments to take proper legislative action to arrest the usurpation of governmental powers by international agencies.

In the Mississippi case the contentions of lawyers avoided the real issue involved and merely served to compound the confusion under which usurpation flourishes.

Not one of the States effected by the United States Supreme Court order of 29 October, 1969, which directs "immediate desegregation of thirty-three Mississippi school districts", has organized its legal and legislative forces to meet this challenge to its sovereignty. As a consequence the free public school system in the State, and in America, faces inevitable collapse and ultimate assumption by a world government authority.

The real issue before State governments is that: a. Federal "laws" are promulgated by the United Nations Organization, and, b. These ultra vires acts are foisted upon State governments, and the citizens they represent, by federal agencies acting in violation of the prohibitions of the United States Constitution.

Clearly, the United States Supreme Court feels that it is no longer bound by the Constitution for it has assigned to itself the task of implementing United Nations directives. This new extra-national role exceeds the authority granted to the Court by the States under constitutional contract. Being illegal it must be put down.

It is by such deceit that forced integration of the State school systems, and of the American society, became the "Law of the Land."

The origin of this subterfuge is U.N. General Assembly Resolution 1904, "The United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination." This sweeping decree, humanitarian on the surface but basically subversive, was adopted by the one hundred nineteen nation body on 20 November, 1963. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg signed on behalf of the United States on 28 September, 1966. By the end of that year forty-eight U.N. Member States had signed the resolution and five had ratified or acceeded to it.

Further in this study it will be shown how such U.N. resolutions are inserted into the U. S. legal code. But, first, it is important to illustrate the implications which Resolution 1904 carries for races and cultures in America.

Resolution 1904 is, of course, couched in the most disarming language.

"The Charter of the United Nations," it begins, "is based on the principle of the dignity and equality of all human beings."

This cruel hoax is rooted in Article 55 of the U.N. Charter, which states in part:

". . the United Nations shall promote . . universal respect for . . human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

An even earlier source is the cry of the French Revolution (1789), "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," a slogan which claimed the lives of one and a half million French citizens.

Following a lengthy preamble Resolution 1904 then declares that (because) ". . . the building of a world society free from all forms of racial segregation and discrimination . . . is one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations. . . . All (Member) States shall take effective measures to revise governmental and other public policies and to rescind laws and regulations which have the effect of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination wherever it still exists."

Forced bussing, racial balance, and other mandatory directives imposed upon State school systems suggest that the real intent of Resolution 1904 is more than advertised. The "building of a world society free from all forms of racial segregation" may have to be achieved at the cost of eliminating races and cultures. The world of the future would then be populated by the United Nations brown man.

"All effective steps," Resolution 1904 continues, "shall be taken immediately in the fields of teaching, education, and information, with a view to eliminating racial discrimination and prejudice and promoting understanding, tolerance, and friendship . . . among racial groups."

Responding to this astonishing order the vast power of mass media is shaping public opinion began to promote the objectives stipulated by the United Nations. Elemental examination of the current massive attack upon the American public would convince most impartial observers, however, that the true objective of this assault is not the elimination of racial discrimination, but the elimination of social and religious inhibitions against racial assimilation. Hard sell integration, and its predictable consequence, assumes increasing characteristics of genocide, planned or otherwise.

In Little Rock, Arkansas, for example, where "tolerance and friendship" was promoted at the point of a bayonet, the graduates of this initial experiment in forced integration are starting their own families. Of the seven original negro subjects involved, five have married white partners. This miscegenation will result in posterity denied cultural identification with either black or white heritage.

The destructive policy of forced integration has created a nightmare for its victims resulting in the most ominous racial tensions in American history. Our sick society is the product of sick brained men. The cynical program of these madmen will lead, unless reversed, to the eclipse of the American civilization.

The sooner Americans study the skills with which these mattoids circumvent the Constitution and impose U.N. edicts upon the States the sooner can such nihilists be neutralized.

U.N. disposition of, The Question of Southern Rhodesia," offers a convenient case history to illustrate the point. As the following political vignette of 1966–1967 unfolds it will be seen that the hostile contempt displayed by U.N. directors in the sample incident is not necessarily reserved for South Africa.

The pivot factor is U.N. General Assembly Resolution 1904. The central figures are Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Two weeks after signing Resolution 1904 on behalf of the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, on 12 October, 1966, announced that South Africa, by the "abhorrent system of racial segregation known as apartheid," had forfeited all right to go on ruling the territory. Goldberg declared that the United States was committed to take the territory away from Pretoria and to place South Africa under U.N. protection. He further indicated that the U.S. must order immediate sanctions against Rhodesia.

The next move was with the U. N. Security Council.

Allowing a sixty-day propaganda campaign to build world opinion in support of its forthcoming announcement, the United Nations Security Council, on 16 December, 1966, adopted Resolution No. 232, "Question of Southern Rhodesia." In this order the Council declared that Southern Rhodesia "constitutes a threat to international peace and security" and directed Member States to impose an economic boycott against the government of South Africa. The Council also reminded U. N. States that failure to implement the Security Council Resolution "shall constitute a violation of Article 25 of the Charter."

"The Members of the United Nations agree," states Article 25, "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

The ban on Rhodesia was, of course, drawn in conformity with another little-publicized Charter article, #39, which provides that "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall . . . decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42 to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The day following its Security Council decision the General Assembly, on 17 December, 1966, ordered mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia and directed Member States to comply with the decisions of the Security Council.

Bound by these United Nations directives, President Lyndon B. Johnson, on 5 January, 1967, issued Executive Order No. 11322, prohibiting trade and other transactions with Southern Rhodesia.

The Order stated in part:

"By virtue of my authority under . . . section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 . . . and considering the measures which the Security Council of the United Nations, by Security Council Resolution No. 232 of the Charter of the United Nations . . . has decided upon pursuant to article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, and which it has called upon all members of the United Nations, including the United States, to apply, it is hereby ordered. . . ."

Imprisonment and $10,000.00 fine awaited transgressors.

At the risk of becoming overly technical it is now necessary to identify the U.N. authorities which President Johnson quoted in Executive Order 11322 so that the reader may judge the effect which these agreements have on United States foreign and domestic policy, and on U.S. sovereignty.

First, the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, enacted by Senate and House vote on 20 December, amended 19 October, 1949, Section 5:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may . . . prohibit, in whole or in part economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication."

Second, Article 41 of the Charter, which defines the sanctions which Member States are to apply upon call of the Security Council:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decision, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures."

The effect of the foregoing alleged U.N. authorities is to transfer powers of government

from the United States to international agencies without the knowledge or consent of the State or its people.

Under color of such illegal and void statutes the executive, legislative, and judicial agents of government now seek to impose the provisions of U.S. Resolution 1904 upon the State and its people to build a "world society free from all forms of racial segregation."

This presumption of power is illegal and in violation of the authority granted to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government by constitutional contract. Only the Sovereign States, as principals to the Constitution, have the authority to change, amend, or modify the Constitution of the United States. This restriction is precisely fixed in the Constitution itself.

Adoption of the so-called United Nations Treaty, the equally tainted United Nations Participation Act, and the abhorrent United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, are flagrant abuses of the constitutional contract.

However, when the State fails to repudiate the unauthorized acts of its agents, a presumption arises that the State has approved these actions. The vitality that is thus given to the purported acts of the agent arises from the power of the State in question. The power does not come from the agents who had no power to so act.

The duty of the State government is, therefore, manifest!

The State Legislature, finding that the constitutional contract is being violated, must take action to bring about correction.

To arrest usurpation of governmental powers the State Legislature may convene a fact-finding committee to inquire into the following constitutional questions:

a. Did the United States Senate have authority under the Constitution to ratify the so-called United Nations Treaty?

b. Can any officer or agency of the United States, or of the Sovereign State, accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations without violating his oath of office, "to support this Constitution," and so render him subject to impeachment?

c. Are the rights, freedoms and privileges guaranteed to the citizens of the State by the Constitution preserved intact by operations of federal agents who accept and carry out decisions and directives from the United Nations Organization, or any agency thereof?

If the State Legislature finds the answer to any of these questions to be "No", then the citizens of the State may demand immediate passage of appropriate laws making it a felony to attempt to enforce within the State any provision, from any source, based upon the United Nations Charter, and providing suitable penalties for infractions thereof.

The citizens of the State are morally and legally obligated to demand of their state legislators an investigation of any threat to the freedoms of person and property guaranteed to the people by the Constitution.

The Integration Syndrome, circulated by sociological drovers posing as humanitarians, constitutes such a threat.

Colonel Roberts, author of the award-winning book "Victory Denied", played a prominent role in the U.S. Senate "military muzzling investigations in 1962. He subsequently won a precedent-setting court case against the Secretary of the Army and retired in 1965, terminating twenty-six years Army service. Roberts now leads a national campaign to restore the Constitution.

---

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 16, 1967]

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RARICK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. RARICK: On page 9, line 19, after (b), strike out lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, and insert:

"'(b) Section 342 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law

"'Whoever, under color of any law, statute, treaty, ordinance, regulation, or custom (including any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President to apply measures which the Security Council or General Assembly has decided, or may decide, pursuant to chapter 41, or any other chapter, of the Charter of the United Nations, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions or resolutions under such charter, or otherwise), willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, District, Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years for life.'"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane in that in the bill before us all we do with reference to section 242 is to amend the penalties.

But in the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Louisiana the entire section and substance of section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code is added to the bill.

This amendment is purely extraneous matter so far as the bill is concerned and it has no relevancy.

Reference is even made in that section to the United Nations, and of course the United Nations has no relevancy to this act and to the issues that we are debating.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I ask that the amendment be declared out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RARICK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today in subsection (b) does provide for amendment by additional penalties under section 242 of title 18, United States Code.

In substance the amendment that I have offered only provides that in addition to the penalties against States and State officials acting under color of law, an American citizen may also have his constitutional rights denied him by treaties and orders, et cetera, emanating from the United Nations and from other sources.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I certainly feel that the amendment is germane and I would ask the Chairman to so rule.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and he feels that it goes well beyond the proposition before the House and adds additional penalties to title 18, section 242, which are not germane to the bill. He therefore sustains the point of order.

---

## THE PRESS AND GOLDA MEIR'S PRAISE OF NIXON: CHAPTER 2

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday—page 34365—I wondered about the downgrading in the New York Times of the story describing the allout backing which Prime Minister Meir of Israel gave to our President's position on Vietnam.

Whereas the Boston Herald Traveler, which I read on the plane to Washington, played this very important diplomatic development on the first page—set off in a box with a picture of the Prime Minister—the New York Times had displayed the same story on page eight.

My purpose was to express total bafflement at this editorial judgment of the Times. Here was a story not only inherently important but involving major elements of two subjects of paramount importance to readers of the Times: Israel and Vietnam. The element, I suggest, which sent this story flying to page eight, is that it was favorable to Nixon.

I thought that was bad but this morning I found an abbreviated account of Mrs. Meir's endorsement of the President on page 23 of this morning's "early bird" edition of the Washington Post, a day late. I was interested enough to make some inquiries, furthermore, and found out that the item ran only in the first edition of the Post. It was stricken from all subsequent editions, which have the greatest circulation.

It is true that Joseph Alsop's column on the previous day dealt with Mrs. Meir's statement but an interpretation of news is absolutely no substitute for the hard report on which the interpretation is based.

It is this sort of failure in service which has led to the crisis of confidence in the news media, which the Vice President articulated so well in his recent address in Des Moines.

---

## OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Journal of Occupational Medicine, October 1969, by Robert B. O'Connor, M.D., and a speech by Lorin E. Kerr, M.D., presented at the long-range planning conference of the American College of Radiology held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 27, 1969:

UNIONS AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

(By Robert B. O'Connor, M.D.)

The appointment of Dr. Lorin E. Kerr as Medical Director of a newly created Department of Occupational Health for the United Mine Workers of America brings to attention the role of unions in the growth and development of occupational medicine. Labor unions have not been noteworthy in their support and understanding of the occupational physician in his endeavors to provide better health conditions at work. Perhaps Dr. Kerr's appointment will lead to what W. A. Boyle, President of the United Mine Workers of America, urged in his announcement of the creation of the new post: "Occupational health should become a major point of union activity. Hopefully, all unions will recognize this and, together, we can add significantly to the overall well-being of the American worker."

A number of unions have functioning safety departments. This includes the United

Mine Workers of America, but only recently have any unions demonstrated an active interest or professed any responsibility to promote occupational health. The American Federation of Labor craft unions, in many instances, have been opposed to it, whereas the Congress of Industrial Organization unions accept the *concept* of in-plant preventive medicine but do not actively engage in the *practice* of preventive medicine under the auspices of a labor union. In 1952, Dr. William A. Sawyer, after his retirement from Eastman Kodak, became consultant and adviser to the International Association of Machinists but did not take on the active role which apparently will be carried out by Dr. Kerr.

Labor's interest in better health for its workers in the past has been mostly confined to developing disability insurance (particularly workmen's compensation) for those injured at work, and to medical-care plans for total care of the worker and his dependents for nonoccupational illness and/or injury. Although it has been argued that the unions have made the most noteworthy contributions to better health of its workers *indirectly*, by demanding increased wages and a better working condition leading to a better standard of living, it is somewhat ironic that the worker, who is the beneficiary of all the endeavors of the occupational health specialist in the past, has not seen fit to develop and participate *directly* in his own well-being. This is understandable in view of our history—the American way of getting something done is to impose so great an economic penalty if the situation remains uncorrected that action is taken by the one bearing the cost.

Another reason for the lack of direct participation by labor in occupational health is the mobility of the American worker which permits him to leave an unpleasant or unhealthy job. However, as more workers become more entrenched and less mobile because of seniority, etc., more interest is being expressed in occupational health. This is particularly necessary in those trades in which there is no central massing of people and in which the union is the key to security. In places where many workers are employed under a single roof, management has provided the means and techniques for improving health through better environmental conditions. Where small units are employed without any great local concentration of manpower (e.g., the craft unions in the construction trades), the provision of adequately healthy working conditions is sometimes minimal and certainly needs improving.

We welcome Dr. Kerr to the ranks of the occupational physician. It is a major undertaking. We offer our help—we think he will need it. His appointment may be the precursor of other such departments in the future in those unions which have the same problem of small groups of men widely scattered in many locations. We will follow with interest his problems and his contributions to the prevention of diseases which have proven recalcitrant heretofore to the piecemeal and uncoordinated efforts carried out by the managements of small production units.

---

THE POVERTY OF AFFLUENCE

(By Lorin E. Kerr, M.D., M.P.H., F.A.P.H.A., director, department of occupational health, United Mine Workers of America)

I am pleased to be one of those invited to speak at the American College of Radiology Long Range Planning Conference. To my knowledge no other medical specialty has endeavored to review its present and future policies and then redefine its course in accordance with those deliberations. You are to be commended for this forward step.

Consideration of your future role should not be as difficult as it might be for some of our other colleagues. You are not burdened with the cliche about the physician-patient relationship, nor are you fettered by the free-choice hangup which often distorts the vision of some of our conferees. Your specialty has the additional advantage of being more attuned to organizational techniques than usually prevail in medicine. Finally your specialty, in contrast with most others, has long been accustomed to the use of technical assistants. Thus, you are familiar with administrative policies and procedures, you have been your own innovators, and you have had to communicate with your colleagues. This knowledge and experience will stand you in good stead in projecting the future role of the American College of Radiology.

While I have been billed as a labor spokesman, it would be presumptuous of me to assume this appellation. However, having been an active participant for the last 25 years in national programs designed to resolve some of the health problems confronting workers, I think I can accurately report some of their apprehensions about the future.

The number one health problem facing the nation, and labor in particular, is the ominous acceleration of charges for medical care services. Collective bargaining agreements for health benefits have usually included monetary increases, but they still pay no more than one-third of the expenses and omit many essential health services.

To meet these escalating costs organized labor has had to run hard to stand still but as a consumer has become medically sophisticated. The United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund is an example of an unique national program providing one segment of the nation's work force with almost comprehensive medical care of a high quality (1.2). This sophistication was further underscored when the United Mine Workers of America recently established its own Department of Occupational Health. While this Department is initially devoting major attention to job-related illnesses, it is already assisting the Union membership in resolving other health problems in addition to serving as a focal point for other unions interested in moving in the same direction. It is the first time in the history of American labor unions that such concern has been implemented.

Organized labor is now demanding comprehensive readily accessible medical care at a cost the Economy can afford. The need and discontent is so great that former staunch advocates of the voluntary approach are seeking the solution through organized national health insurance (3,4). Will the American College of Radiology follow the discredited past dictates of organized medicine or will it provide leadership in developing solutions to this growing and critical problem?

In its struggle to provide high quality medical care at a reasonable cost, organized labor has become a strong proponent of prepaid group practice (5,6). The reduction of hospital utilization through the provision of continuing coordinated comprehensive ambulatory medical care results in marked financial savings (7,8). Prepaid group practice thus enjoys an undisputed economic advantage over all other methods of delivering medical services. Until recently, organized labor and consumer organizations such as the Group Health Association of America, were the solitary forces promoting and subscribing to prepaid group practice. Today, they are being joined by medical faculties, management consultants, entrepreneurs, corporations and conglomerates. Can you assess your role in this development? How will you participate?

Attempts to resolve the problems of the quality, quantity and cost of medical care are inextricably intertwined with the shortage and maldistribution of health manpower. The health industry is now the third largest in the nation with annual expenditures exceeding $50 billion, and employing more than 3½ million individuals. The major control of this vast industry rests with physicians and there are far too few of them. Authoritative voices claim the number of medical students graduated annually should be doubled. Look at your own specialty. I am sure you will agree that there are far too few qualified radiologists to meet any rational demand for your services. This shortage of all physicians places a high premium on their services.

Until very recently, organized medicine has opposed increasing the number of medical schools as well as making funds available for students unable to pay the exorbitant costs of medical education. Moreover, opposition to national licensure enables state boards to pursue a restrictive course. Until recently one state with a population of about 2.5 million would license no more than 800 physicians in the entire state. Furthermore, a maldistribution of physicians is not only a Southern phenomenon. A recent report from the American Public Health Association states that there are only five physicians, two of whom are quite elderly, providing services for the 50,000 residents in the Kenwood-Oakland area of Chicago (9). In 1930 28,000 people lived there and they were served by 110 physicians.

Organized labor is actively supporting all endeavors to relieve the shortage and maldistribution of physicians. Educational opportunities must be readily available for the qualified sons and daughters of every worker, both black and white. Continued racial and religious discrimination will only prolong the agonizing shortage of all health manpower, including doctors. Will you break with patterns of the past?

The last item I would like to add to your future deliberations is the almost extinct subject of the health of the worker on the job. Any discussion of comprehensive health must, by definition, include occupational health. However, over the years I have encountered a disturbing lack of concern among many physicians about this subject and a frighteningly cavalier attitude about the prevention of these illnesses and injuries. Annually about 14,500 men and women are killed on the job. This occupational slaughter approximates the number of U.S. troops killed last year in Vietnam. Two million more workers are either permanently or totally disabled and 7 million lose a day or more of work because of injuries on the job. Moreover, the rate of injuries per million man-hours worked has been steadily rising during the last decade. This is attributed, by workers, to the generalized speedup occurring throughout all industries. In addition, a decline in real earnings occasioned by the inflationary spiral has made overtime and moonlighting essential for making ends meet. The resultant fatigue slows reflexes, and jobs, like the angel of death, take their toll.

Disturbing as these figures may be, they understate the actual conditions. There is ample reason to believe that these figures do not begin to indicate the severity of the situation. More than a decade ago a Department of Labor official charged that all those concerned with the collection of these figures were playing a numbers game which constantly dealt the worker a bum hand. In the intervening 12 years nothing has changed except the worsening of conditions.

The statistics on occupational injuries may be incomplete but they are more accurate than information on the extent and severity of occupational illnesses. For example, we are ignorant about the number of workers disabled or killed by exposure to carbon monoxide, lead and dynamite. More than half of the illnesses reported are diseases of the skin but I am not convinced this is disproportionately high. Although the precise incidence and prevalence of the pneumoconioses

is unknown, it is possible from a number of different sources to make knowledgeable estimates.

An outstanding example of the problems associated with the occupational dust diseases is provided by the protracted efforts of the United Mine Workers of America and the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund, reported in detail elsewhere, to secure medical recognition of coal workers' pneumoconiosis as a clinical entity in the United States (10–13). In 1942 British investigators identified a new type of dust disease which they called "coal workers' pneumokoniosis" (14). The following year this disease, distinct from, and in addition to, classical silicosis became compensable (15, 16). In Britain coal workers' pneumoconiosis is a diagnosable occupational dust disease, separable into two distinct forms, simple and complicated (17). It is reported to have characteristic pulmonary radiological changes which have been observed in workers exposed to hard or soft coal and some other carbon dusts both in Britain and the United States (18). Pathological studies have demonstrated lesions which are believed to be specifically characteristic (19).

Evidence accumulating indicates that coal workers' pneumoconiosis is today the most alarming occupational dust disease in America (20). It is conservatively estimated that 125,000 active and former coal miners have some radiographic evidence of this disease and that of this number nearly 50,000 may be disabled by the disease (21–30). These are frightening figures! Even more frightening is the fact that physicians are now reporting 35 year old miners with incipient disability which, until recently, was rarely seen in men younger than 50 years of age. This development could be the prodromal warning of an epidemic outbreak of coal workers' pneumoconiosis reminiscent of the silicosis debacle in another industry at Gauley Bridge, West Virginia, nearly 40 years ago.

Radiographic examination of the lungs is essential for determining the earliest changes, severity, progression and prevalence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. A standardized method of describing and classifying the radiographic changes, developed by British investigators, was accepted with minor modifications by the International Labour Office Conference of Experts on Pneumoconiosis in 1950 (31). This Classification was further refined in 1958 and is now designated as the International Classification of Radiographs of the Pneumoconioses (Geneva, 1958) (32). This Classification is the generally accepted method of classifying the degree and extent of pulmonary abnormality. The Classification is purely radiological and does not imply a relationship between categories of abnormality and "suffering from pneumoconiosis", the presence of compensable disease, or a particular degree of disability.

Two major types of changes, simple and complicated pneumoconiosis, are defined, and the "dust opacity" is described as the basic abnormality. These opacities are usually less striking than those observed in silicosis. Some radiologists in Britain and elsewhere who are unfamiliar with the characteristic appearance of coal workers' pneumoconiosis are inclined to regard the radiographic changes as trivial and not necessarily diagnostic of disease. The significance of the radiographs is apparent when comparisons are made with the autopsied lung. The exceptions are those minimal cases with lesions not radiologically apparent. There is a fairly close correlation between the two types of examinations in slight or moderate pneumoconiosis. The major difficulty in making a correct radiological diagnosis of complicated pneumoconiosis is the occasional confusion with pulmonary malignancies. The radiograph is rarely helpful in determining the severity of the focal emphysema observed at autopsy.

The standardized radiographs and photographs illustrating the Classification are readily available from the International Labour Office and are now being utilized successfully by an increasing number of physicians who are concerned about the need for an objective description of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. A higher consistency of proper radiographic classification than is usually obtained, particularly among less experienced observers, occurs with the use of the standard reference films. Their use is enhanced when recommended standards for the exposure and development of the films are observed. It is also recommended that duplicate readings be made on all films with an additional third reading in the event of disagreement between the first two. Miniature films are not satisfactory for the proper classification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

The experience in Britain and elsewhere with the International Classification and the standard films and photographs illustrating the Classification is reported to be sufficiently helpful to warrant an intensive American evaluation of the system. A limited Anglo-American study of the Classification has been conducted by the United States Public Health Service in cooperation with some of your colleagues (33). The resultant USPHS Modification of the Classification has been published and is readily available (34). This limited experience must be broadened to include many physicians. There is an urgent need to clarify any differences of opinion concerning both classifications and their use and thereby hasten the early detection and control of coal workers' pneumoconiosis among U.S. coal miners.

Despite seven major conferences on coal workers' pneumoconiosis, this disease is still not well known or widely recognized in the United States. There are many reasons why American doctors have been reluctant to accept the fact that coal dust is a killer. Until recently little has appeared in American medical journals on this disease and most of the earlier articles were reports on British research and surveys. This lack of concern about coal workers' pneumoconiosis has been due, in part, to a belief that conditions reported world-wide could not exist in the United States. It is also due to the conviction that only silica and dust containing silica are injurious. Moreover, there is the attitude and influence of employer-oriented physicians who avoid facing known facts about the ravages of coal dust in human lungs because to do otherwise could cost money.

Dr. Adolph Kammer, 14 years ago, in searching for the answers concerning coal workers' pneumoconiosis, urged American physicians to reassess earlier decisions. He stated, "Our best observations will be those that encompass the breathless coal miner as a total man, living in a particular kind of community and working in a particular kind of industrial structure. He is a member of a social group in which there are perhaps some fixed thought patterns, particularly as relates to shortness of breath after one has worked underground for a number of years. The reassessment must be made by physicians with this sort of horizon and not by physicians acting simply as lung doctors. Full utilization must be made of good epidemiologic techniques and the best possible case judgments that give full consideration to the miner as a total man" (35).

Today, there is a marked similarity of conditions in the United States and Britain 30 years ago. A pertinent comment on our 30-year lag behind the British is provided by Dr. Donald Hunter, the world-famous British authority on occupational health (36). Ten years ago he said that although coal had been mined in Britain since 1234 it was not until 700 years later that British physicians began to accept the fact that coal dust in miners' lungs produces a slowly progressive fatal disease. He continued to say, "It must be admitted that medical men, by their ill-informed complacency have a heavy load of responsibility to bear for this failure to discover the true state of affairs; a failure which constitutes what is probably the greatest disgrace in the history of British medicine." Today, American medicine has barely begun to overcome its "ill-informed complacency" and "discover the true state of affairs" regarding coal workers' pneumoconiosis. This failure to take earlier action constitutes what may be labeled in the future as the greatest disgrace in the history of American medicine. U.S. schools of medicine must accept a substantial share of this indictment.

Recognition by the U.S. medical profession of coal workers' pneumoconiosis is a first order of business. More than anything right now coal miners need doctors who, regardless of past assumptions, are adequately trained and know how to make a correct diagnosis of this man-made disease.

I have related in some detail the situation as I know it in one particular industry. But similar conditions prevail for many of the same reasons in other industries. For example, today we still have no accurate figures on the amount of silicosis occurring among workers. The control and prevention of beryllium poisoning is receiving insignificant attention. We, in this country, had to be convinced of the dangers of asbestos from reports emanating from South Africa via the United Kingdom. Only recently have U.S. medical investigators conceded that, in addition to asbestosis, an alarmingly high cancer death-rate occurs among those exposed to this dust. For those who may not recall, I would remind you that nearly 20 years ago the need to control and prevent diatomaceous earth pneumoconiosis was the sole reason the affected workers stayed out on strike for 15 months. The scandalous amount of this disease, complicated by tuberculosis, which was occurring among these workers caused such an uproar when publicized that their demands were finally met. A more current example is the repudiation of the reports which have appeared consistently in the American literature that American textile workers do not suffer from byssinosis. We now know this is not true.

It is my sincere hope that in your deliberations about the future of your College you will be fully cognizant of the key responsibility of radiologists in diagnosing the occupational dust diseases. The workers and their unions have known too well that the ravages of disability and death are the daily penalties paid for allowing conditions to prevail which produce these diseases. Throughout the world the great plagues, polio, typhus, malaria and smallpox are being eradicated. The pneumoconioses are man-made plagues which can be eliminated in one generation. Your help is vital to the ultimate success of labor's campaign to control and prevent these diseases.

In conclusion I would like to return to the title I selected for this paper, The Poverty of Affluence. Each of the four points I have covered is a problem of long standing which, with the passage of time, has worsened. This, in part, is due to the national priorities which have permitted the expenditure of billions of dollars for precision lunar landings and billions more for precise and wanton destruction in Vietnam. Despite the plethora of skills, talents and money devoted to such awesome precision, we as a nation have been sadly lacking in setting our house in order. Lately I have been haunted by the thought that a more pervasive reason may be the deadening impact of these and other billions of dollars on ethical precepts. Medicine is an ethical profession with dedicated commit-

ments to the patient, the community and itself. But after reciting my litany this morning, it is worrisome to think that the impact of the community of which we are also a product has fragmented our ethics and separated us from those in need of our skills and learning. Ethically we may be poverty stricken because we, as physicians, have abjured our responsibilities in the community and in the nation, and have not shared both the hopes and pains of others. We have forgotten that, "They who sow in tears shall reap in joy."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund. Report for the Year Ending June 30, 1967. Washington, D.C.

2. Kerr, L. E.: Desire, Expectation and Reality in a Union Health Program. New Eng. J. Med., 278:1149–1153 (Sept.) 1968.

3. Seidman, B.: The Coming Battle for National Health Insurance. AFL–CIO American Federationist, pp. 8–11 (Jan.) 1969.

4. Reuther, W.: The Health Care Crisis: Where Do We Go From Here. Eighth Annual Bronfman Lecture, presented at 96th Annual Meeting of American Public Health Association, Detroit, Michigan, November 14, 1968.

5. Shoemaker, R. E.: Negotiating Effective Health Care. AFL–CIO American Federationist (Nov.) 1968.

6. Kerr, L. E.: Prepaid Group Practice: Essential to Medical Care Quality and Economy. Journ. National Med. Assn., 60:415–419 (Sept.) 1968.

7. Perrott, G. S.: The Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Group Health and Welfare News Special Supplement (May) 1967. Group Health Association of America, Washington, D.C.

8. Idem.: Utilization of Hospital Services Under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. Am. J. Pub. Health 56:57–64, 1966.

9. This Is The News. New York, New York, American Public Health Association, (Aug.) 1969.

10. Kerr, L. E.: Black Lung. Washington, D.C., United Mine Workers of America, 1969.

11. Idem.: Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis. Indust. Med. and Surg., 25:355 (Aug.) 1956.

12. Idem.: Coal Workers and Pneumoconiosis. Arch. Environ. Health 16:579 (April) 1968.

13. Idem.: The Occupational Pneumoconiosis of Coal Miners as a Public Health Program. Virginia Medical Monthly 96:121–126 (March) 1969.

14. Medical Research Council, Special Report Series, No. 243: Chronic Pulmonary Disease in South Wales Coalminers: I. Medical Studies, A.—Report by the Committee on Industrial Pulmonary Disease. B.—Medical Survey. C.—Pathological Report. London, H. M. Stationery Off., 1942.

15. Fletcher, C. M.: Pneumoconiosis of Coal Miners. Brit. M. J. 1:1015 (May) 1948; 1:1065 (June) 1948.

16. Fletcher, C. M. and Gough, J.: Coalminers' Pneumoconiosis. Brit. M. Bull., 7:42, 1950.

17. Gough, J.: Patterns in Pneumoconiosis. Fourth Conference on Silicosis and Aluminum Therapy, January 28–30, 1952, Toronto, McIntyre Research Found.

18. Hugh-Jones, P.: X-ray Classification, Epidemiology and Pathology of Coal Miners' Pneumoconiosis in Wales, Symposium Coal Miners' Pneumoconiosis, Elkins, West Virginia, Golden Clinic (Nov.) 1952, pp. 44–59.

19. Heppelston, A. G.; Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis. Arch. Ind. Hyg. & Occ. M., 4:270 (Sept.) 1951.

20. Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Governor's Conference on Pneumoconiosis, Harrisburg, Pa.: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Health, 1964.

21. Rogan, J.: Socioeconomics and Medical Aspects of Coalworkers' Pneumoconiosis in Great Britain. Read before the West Virginia School of Medicine Centennial Symposium on Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis at Morgantown, West Virginia, May 18, 1967.

22. Lieben, J.: Coal Miners' Pneumoconiosis in Pennsylvania—1967. Read before the West Virginia School of Medicine Centennial Symposium on Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis at Morgantown, West Virginia, May 18, 1967.

23. Enterline, P. E.: Mortality Among Coal Miners. Am. J. Public Health 54:758–768 (May) 1964.

24. Brown, M. C.: Pneumoconiosis in Bituminous Coal Miners. Mining Cong. J. 51:44–48 (Aug.) 1965.

25. Hugh-Jones, P. Fletcher, C. M.: The Social Consequences of Pneumoconiosis Among Coal Miners in South Wales. Medical Research Council Memo. No. 25, London, H. M. Stationery Off., 1951.

26. Cochrane, A. L. et al.: The Prevalence of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis; Its Measurement and Significance. Brit. J. Ind. Med., 13:231 (July) 1956.

27. Hyatt, R. E., Kistin, A. D., and Mahon, T. K.: Respiratory Disease in Southern West Virginia Coal Miners. Am. Rev. Resp. Dis., 89:387 (March) 1964.

28. Martin, J. E.: Coal Miners' Pneumoconiosis. J. Am. Public Health Assoc., 44:581 (May) 1954.

29. Levine, M. D. and Hunter, M. B.: Clinical Study of Pneumoconiosis of Coal Workers in Ohio River Valley. JAMA, 163:1–4 (Jan.) 1957.

30. Johnson, C. C., Jr.: HEW's Eight-Point Program to Combat Coal Miners' Pneumoconiosis. Read before the American Mining Congress, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 5, 1969.

31. Suggested International Scheme for the Classification of Radiographs in Some of the Pneumoconioses: Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Experts on Pneumoconiosis, Feb. 28–Mar. 10, 1950, Geneva: International Labour Office, 1943, Vol. 1, pp. 130–133.

32. Meetings of Experts on the International Classification of Radiographs of the Pneumoconioses, Geneva, Oct. 27–Nov. 7, 1958, Occup. Safety Health 9:63 (April–June) 1959.

33. Ashford, J. R. and Enterline, P. E.: Anglo-American Radiographic Reading Exercise and Study of the International Labour Office (1958) Classification of the Pneumoconioses: A Cooperative Study. Arch. Environ. Health 12:314 (March) 1966.

34. Jacobson, G., Felson, B., Pendergrass, E. P., and Lainhart, W. S.: Radiologic Classification of the Pneumoconioses, United States Public Health Service Modification of the International Labour Organization Classification. Med. Radiography and Photography 44:18, No. 1, 1968.

35. Kammer, A. G.: Occupational Health Problems of the Bituminous Coal Miner. Arch. Indus. Health 15:466 (June) 1957.

36. Hunter, D.: Health in Industry. Middlesex, Great Britain, Penguin Books Ltd., 1959, p. 209.

---

## CLEVELAND, CITING LOCAL WORRIES, OPPOSES BIG DAM PROPOSAL AS THREAT TO NORTHERN NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during the 7 years that I have served in the Congress, I have expended considerable time and energy in opposing large dams in various parts of my district, and for that matter, in other parts of the country. A number of factors have been involved. Considerations of cost, conservation, and the feelings of affected citizens have been among them.

It seems to me unfortunate that Washington-oriented planners in the Corps of Engineers or elsewhere seem to be so delighted at the prospect of a big dam, which is not wanted. An important part of my district in northern New Hampshire is now faced with just such a proposal, and the people there are understandably beginning to express to me mounting concern. For the RECORD, I include editorials from the News and Sentinel of Colebrook, N.H., and in addition, an excellent article by Linnea Staples, the natural resources editor of the New Hampshire Sunday News, Manchester.

I am grateful to Frederick J. Harrigan, the publisher of the Colebrook, N.H. paper, for his excellent editorial comments and his serving notice of the petition, which will shortly be coming my way.

I am also grateful to Linnea Staples for the time and effort and research that went into her fascinating article.

[From the Colebrook (N.H.) News and Sentinel, Oct. 8, 1969]

THE SECOND INDIAN STREAM REBELLION

The complete account of last week's meeting of about forty Upper Coos citizens with Union-Leader feature writer Linnea Staples is on its way to us via our man on the scene, but Mrs. Staples' account in the Sunday paper gives a pretty good idea of what went on. That proposed Army Engineer Dam at Indian Stream, coming on the heels of the earlier Connecticut Valley Recreation Area scheme, has Pittsburg and area residents almost literally up in arms. There haven't been any head knockings yet (such were the only casualties in the earlier Indian Stream Rebellion), but feelings are running so high it looks like 1832 all over again.

Maybe this newspaper didn't help matters with an editorial a couple of weeks ago, suggesting only partly with tongue in cheek that the Republic of the United Inhabitants of Indian Stream might get itself back in business. It might also be remembered that both news story and editorial emphasized the question asked by Colebrook Selectman Fred King at the September 18 meeting in Groveton with the Army Engineers. Mr. King asked why residents of the area weren't consulted before these grandiose schemes are concocted, and got the facetious answer that you couldn't "knock at the doors of the million, plus, inhabitants of the area." 'Twan't funny, McGee.

The answer is, of course, that you don't have to knock on a million doors. All that needs to be done is to make the elected officers of the various townships a part of the planning in the beginning, or at least consult with them, instead of coming around months afterward with elaborate slides and brochures of expensive plans already made, saying, "You do approve of this, don't you?"

That would be too simple. Yet Mrs. Staples, with only word of mouth communications to help, managed to assemble forty area leaders on a moment's notice. The government had better learn to do the same, before instead of after, if it's going to promote the flooding, expropriation, or bankruptcy of the far north country for somebody else's profit.

---

[From the Colebrook (N.H.) News and Sentinel, Nov. 12, 1969]

ARE YOU LISTENING, GEORGE?

The drive for signatures is only just getting under way in the Upper Coos and the Indian

Stream Republic with regard to a sonorous and significant document, which readeth as follows:

"PETITION

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Governor of New Hampshire, the Governor of Vermont, the General Court of New Hampshire, the General Assembly of Vermont, and to whom it may concern:

"We, the undersigned, being residents of the towns located in those townships of both New Hampshire and Vermont which are in the vicinity of and will be affected by the impoundment dam proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Indian Stream in Pittsburg, New Hampshire, and the Connecticut River Recreation Area planned or proposed by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior, insofar as this plan affects the areas of northeastern Essex County, Vermont, and northwestern Coos County, New Hampshire, having duly considered the impact of either or both of these measures on the economy, recreational potential, agricultural production, industrial activity, and woodland and forestry management and production within said area, do hereby most vigorously and sincerely protest the enactment of implementation of either or both of said proposed measures, and do call upon the addressees hereof for all assistance which they or any of them can give in their aforesaid capacities."

The response to the foregoing is expected to be overwhelming as the downtrodden citizenry try to protect their fields and forests. Makes one think of another document, some years ago, which said, among other things, "In Every Stage Of These Oppressions, We Have Petitioned For Redress In The Most Humble Terms." It began, "When In the Course Of Human Events . . ."

---

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News, Manchester, Nov. 16, 1969]

FEDERAL PLANS STIR NEW INDIAN STREAM REVOLT

(By Linnea Staples)

PITTSBURG.—A second Indian Stream Rebellion is brewing. . . .

The fact that Pittsburg is this time joined by its sister towns to the south—Colebrook, Stewartstown, Clarksville and Columbia—merely enlarges the front. It changes nothing else.

The spirit of Yankee independence runs as strong in North Country people as ever it did; the determination to "do for ourselves whatever we can" is undiminished.

In that first uprising that spanned the 1830s, however, there was but one point of conflict, national allegiance.

The issues today are many. And incredibly complex.

Stripped to the bare bones, this new rebellion actually pits these people against the ruthless march of an exploding population, pushed onward by an increasingly urbanized, mechanized and materialistic "civilization."

And the mushrooming governmental agencies ostensibly created to provide for this human mass what it is, by the very nature of its own bigness, helpless to provide for itself.

The key issues to emerge involve the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

The first agency with its plan to dam wild and historically rich Indian Stream, turning the major portion of the beautiful valley into a barren "stream flow augmentation" impoundment.

The second, with its proposal for a Connecticut River Valley National Recreation Area, creating an 82-mile long public recreational "corridor" along the main stem of the river south to Littleton, plus a huge 54,000-acre state park encompassing the entire Connecticut Lakes region. This is part of a plan involving the whole river.

The questions raised thereby tear at the heartstrings of the citizens of these towns, bringing apprehension, anger and confusion.

How much of the land they still retain will they be required to give up should the projects succeed as outlined? Should they be made to relinquish it, according to the BOR plan, whether to provide recreation for others or, perhaps, to spare it from indiscriminate development?

How much will be inundated to dilute pollution dumped into the Connecticut River by downstream communities, to provide a "flushing" effect as projected by the Army Engineers?"

Or, as they firmly believe, should they instead be allowed to formulate their own plans for controlling the spreading influx of tourists and vacationers from overrunning and ruining this land, one of the last bulwarks of unspoiled countryside in the northeast?

Agriculture, the lumbering industry, and the fishing and hunting facilities and private campgrounds already developed are factors, as these people seek the means to counter these massive federal proposals.

SET UP REPUBLIC

This rebellion could brew up a storm equaling in bitterness that long rebellion of 1832 when the citizens of Indian Stream, left adrift by both the United States and Canada with the international boundary still unsettled, took matters into their own hands.

They simply up and declared their independence from both, and established the "Republic of the United Inhabitants of Indian Stream Territory."

The matter came to a head with the one-day Indian Stream "War" on Oct. 22, 1836; a fast-moving, furious, yet bloodless affair.

The town was subsequently annexed to New Hampshire and in 1840 was rechristened "Pittsburg." The boundary dispute was finally settled in 1842, with the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.

Short-lived though it was, the Indian Stream Republic represented one of the most colorful and intriguing periods in the history of our nation; one almost forgotten.

Today's North Country citizens are no less hardy a race.

AMEY'S VIEWS

Holman Amey, outspoken descendant of those stalwarts of old, is typical, and voices the resentment of his neighbors when he observes:

"They intend to wrap us up with out land in a big Santy Claus package and give us away to what they call the 'public.'

"When they look at us up here they think we're not of much consequence. It makes you wonder some, the way they go at things . . . We don't mind taking our part of the state burden, but why should the few of us up here be Santy Claus for this 'public'?

"We've done for ourselves all these years; we aim to continue."

This resolve was succinctly stated recently by Frederick Harrigan of Colebrook, editor, publisher, lawyer and probate judge. He declared:

"We can take care of things ourselves, if they'll just leave us alone and let us get on with it.

"No one in his right mind would say that nothing has to be done. We all know it has to be. But we'd like to have a say in what is being planned for us!"

NONE CONSULTED

Making hackles rise most of all hereabouts is this very factor. Community leaders in each of the towns affirm that in none of it, neither in the planning nor in the proposals now set forth, were any of those most directly concerned consulted.

Earl Wadsworth, president of the Colebrook Banks, commented at a meeting at The Glen in Pittsburg:

"We are simply told, 'like it or lump it, this is the way it's going to be.' "

In the unqualified opposition to the Indian Stream project, local citizens are joined by just about every state agency including Fish & Game Department and the various divisions of the Department of Resources and Economic Development. Water supply and pollution control officials also, at least to the extent that it is intended to make possible a lesser degree of sewage treatment at Groveton. Adequate treatment from the start is their goal.

ENGINEER SCHEME

The Army Engineer scheme is simply this: Dam Indian Stream just above the Tabor Grey place and catch the spring runoff, backing the reservoir all the way to Abbott Brook. Some reports say clear to Depot Camp.

At "full pool" around June 15 each year, the reservoir would cover 1,560 acres. From then until Sept. 1, the water would be released to dilute pollution in the Connecticut below Groveton, and 80-foot drawdown leaving only a 250-acre permanent pool by fall.

Fish and Game officials assert that any management for fishing would be impossible, and today's superb trout fishery destroyed. So, too, would be much of the valley's prime deer yards, and there would be a severe cut in the income from timber and pulp.

Destroyed, too, would be the priceless historical background.

For here is the land of the Dartmouth educated Indian Archie Annance who, in the early 1800's, took gold from the valley at will—gold the source of which no one else could discover. Old Jimmie Fry, who died in 1962, found gold here also, though apparently not in the amounts Archie Annance did. Jimmie Fry's cabin still stands at Depot Camp, historic lumber camp site.

There are those who firmly believe that the spirits of George Van Dyke, Win Schoppe, and their fellow loggers and lumber barons still walk in this valley and along the Connecticut River, scene of those mighty log drives of long ago.

Kim Day and his numerous kin; the Washburns, Tabors, Comstocks, Robies, Parkers, Judds and the Perkins family . . .

Far too numerous to recall here, those lusty, robust folk of the past are not forgotten, and many of their descendants still live in the northern towns.

CAMPING AREAS

"No question we need more camping areas up here, more places to put people who come. But why can't we have a go at it ourselves? Why does the government have to do everything?"

Tabor Gray, who farms the old Tabor Place on lower Indian, where he was born and raised when his father worked for the Tabor family, echoes the prevailing sentiment on this, and he adds: "Is this the way to fight inflation?"

Harry Huggins, president of the N.H. Guides Association, speaks for the many local and out-of-state hunters and fishermen who fear what widespread development into public lands will do.

"What part of the town is going to be left for us? We have a good hunting and fishing recreation industry up here now, why ruin it? The people they leave won't be able to pay enough taxes to support the town."

OTHER VIEWS

But others have different views.

George McGee, of the State Water Resources Board, while stating his agency is neutral, recently commented:

"In the end it is the greatest good for the greatest number that will have to be considered. I am fully sympathetic to these people up here. Of course they love their land. But what about all the thousands of others who want to enjoy the river? How about the

man down in, let's say, Claremont who has Sunday off and goes over to Connecticut River to fish.

"He gets there and finds the river too low. If extra water let out up here will make the river usable below, well, who's to say it wouldn't be right?"

The Army Engineers, in their report, outline six possible courses of action. But they recommend the Indian Stream project as being the least expensive at $6 million as opposed to the cost of tertiary sewage treatment at Groveton.

On the heels of this comes the prediction that within 10 years tertiary, or the most stringent, treatment would have to be installed anyway—Indian or no Indian.

Joseph L. Ignazio, chief, Basin Planning Branch, New England Division, at a recent hearing in Groveton, further stated:

SCENIC UNIT

"Low flows from the confluence of Indian Stream would greatly enhance and permit increased water activity, and significantly contribute to the Coos Scenic unit."

The Coos Scenic Unit is a part of the immense BOR Connecticut Valley National Recreation Area. It is outlined in a magnificently illustrated report titled "New England Heritage."

Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.) has provided the vehicle for implementing it in his Senate Bill S. 1805, entered April 15, 1969.

Sen. Thomas McIntyre (D) of New Hampshire is co-sponsor along with Senators Thomas Dodd (D-Conn.), Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), and Edward Brooke (R-Mass.).

This takes in the 82-mile section of the river from Lake Francis to the Moore Reservoir in Littleton. Of the 21,000 acres of land involved, 1,000 acres would be acquired outright and the remainder controlled by scenic and access easements.

Far too complex to deal with here, it nevertheless calls for careful consideration, according to DRED Commissioner Roger J. Crowley.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would do well to heed these articles before they waste any more time and money on planning. An area that once seceded from the United States and Canada as an ultimate expression of independence will certainly not sit idly by while large areas of its finest river, forestry, and hunting potential is laid waste, nor will those who represent them. On several occasions in the past, with the most able help of U.S. Senator COTTON, I have been successful in preventing the construction of big dams in my district, which were clearly and justifiably opposed by local residents.

It seems too bad that the Federal Government does not give northern New Hampshire more of what it needs and wants; for example, better roads and better communications facilities, and less of what it does not want, of which the big dam plan for the Indian Stream in Pittsburg, N.H., is typical.

## CAN THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY TOWARD THE SMALL SAVER BE DEFENDED?

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in a perceptive article in the November 13 issue of the Washington Star, financial columnist Sylvia Porter questions whether this administration's policy toward the small saver can be defended. Using as an example the interest rate on U.S. savings bonds, she concludes that the Treasury is paying the least amount of interest on such savings of any nation in the world.

Some time ago I pointed out that bond sales were falling off at an alarming rate; the trend has not stopped and nothing is being done to reverse the trend. There is an official callousness about the savings bonds program that is hard to stomach and I find it incompatible with the publicly reiterated concern of the Republican Party to "do something" for the forgotten American. Unless the interest rate on savings bonds is raised to be competitive with other marketable Government securities, the party and the administration will be contributing to the spread of a lack of faith in the system we so proudly hail.

Miss Porter's article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 13, 1969]

UNITED STATES LAGS ON SAVINGS BONDS

(By Sylvia Porter)

If you were a small investor in Canada today, you could buy a new issue of Canada savings bonds paying 7 percent for the first year, 8 percent for each of the next two years, 8¼ percent for each of the last six years.

If you held the bonds to maturity in nine years and didn't cash the interest coupons as they came due, you would get a bonus payment which, along with your accrued interest, would double your original investment in the nine years.

You could buy the bonds in denominations as low as $50 up to a limit of $25,000. Of course, you could cash in the bonds at any time for their full face value plus earned interest.

In England today, you also can buy a new series of savings bonds via payroll deductions which pay the equivalent of a tax-free 7 percent for five years or 7½ percent for seven years—a return which the London Economist says is "not to be sniffed at." All sorts of bonus deals encourage you to hold bonds to maturity plus safety, plus the advantage of systematic savings, etc.

U.S. RATE CITED

A small saver in the United States buying U.S. savings bonds via payroll deductions can get 4¼ percent, but only if he holds the bonds to maturity in seven years. He gets much less if he cashes in before maturity.

And while Congress eventually will get around to raising this rate to 5 percent by shortening the maturity of the bonds to five years and 10 months, the new high rate still will be less than 1969's rise in the cost of living.

The new 5 percent rate will, in blunt summary, be disgracefully belated, although it will be made retroactive to June. It will be shamefully out of line with what the Treasury is paying sophisticated buyers of its marketable securities (8 percent on a short-term I.O.U. last month). The rate will be blatantly unfair to the innocent saver in this era of steep interest rates and galloping inflation.

LACK OF IMAGINATION

And even after it's voted, it will mirror a lack of imagination among administration policymakers which is embarrassing.

It's getting tougher and tougher to defend this administration's attitude toward the small saver in this land.

I don't want to undercut this program, for it's fundamentally too good to deserve this treatment. I don't want to risk spurring a mass cash-in of the $52 billion of savings bonds held by 10,300,000-plus Americans today, for I understand the inflationary dangers inherent in this.

Nevertheless, when I study what Canada and Britain are offering their savers, I am ashamed of my own government.

The U.S. Treasury is paying the small saver of this country less interest than any other nation in the entire world. It is openly taking advantage of the small saver's apathy while paying more sophisticated investors what the market demands.

UNMISTAKABLE WASHOUT

The Treasury (with the help of Congress) is severely damaging one of the greatest savings programs ever devised—turning into an unmistakable washout a program with which I was once proud to be associated. Savings bond sales have lagged behind cash-ins for the last 11 months; while Treasury officials pay lip service to the program, I can't help wondering whether they give a damn.

The debt managers of this administration are showing a shocking lack of imagination and boldness.

If incentives are essential to encourage people to save via bonds in this era, why not give them? If Canada and England can offer bonus rewards to long-term investors, why can't we? If other major countries try to pay the little fellow enough interest to keep him at least even with rising living costs, how dare our government pay a negative rate of return?

If this column sounds as though my typewriter is stuttering with indignation, it is—and I am.

## THE ULTIMATE CONSUMER FRAUD

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the administration has unveiled its consumer protection program with self-praise and great modesty. They have much to be modest about. What is termed "a consumer's bill of rights" is the ultimate consumer fraud, perpetrated this time by Government itself. At the outset it makes no provision for a powerful, centralized, independent agency for consumer protection. Such a creation could possess an unfettered consumer counsel to intervene on behalf of the public in administrative and court proceedings. Under the administration measure, a consumer protection measure would be tacked on to the Department of Justice. The President's consumer affairs adviser supposedly would have statutory coordinating power. How enlightening it would be to see the Attorney General being so instructed. Sort of like a corporal giving commands to a field marshal.

Now the Justice Department often represents agencies opposing the consumer interest. It now has a minimal legal staff dealing with corporate criminal behavior, which accounts for almost all consumer victimization. In effect, the administration seeks to water down the really sound measures now awaiting congressional action. The Government really aims at depriving consumers of assistance under the guise of helping them.

One essential step in inhibiting consumer fraud by industry would be to allow victimized consumers to band together to bring class action suits against individual corporations. Advocating a law allowing such suits would have been true consumer protection. The President cleverly pulls the fangs of this alternative.

His proposal says citizens could bring such suits only if the Justice Department first took an initiative by establishing fraud through a Federal suit. Even then recovery would be limited to 11 types of fraud. This is consumer helplessness. Mrs. Knauer will only have to make 1,463,762 more speeches in the next 30 days to smokescreen this one out. The President's message is replete with clever delaying words, such as "surveillance" and "study." Nothing which would really prevent poor and unsafe goods from reaching the marketplace.

An independent consumer protection agency, well staffed and strong, as offered in the House-originated bill which I have joined in sponsoring, aims at consumer rather than political benefit. Under it, an administrator would audit consumer performance of Government agencies for the Congress. Information would be made publicly available on performance of brand-name products tested by Government. There would be a Director of Consumer Safety. Yet, in each of these areas the President's proposals call for "surveillance" or "dissemination of general information." Instead of curing the disease, he proposes to tell the patient he is ill.

Ralph Nader has assailed the President's consumer program. So has Mayor Lindsay's consumer affairs commissioner, Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant. The attorney general of New York State has been equally negative toward it. Most damning of all, the Consumer's Union has found fundamental fault with the President's entire approach.

For under it, consumers can still be victimized by unsafe goods, frauds, usurious interest rates, shoddy merchandise, and the entire range of deceptions which endanger health as well as steal dollars. Plenty of nifty words endorsing consumerism, but no action.

Meanwhile, this administration is going along with moves which will expose the public to dirty meat for another year or more, as it prepares to give almost every State more leadtime to upgrade inspection procedures; 15,000 plants are involved, producing 15 percent of all meat eaten by consumers. This meat, moving intrastate, was to be subjected to Federal-type inspection by this December 15. Matching grants were offered to help States upgrade procedures. To date, almost all States have been sitting on their hands, awaiting the extension they are now practically guaranteed.

In both House and Senate, bills have been offered to delay the deadline by 1 year, adding a further 1-year grace period after that. Small plants are exempted if they do less than $250,000 annual business. These are the very same plants who were found in 1967 to be the worst offenders.

Meanwhile, Agriculture has been assuring consumer groups the 1969 deadline would be scrupulously adhered to. How about that for consumer protection? When the man charged with enforcing the act was its main opponent, you have a fox guarding the chickenhouse. Label the consumers' chickens.

And yet while all this goes on, we are offered what the Government calls a consumer's bill of rights. The prisoner awaiting execution receives a new suit of clothes.

Where is the voice of President's special assistant for consumer affairs? We have heard for months from her that President Nixon is practically Ralph Nader in disguise. The voice of the consumer in the administration is as silent as a pork chop salesman at a Jewish wedding. The good lady has endorsed direct class action suits by consumers, which seems to have escaped the President's attention. The champion of the people has been telling garden clubs and literary lunches from San Antonio to Dubuque that the President's program will save us all from bad meat, low beef prices, rabies, and the cold wobblies. What will she tell the yeomanry now? That Richard Nixon is a consumer, too? That AGNEW believes all consumers are effete shoppers?

That what is good for A. & P. is good for all of us? That once you have seen one consumer fraud, you have seen them all? That once you have seen one piece of dirty meat, you have seen them all? Anybody for chicken in our hot dogs?

The consumer better wake up and use better judgment when she shops, or else somebody here will take away her license to be cheated. What is good for television commentators is good enough for the average shopper.

---

## EFFETISM IN DEFENSE OF LIBERTY IS NO VICE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the mobilization against our Vietnam involvement has come and gone. Washington is relatively quiet once again, and a few comments on recent events are in order.

First, the entire demonstration is a tribute to the young people of this country. They organized and carried through the largest protest of its kind in American history. Those forces who eagerly awaited a chance to exploit any violence were terribly disappointed. Sorry. Better luck next time.

It is enlightening to list events leading up to this protest, for many roadblocks were heaved in its path by supposedly responsible officials. A carefully orchestrated campaign was waged by our highest political authorities to discredit it. Every resource of government was employed in this ignoble effort. Speeches filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD forecasting doom and Communist takeover. They implied that at best the protesters were misguided Communist dupes. Implications of treason flew around the Capitol like feathers in a breeze. I fully expected to see Lenin and Trotsky's ghosts walking arm in arm in front of the demonstration.

Next, our President took to the television screens of the Nation to deliver a Vietnam speech billed as a modern equivalent of the Sermon on the Mount. Its content was as bare of new alternatives or gestures towards dissenters as the Vice President's speeches are devoid of moderation.

I will not dwell upon the Vice President's venture into media criticism, for that is a luscious subject worthy of separate mention. It is worth noting that comedians blossomed into political pundits overnight, seeking to utilize their reputation as entertainers as political levers. Then Government played musical chairs with parade permits, pretending fear at protest demonstrations after failing to drum up major crowds for its own policies. Frontline combat troops were brought into the city in significant numbers, and were deployed in many major Government buildings. Shameful to relate, even the very Capitol of the Nation was turned into an appendage of confrontation, and was used by elements of the Armed Forces. What were these children going to charge them with; death-dealing buttons and banners?

What actually occurred? Approximately 300,000 effete snobs descended on their capital, spent several days protesting the war, and then went home as quietly as they had come. Some few extremists disturbed the peace at the Embassy of South Vietnam and at the Justice Department. They were vigorously disowned beforehand by the entire mobilization leadership. A few windows were smashed. Some tear gas was thrown. Curse words often filled the air. The Washington police, heaven praise them, set an example of law enforcement the entire Nation can look upon with admiration. The President chose to ignore the protest and its arguments, refusing any communication with these people. The White House was turned into something like a bunker.

And who were these people who came? Effete snobs wearing medals won in combat in other American wars. Decent youngsters in their scores of thousands, demonstrating because they still have faith in our system. They were not anarchists or Communists, as the President would have the Nation believe. And I do not think it is yet a crime to trudge in rain and hail past the White House carrying a placard with the name of a dead American boy killed in Vietnam on it. Not yet, at least.

Never has an administration been further or more totally out of touch with an entire generation of American youth. Never before has an administration sought to use Government as an instrument for discrediting such a protest. Never has such an outpouring of sentiment been so utterly ignored by an American Government. Such blindness has rarely been seen in our history.

America changes, changes, changes before our eyes and beneath our feet. Those who have implied these youngsters are traitors have done them a fierce, degrading injustice.

Surely we must learn from what these people have shown us. Surely we must look beyond past silence and recent anger. These are the majority and their views should command some Government accommodation. If we deny their views respect or understanding, we invite mass actions outside the law. If a government

will not hearken to voices of its own people, it invites vengeful reaction.

Mr. Speaker, in his book, "All Quiet on the Western Front," Erich Maria Remarque has a remarkable passage. One soldier asks how the war started. Another responds that France got mad at Germany. A third ridicules the idea, commenting that a hill in France could not have been enraged by a field in Germany. Sergeant Katczynski suggests the following solution:

> They ought to rope off a big field and put all the generals and field marshals and politicians and ministers and kings and queens and presidents in it when a war is coming. Strip them down to their long underwear and give them clubs. Then they can beat each other's brains out while we watch from the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of our youth. A few use dope and support our enemies. A few are criminals and delinquents. Most, however, are simply wonderful, conscience-stricken, concerned, aware young people. I totally reject those who fear them so much that they must condemn them. It seems they struggle for a better world than the one we have created for them. They want a vital America. Mr. Speaker, they love their country and fight for the souls of those who hate them. They love ideals we have taught them. They cherish principles we have told them America stands for. That is why they came. That is why they spoke out. A million soldiers will not cow or inhibit them. No speech by AGNEW will swerve them from their course. Their voice is freedom, conscience, protest, peace, and life. Our Government makes war. They chant "peace." Naive they may be in some few ways. Traitors? Never.

---

## VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW AND THE MEDIA

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, November 13, the Vice President not only attacked network television commentators for their commentary following President Nixon's much heralded November 3 address on Vietnam but also singled out Ambassador Averell Harriman because of his comments on ABC television.

Certainly Ambassador Harriman needs no defense from anyone, but I do want to express my astonishment that the Vice President would make unsubstantiated charges about Ambassador Harriman's role at the Paris peace talks. It is interesting to note that the New York Times reported on November 15 that the White House refused to comment officially on the meaning of the Vice President's charges.

In reviewing Governor Harriman's comments on ABC upon President Nixon's address, I find them to be both well reasoned and restrained. As for the President's policy of Vietnamizing the war, he said:

> I don't think we can be successful in Vietnamizing the war, because I don't think they can carry the weight.

He pointed out, as he had in the past, the necessity of broadening the base of the Saigon regime if it is to gain the support of the people.

In his years of service to our country Averell Harriman has been Ambassador to Great Britain, Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Secretary of Commerce, Governor of New York, Under Secretary of State, chief negotiator for the United States at the talks on the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and President Johnson's chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks.

The administration would do well to consult with, and listen to the advice of, Governor Harriman whose experience as a diplomat and negotiator would be of invaluable assistance to the President.

It does not further the course of peace or the unity, which the administration professes to seek, to discredit an outstanding public servant who has contributed so much to his country.

Furthermore, I might add that the Vice President's attempt to intimidate the media by reminding them that the privilege of broadcasting required Government licensing is hardly consistent with democratic concepts of free speech and press.

The New York Post in an editorial on November 15 summed up the dangers of the Vice President's attack and the support the Vice President received from the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The editorial follows:

### DEAN BURCH GETS INTO THE ACT

> Just a month ago today, during his confirmation hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, Chairman Dean Burch of the Federal Communications Commission assured his questioners that "I would not be a Republican chairman of the FCC, but simply the chairman. I'll be sitting there as an advocate of the public interest."
>
> Now Burch has emerged as a frankly, aggressively Republican chairman of the FCC, hailing Vice President Agnew's blast at the TV networks as "thoughtful" and "provocative," and commending it to "careful consideration by the industry and the public." It developed that Burch had personally asked the networks to produce transcripts of commentary on President Nixon's Nov. 3 Vietnam address—the same commentary Agnew denounced as "instant analysis and querulous criticism." Where will he strike next?
>
> New York Post readers can judge for themselves today whether these commentaries were sinister or thoughtful, capricious or conscientious. The transcripts are published in full in the Weekend Magazine. But whatever one's appraisal of the validity of some of the observations, there can be little serious respect for the claims of both Agnew and Burch that their concern is "responsible" broadcasting.
>
> The real motivation in this case, as transparent as it is ominous, is political reprisal and intimidation. Apart from occasional stout dissents by individual members, the FCC has rarely challenged broadcasters to battle. There are, indeed, many legitimate public-service questions that might be raised on many matters. But there would obviously have been no complaints from Agnew and no seconding statements from Burch had the commentary on the Nixon address been universally favorable or at least acquiescent. The right to assent is still secure.
>
> In other words, they are attempting to promote precisely the same kind of monolithic, partisan comment on public affairs which they profess to be protesting. It is painfully clear that Agnew speaks for President Nixon. Does Burch speak for all the FCC members? Is he really prepared to convene public hearings on licensing in which the test would be loyalty to the Nixon Administration rather than service to the public? The spectacle would be interesting but no such clear-cut challenge is likely. It is plain, however, that although the season for paid political broadcasting is over, both these "commentators" are anxious to make it a year-round activity—without paying for time. And they have raised an unmistakable threat to the integrity of the TV industry and to independent journalism on every level.

---

## MARCH FOR PEACE

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for 3 days—November 13, 14, and 15—Americans from all over this Nation came to Washington to express their opposition to the present policy in the Vietnam war.

On Thursday night, a march against death began at Arlington National Cemetery. For 40 hours, a solemn procession of Americans—each one carrying the name of an American soldier killed in Vietnam—proceeded past the White House, and then to the Capitol.

On Saturday, well over a quarter of a million people gathered on the grounds of the Mall to march on Pennsylvania Avenue to a rally at the Washington Monument grounds.

In this largest demonstration in our Nation's history, a peaceful march took place along a route which less than a week before the Justice Department refused to make available.

Keeping the marchers in line were volunteer marshals, who during the course of the march, made sure that the terms of the permit were met.

The marchers were united in their deep disappointment in the President's Vietnam policy and their desire to see peace and the return of American troops.

The marchers were united in their frustration over the President's refusal to acknowledge their position and their right to express it.

Recently the administration had, through the Vice President, equated disagreement over Vietnam policy with lack of patriotism. But most of the marchers were patriotic, and many of them proudly carried the American flag.

The President still did not listen.

And the Attorney General and Communications Director Herbert Klein dismissed the protest and its importance.

Although local police officals and other authorities praised the peacefulness of the protest, the representatives of the administration stated that the antiwar gathering had not been a peaceful one. They cited two disturbances, one at Du-Pont Circle involving a march on the South Vietnamese Embassy and one at the Justice Department, involving radical elements. But these disturbances involved a small fraction of the 250,000—by conservative estimate—people who participated in the march.

Yesterday the Attorney General was quoted in the Washington Post as saying:

I do not believe that, overall, the gathering here can be characterized as peaceful.

Communications Director Klein said that, if there had not been massive security arrangements, a riot would have ensued which would have been far more serious than the April riot of 1968. He based this assessment on evidence that—

Greater elements, better planned elements who were dedicated to destruction were present in this city during the weekend.

Once again, the administration was balming over 250,000 people for the position of a small percentage. Of course, violence cannot be condoned. But the administration's attitude did not help avert it.

The President recently sent all Members of Congress a photograph of 52,000 telegrams he received the day after his speech on Vietnam illustrating his support from the "silent majority."

Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, in his remarks before the march on Pennsylvania Avenue, told the thousands of people—who had come to Washington to demand peace now—that they bore better witness than 52,00 telegrams.

On Saturday the peace marchers were living proof that the ratification of the first amendment in 1791 was not a mistake. For on Saturday, Americans exercised their freedom of speech, assembly, and right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

They spoke in a loud, clear, and unified voice. And they did so peacefully.

Such a demonstration cannot be ignored.

I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post which states:

The effort by this administration to characterize the weekend demonstrations as (a) small, (b) violent, and (c) treacherous will not succeed because it is demonstrably untrue.

I also include Tom Wicker's column from today's New York Times, in which he observes:

But if the President continues to make policy on the pretense that the protest movement is not serious, he will be basing that policy on an unreality.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1969]

No

The effort by this administration to characterize the weekend demonstration as (a) small, (b) violent, and (c) treacherous will not succeed because it is demonstrably untrue. If citizens had had the opportunity to witness the weekend on television, they would know it to be untrue; as it is, they will have to ask those who were there—either kids or cops, no matter. For sheer balderdash it would be difficult to exceed Herbert G. Klein's estimate: "Had it not been for the highly effective work of the Washington police, of the National Guard . . . for the reserve forces of the Defense Department and the complete cooperation of all elements of the government . . . and the work of the Justice Department . . . the damage to Washington (Saturday night and the night before) would have been far greater than . . . the . . . riots after the death of Martin Luther King."

That statement is inaccurate on every count save the first—the enormously effective and professional performance of the Washington police department. Not necessarily in order of importance, thanks should be tendered to (a) the marchers, (b) the volunteer marshals, (c) the police and Chief Wilson, (d) the Mobe leaders, (e) Mayor Washington, and (f) the scores of organizations, churches and others, and individuals who went out of their way to exhibit what the mayor called "neighborliness."

What this administration, and the Attorney General in particular, does not seem capable of grasping is the simple truth that if the demonstrators had wanted serious violence they had the numbers to create it. Does anyone seriously believe that Washington's undermanned police force could contain 5,000 or 50,000 or 150,000 demonstrators bent on violence? The answer is No, and the demonstrators didn't want trouble. The fringe groups—Weatherman, crazies—did want trouble, and got it. To the Attorney General, this is evidence that the Mobe lost control and broke its nonviolent pledges. Is it reasonable to hold the Mobe leaders (and, by implication, all those thousands who marched) responsible for the actions of 50 or 200 or 500 people? No, it is not. The Mobe does not control Weatherman—and that is not an apology, it is a fact. There is evidence now that Weatherman demanded $20,000 from the Mobe as the price for peace; the Mobe refused, and the wild ones marched on the Saigon embassy. What there is now is a split between the antiwar moderates and the extremists; it is a serious split, but if John Mitchell tries hard enough he can probably heal it. He is one of the few men in the country who can.

"I do not believe that—over-all—the gathering here can be characterized as peaceful," was the way the Attorney General put it. He places in evidence the fact that at the "major confrontation" at Dupont Circle "20 persons were arrested." If the arrest of 20 people then, less than 300 people over-all out of a crowd of a quarter of a million, constitutes a "major confrontation" engineered by the leaders of that crowd—then, what we may have here is a failure of communication.

These men—Mitchell, Klein and others who have had a hand in making policy in this matter—are not dumb or weak but small, men who somehow naturally see themselves as beleaguered adversaries. It seems clear from their statements, and from the accounts of participants at the command post in the Municipal Center over the weekend, that the Nixon administration was less interested in trying to keep the march peaceful than in trying to make it seem less large and more violent than it really was, and in trying to scare the daylights out of that putative Silent Majority at the same time.

So yesterday, as is the fashion with this administration, we had the qualifying statement from the White House press secretary, Ron Ziegler. Yes, it was a pretty large crowd; yes, it was, when you think about it, fairly peaceful. More moderate, more generous, more truthful than the other statements—but there is no reason to think that what Ziegler says is what the President thinks. On Saturday and Sunday, the President by his own account was preoccupied with the football games. It was a fine afternoon for watching football, he is quoted as saying on Saturday, and for sheer piquancy, we have not heard the likes of that since Marie Antoinette.

---

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1969]

IN THE NATION: MISSING THE POINT OF THE MOBE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, November 17—Attorney General Mitchell told the nation Sunday that the gathering of a quarter-million Americans in Washington to demonstrate against the war had not been peaceful enough. On another network, Herbert G. Klein, the Administration's director of communications, insisted that the majority of the people support the President, no matter how big the turnout was.

The facts are that:

The kind of violence Mr. Mitchell and the Justice Department said in advance that they expected was never remotely in evidence. A magnificent performance by the Washington police and the Mobilization marshals, a jovial and generous spirit in the immense crowd, the nature of the occasion, perhaps even the clear but cold weather, kept the violence to a minimum. The incidents that did occur were clearly the work of fringe groups.

Nobody ever claimed that the size of the turnout would be an accurate guide as to how many people do or do not support Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policies. It was a much bigger gathering than the Administration wanted and it might well be asked whether Herb Klein or anybody alse believes he could get 250,000 people together anywhere in this country to march in support of Richard Nixon and the present pace of his peacemaking. But the real point is simply that the Mobe showed once again that a huge and dynamic segment of the population wants that pace speeded up, and sharply.

THE HARD FACT

That is the fact that confronts Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Klein after the Mobe. That is the fact that they tried to diminish on television. That is the fact that Mr. Nixon, behind the wall of parked buses that surrounded the White House, tried to ignore by tuning in the Purdue-Ohio State game (not that he could have found any of those unfair Eastern liberal networks televising perhaps the largest crowd ever seen in America, and certainly in Washington; where were they?)

But this hard fact will not go away. The protest movement is not a fringe group of violent extremists. It is not a small and unreasonable minority. It is a serious, sizable, sustained element of American politics that, while it may or may not be a majority, certainly is not silent. It is active, growing, determinated and here to stay.

Nevertheless, the reaction of Mr. Klein and the Attorney General, which may be taken for that of the President, suggest not only that Mr. Nixon is standing firm on his approach to Vietnam, which was to be expected; they suggest also that the Administration will persist in trying to discredit and deny the importance of the opposition to that approach. Like King Canute and Lyndon Johnson, it will try to command the waves to cease.

But if the President continues to make policy on the pretense that the protest movement is not serious, he will be basing that policy on an unreality.

NO TIME FOR DELUSION

Take, for instance, the empty debater's argument that a President cannot make decisions under the pressures of a street mob; of course he can't, but no one expected Mr. Nixon to take a look out the window on Saturday, then call Hanoi. What he might be expected to do is to stop deluding himself that there is enough unity in this country to permit, without serious political and social disruption, the long, dubious process of "Vietnamization."

The Administration also asserts that peace demonstrations encourage Hanoi to hold out. But not only does the evidence suggest that Hanoi—certainly the N.L.F.—will hold out anyway; surely it is unrealistic for Mr. Nixon to expect the peace movement, with its origins and experience, to swallow its moral objections to the war and its political doubts about his policies so that he can move unhurriedly toward a faraway and ill-defined end. It is the most frightening of his difficulties that so many Americans no longer trust their leaders that much.

The point the Nixon Administration seems

to miss, as its predecessor did, is that the main cost of the war is in America itself—the alienation of the young as well as more and more of their elders from a political system that appears ineffective and a Government that seems unresponsive—and it is far too great for any interest that might conceivably be pursued in Vietnam. That Mr. Nixon cannot see this is why he could not see the mobilization for what it was.

## THE BILL BRYANT STORY

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the story of Summersville, W. Va., is a success story whose leading character is Bill Bryant. As mayor of this bustling Nicholas County metropolis, 48-year-old Bill Bryant is starting his seventh 2-year term. A bundle of energy, he has turned his hand to so many civic projects that he leaves the average person gasping for breath, but they all end up gasping with admiration for his talent, pride, and drive.

One of the high watermarks of his tenure as mayor came in 1966 when President Lyndon B. Johnson came to Summersville to dedicate the Summersville Dam and Reservoir. Crowds thronged Summersville not only to see and hear the President of the United States but to pay tribute to Mayor-millionaire Bryant, a native of Beckley who came to the town as a lowly payroll clerk in 1948 and rose to be lord of the roost.

The Bill Bryant story should be made into a motion picture, it is so fabulous. It is a typical American story of rags to riches, but even more it is an inspiring story of how determination and community pride can remake small-town America and make it into something which is living and vibrant.

Mayor Bryant has time for national political activity as well as running his hometown. As a delegate to the Democratic National Convention, he helps make national policy. He is well known throughout West Virginia. His accomplishments should be an inspiration for all Americans, and the progress of Summersville is graphically told in some of the following articles from the Charleston, W. Va., Daily Mail of November 14, 1969:

### SUMMERSVILLE SUCCESS STORY: INITIATIVE, INGENUITY

(By Richard Grimes)

Summersville, a one-time typical coal town, has turned the tables on poverty. The place is booming.

And, there are many success stories in the Nicholas County seat as a result of it.

One story might be the people—friendly ones not afraid to invest their time, money and energies in the young people of the area.

Another might be the local speculators like Mayor William S. Bryant who 22 years ago pinned his hopes on virgin coal fields around Summersville and came out smelling like a million dollars. Much of his good fortune has been invested back in the town.

The story might be the Bright brothers, natives of the community who started a greeting card business in their bedroom and now, not even a decade later, operate a multi-million dollar industry, hiring 300 people, in a structure covering two football fields just outside Summersville.

And so on. Easily, there are a dozen more.

The story seems the reverse of elsewhere across Appalachia. In most instances, the spark of hope long trusted by the Mountaineer that his once bustling, tiny coal town will someday shake the drabs and again ring with life, flickers no more.

West Virginia has its string of them, too: towns once rich in, if nothing else, spirit and young high school football players; and now bleak crossroads with depressed widows whose children left for the city and whose husbands died from disappointment long before their graves.

But out of the ashes has emerged this hot bed of coals—Summersville, a town of 2,500 that was a crossroads and became a community, rich in spirit and wealth.

What might appear to the uninformed traveler as simply some houses and a store at the intersection of U.S. 19 and W.Va. 39 actually is the production center for coal, greeting cards, placemats, model homes, camping trailers, plastics, mine machinery and shoes. Some 500 are employed in Summersville proper, and another 700 on the perimeter.

The city sports a new municipal building, library and teen center complex, plus a modern, five wing, convalescent hospital that may go general in the near future.

For a switch, young people are returning to Summersville. While there is no true way to measure at this point, the mayor, a banker, a county clerk, a grocer and a coal miner all say that between 50 and 75 per cent of the area's working force is under 35 years of age.

Besides that, executives from Ohio, New York and Pennsylvania are moving to Summersville to base operations.

Take John Harris, a big man in the plastics field. He came to Summersville from Binghamton, N.Y. in February to invest talent and money in a new plastics plant in the heart of town.

Harris plans to organize the Summersville Players, a theater group he says will soon be one of the best in the state. He adores the Charleston Civic Center and predicts his players will someday perform there.

"I can't understand why West Virginians complain. This is great down here . . ." he adds. "I fell in love with West Virginia immediately."

Harry Richards, who was an engineering consultant to 20 hospitals in the Toledo, Ohio area gave that up to come to Summersville and become executive vice-president of Cardinal Homes, a firm building eight mobile homes a day with 25 men.

Most of the imports say Mayor Bryant was instrumental in bringing them to the Nicholas County seat.

Four major industries have started up this year alone. Besides Cardinal Homes, for example, Hanna Line is building a plant to make camping trailers. Bright of America, which started in greeting cards for fund raising groups, has diversified into other fields and is contemplating further expansion.

Inventive Molded Products Co. has its hand on a contract that may revolutionize the plastics packaging industry. There are 25 coal companies around the city. The Carroll Shoe Company is going strong.

U.S. Department of Labor statistics indicate that in the last decade Summersville and its surrounding area has increased from 45 to 75 businesses.

The population has grown almost 1,000 in 10 years and the mayor predicts it will exceed 5,000 before 1980. "That increase, incidentally, will be one of well trained people," says Mayor Bryant.

Bill Bright, one of the successful Bright brothers, says his firm is forced to tie up housing ahead of time so that enough is available for his people. Not only that, but he is counting on the town's mobile home manufacturer to produce enough units to assist in the housing shortage there. Since 1955, more than 300 new homes have been built in and around Summersville.

Of course, there is popular Summersville Dam nearby. It opened in 1966 and already is a tourist attraction for West Virginians. Still, Mayor Bryant says it hasn't even started to be the recreation mecca it will be for the eastern United States when the Appalachian Highway System passes it.

Summersville has its problems. The roads are not up to snuff and Nicholas County still has an unemployment rate higher than the national average. But it's a far cry better than it was 15 years ago and prospects of additional improvement are great. And, there are hot politics in the city, some jealousy and probably some hate.

"You have to expect that," says the mayor, "when there is money to be made and people are competing."

### IMPRINT BOTTLE IS THE NAME TO REMEMBER

Remember the name, "Imprint bottle."

It may revolutionize the packaging industry, says its future manufacturers in Summersville.

Summersville Mayor William S. Bryant and former New York plastics industrialist John Harris are building a plant in which to produce it. Things should be ready by next August.

Their firm, Inventive Molded Products Co., has a verbal understanding from the German inventor of the operation that the Summersville company will be given exclusive U.S. manufacturing rights.

Usually, a plastic bottle is made in one operation, explains Harris. Then, in a separate operation, the label is put on or the printing is done. Sometimes, the bottle is transported to another location for labeling.

Under the new method, the label will be formed into the plastic bottle at the same time it is being formed. One operation for both processes should cut the overall production time and cost 30 to 40 per cent, says Harris.

When you ship bottles, you ship air. So, he points out, either the firm will have to sub-license other manufacturers to produce it, or the Summersville firm will have to build other plants.

"We won't take it more than 500 miles," Harris says.

The firm also expects to get into the plastic whisky bottle business. "It's a natural," Harris adds.

Under the imprint bottle method, the coloring on labels will permit a maximum of eight colors.

According to Harris, present labeling methods permit five colors.

### MAYOR BILL BRYANT'S HAND EVERYWHERE IN COMMUNITY HE SERVES WITHOUT PAY

There is a saying around Summersville that when you eat or sleep here, you must deal with Bill Bryant.

Mayor William S. Bryant owns more than his fair share of greater Summersville and makes no bones about it.

Some love him for it and others hate him.

Veteran Nicholas Countian Miss Sarah Hamilton says she can remember when the town had boardwalks and outhouses on the main street. Then came Bill Bryant, she beams.

"I've seen the city move from not much of anything to this bustling community. And Bill Bryant championed it. This has to be our greatest day. He goes out and dares to do this and dares to do that . . ."

On the other hand, retorts a town opponent, "Bill Bryant is like a pumpkin seed. You put one in the ground and it takes over the whole damn garden."

Whatever the recipe is for mixing finan-

cial wizardy with political savvy, Bryant has found it.

He doesn't have enough fingers and toes to count his investments. He owns Cardinal Homes, most of Inventive Molded Products Co., is vice president of Peerless Coal Co. and owns three corporations that operate hotels, motels and eating establishments in Nicholas County. Then there are his land holdings.

He confirms that his estate is worth a million dollars. With his wife and two daughters (he has a son attending Marshall) he resides in a stone mansion atop a knoll in Summersville. He has an ample supply of cars and a horse farm for a back yard. But he lets someone else farm it.

"I'm the type of guy who would rather stand with a glass of scotch and watch," he says.

Bryant explains frankly that he knows he manipulates and that he dangles money to get things for Summersville, but adds: "The town is prospering, isn't it?"

Bryant, besides traveling to make promotion for his town, says he gives at least $1,000 annually from his pocket to the city. He doesn't accept his $100 a month salary for being mayor.

"Sure, my business is more important to me than being mayor," he says. "It would have to be. Politics is a hobby for me. Of course, the people here are terrific and this place is my life."

Bryant, a Democrat, is 48. He recently started his seventh, two-year term, or 13th year as mayor of Summersville. The last four times he has been unopposed.

He doesn't know whether he wants to be mayor again. "I'm interested in the state Senate." His friends would like to see him governor. Bryant kind of smirks at the thought, but adds:

"I think I could do for West Virginia what I've done for Summersville." Bank official Larry Tucker, also President of the state's Young Democrats, says: "Bill will make us a fine governor in 10 years."

Asked what will happen to Summersville when Bryant dies, he says, "This is a real problem. I worry about that. Really, I do."

Yet, Bryant moves so fast it may be difficult for someone else to grab the reins. The federal government built the lake and dam, but people around the town say if it hadn't been for Bill there would be no dam.

The convalescent hospital was partially financed by Hill-Burton Funds at a time when they were available only to nursing and convalescent hospitals. So that's what the hospital is. But a tour indicates that with few modifications it might just as easily be a general hospital. When queried about this, hospital officials could only smile sheepishly and refer the reporter back to Mayor Bryant. The mayor, when questioned, gave an ornery smile.

Bryant runs the town, not from city hall, but from his second floor office atop The Farmers Merchants Bank or in an office in the St. Nicholas Hotel across the street. "I rarely use the mayor's office in the municipal building," he says.

The man on the street, knowing full well that Bryant may own the land he lives on, still, for the most part, speaks highly of him. Bryant appears to have the greatest admiration for the townspeople. Like the boy with a reconstructed village under the Christmas tree, Bryant shows off the area and the people with the greatest pride.

A native of Beckley, he came to Summersville area in 1948 as a payroll clerk for the Peters Creek Coal Co. As other coal firms moved in, he applied his talents and moved up. He bought into the companies and it paid off. He bought land around Summersville and cashed in when the influx came to Summersville. Bryant is the graduate of a business college in Roanoke, Va.

One day a man called the mayor and, in an effort to get Bryant to endorse a new memorial park, said: "Mr. Bryant, how would you like to go into a cemetery?"

Replied, the mayor: "There are a lot of people around here who would like to see me in a cemetery.

"When I die, I expect to be buried on the courthouse lawn."

---

## AGNEW, THE WASHINGTON MARCH, AND FREEDOM OF THE AIRWAVES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1969, in his Des Moines speech, Vice President SPIRO AGNEW lashed out at the television industry for its instant analysis and commentaries which occurred immediately after President Nixon's Vietnam speech on November 3.

The Vice President said:

When the President completed his address—an address that he spent weeks in preparing—his words and policies were subjected to instant analysis and querulous criticism. The audience of 70 million Americans—gathered to hear the President of the United States—was inherited by a small band of network commentators and self-appointed analysts, the *majority* of whom expressed, in one way or another, their hostility to what he had to say.

The Vice President also said:

How many marches and demonstrations would we have if the marchers did not know that the ever-faithful TV cameras would be there to record their antics for the next news show?

The Vice President's speech was drafted far in advance of November 13. As a matter of fact, the entire speech was printed in the issue of Human Events dated November 22, and delivered November 15 and submitted to the magazine, before actual delivery of the Vice President's speech in Des Moines. It was expertly prepared by an effete panel of cornflake public relations men in the best tradition of the Madison Avenue industry.

Was it coincidental that the Vice President's expertly prepared speech was delivered 2 days before the young peoples march in Washington? Did the Vice President intend to warn the television industry from covering the events on Pennsylvania Avenue and the Washington Monument? When the Vice President's speech was fully endorsed by Federal Communications Commissioner Dean Burch, former Republican Chairman, the words were supported by the flexed muscle of Federal regulators.

For 32 minutes on November 3, the President spoke to the entire Nation on Vietnam. For 2 days, in dreadful weather, 250,000 young and old Americans petitioned their Government in utter blackout by the television medium. Vice President AGNEW and Dean Burch made their point—put the Washington march on television, and we will get you.

Following is an excellent article by Nicholas von Hoffman entitled "Television Blackout," which appeared in the Washington Post on November 17, 1969:

TELEVISION BLACKOUT

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

The television networks can broadcast live and in color from the moon but not from the base of the Washington monument. NBC had one, mind you, one live camera to photograph the largest political meeting in the history of the United States. It was used three times for a total of five minutes, and that was all the live coverage there was on American television; the other networks had none.

The vast rally was made to order for television. It's the kind of story that makes us old pad and pencil journalists wish we could get into electronics, but on Saturday it was the TV correspondents who were coming up to us and saying, "My God, you don't know how lucky you are to work for an outfit that will cover the news. We collapsed on this story."

Think what it would have cost if the networks had gone out to buy the talent that was performing on the stage across the field from the great marble spike, Arlo Guthrie, Dick Gregory, Leonard Bernstein, Richie Havens, Pete Seeger, Earl Scruggs, Peter, Paul and Mary; Mitch Miller, John Denver, Tom Paxton, John Hartford and the cast of "Hair" singing the super hit song from the show. If that isn't a spectacular, then what is? Companies like Plymouth and Westinghouse pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to put entertainment of that quality on the tube, and here it was for free.

But that wasn't all. There was a supporting cast of hundreds of thousands costumed in everything from the saffron robes of buddhist monks to cowboy outfits. There was street theater, impromptu traveling bands of music makers, giant puppets, a thousand different kinds of visual jokes, signs and slogans. Just the kind of stuff that drives a writer to make movies or try for a job in television.

On the more sober side, there was the political meaning of the event, which was either missed or mutilated. If, five years ago, somebody had told you that between a quarter and a half million people would turn up at the White House carrying hundreds of red flags you would have had him committed to the boobyhatch. But it happened; there were countless red flags of revolution and black flags of anarchy there on Saturday. On the flag poles planted in a circle around the base of the Washington Monument where the American flag usually flies, there was a Vietcong flag, peace banners with the upside down Y, Yippie pennants and emblems from organizations too new or too obscure to be easily identifiable.

It would have been performing a service television is supposed to perform to show these symbols and how they were used. It would have been useful to let the television audience see and make its own judgment of how many people in that throng were signifying their politics by making the V-sign and how many were using the clenched fist and shouting, "Right on! Right on!" Because of the television blackout—and that's what it was for practical purposes—the public will have to accept reporters' estimates of these highly indicative acts. We reporters try to be fair but every human being's perception is colored by his beliefs and sympathies, so that each person will make and pass on to the public a different assessment when the public could have made its own.

Now let's look at what the networks' schedules show them putting on the air during the hours the President of the United States was hiding in his house behind barricades of buses and battalions of soldiers lest maddened waves of peace-crazed young Americans see him in the flesh and ask, "WHY?" NBC was offering, among other items, "Ba-

nana Splits Adventure Hours," "The Flintstones" and "The All-American College Show." About the time this unbelievable march kicked off down Pennsylvania Avenue, Metromedia was airing "The Spirit of Notre Dame," a 1931 movie starring Andy Devine and Lew Ayres, for its Washington audience. Lord, wouldn't it be terrible to miss that one to look at a half a million pinko faggots who ought to go back to Russia?

Later in the day, Metromedia showed the following musts: reruns of "Daktari," "I Love Lucy," "Gidget" and "I Spy." The American Broadcasting Company had a football game on, while CBS checked in with some real heavy stuff: "The Perils of Penelope Pitstop," "Scooby-Do, Where Are You?" "Superman" and "The Red Skelton Show."

However, never let it be said that CBS, with its staff of highly paid, veteran newsmen is not alert to the exigencies of the times. No, no, CBS was on the spot with an evening special telecast, an hour and a half long, and do you know what it was? No, you don't know what it was because you weren't watching. You were too worked up and excited about the March, so you missed it. You missed, "Miss Teenage America With Dick Clark."

A lot of people are going to blame this disaster on Slugger Agnew. Slugger's all right. Don't pick on him, because he's one of the few elected officials we've got who shows himself for what he is. If he feels that his boss isn't getting enough adulation from those Alpo Dog Food salesmen who read the Associated Press wirecopy on the air, Slugger muscles himself some airtime to threaten the network executives.

He needn't have bothered. It appears from asking around that the decision to black out this enormous rally in favor of "The Archie Comedy Hour" and "Wacky Races" (CBS, the both of 'em) was made before Slugger opened America's biggest mouth. And that's the pity of it. They don't need to be threatened with censorship. They'll castrate themselves and call it "sound news judgment."

They are genuinely upset at what Slugger did to them, because he did it out in the open. They've lost face and been humiliated, and so they're running around to the newspapers saying, "We're journalists, too, we should have the same first amendment-free speech rights as the printing press."

You can't maintain a right without using it and in the case of free speech that means saying things a lot of people dont' like. You don't need free speech to put on propaganda plugs for government front organizations like the Boy Scouts and the Red Cross. You need the protection of the first amendment to do things that will get you angry phone calls and letters, things like covering the rally Saturday.

As it is now, we might as well let Slugger have the networks. That way there won't be any confusion about their being independent news agencies; everybody will know that they will have become, in a more genteel way, the American equivalent of Radio Moscow. We'll all buy ourselves shortwave sets and listen to the Canadian Broadcasting Company.

In the final paragraph of his Des Moines speech of November 13, Vice President AGNEW said of television network power:

We would never trust such power over public opinion in the hands of an elected government—it is time we questioned it in the hands of a small and un-elected elite. The great networks have dominated America's airwaves for decades; the people are entitled to a full accounting of their stewardship.

However grave are the dangers of the concentration of power in those who determine the content of network communications, they are less than the infinitely greater danger of government manipulation and restraint on circulation of ideas and information.

Mr. Corydon B. Dunham, vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., on Monday, August 11, 1969, in a speech entitled "Crossroads: Free Media or Regulated Access" before the American Bar Association said:

It is important to our society that there be access to information and ideas. The question is whether providing a regulatory remedy of access to the mass media to serve this clearly definable end will serve the public—particularly when the price is undefinable government regulation of media content which the tenets of an open society and our own traditions have historically condemned.

The risk of abuse of fairness by the television industry which Mr. AGNEW and every other American can openly criticize and attack is indeed a lesser danger than the risk of assault on freedom by political groups which can control the administration of Government and suppress truth.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for November 19 through December 2, 1969, on account of urgent district business.

To Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 20 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 20 through November 24, on account of official business as member of House Committee on Education and Labor.

To Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today on account of knee injury.

To Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on November 19 and the balance of the week, on account of official business as a member of the House Select Committee on Crime.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members) at the request of Mr. WHITEHURST), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for one hour, on November 25.

Mr. RHODES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MCCORMACK to extend his remarks, and that the remarks that he made and the remarks made by other Members today on the death of Joseph P. Kennedy appear at the outset of the RECORD of the House today.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee on the conference report on H.R. 12307 and to include tabular matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, to have his remarks on the death of Joseph Kennedy follow those of the Speaker, today.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during general debate on H.R. 14794, today.

Mr. HALPERN to extend his remarks prior to the vote on the Koch amendment to H.R. 14794, today.

Mr. RANDALL to extend his remarks during consideration of H.R. 14794, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHITEHURST) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. SEBELIUS.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. COWGER.
Mr. PIRNIE in two instances.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. RHODES in five instances.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. LLOYD.
Mr. MIZELL in three instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. LIPSCOMB.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. WOLD.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. COLLIER in two instances.
Mr. CRAMER.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.
Mr. COLLINS in four instances.
Mr. TAFT.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. CÓRDOVA.
Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.
Mrs. REID of Illinois in two instances.
Mr. HORTON in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS in two instances.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. REES.
Mr. MARSH.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. NEDZI.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. CASEY.
Mr. FRASER in four instances.
Mr. COHELAN.
Mr. NICHOLS in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. TUNNEY.
Mr. NIX.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. DULSKI in four instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. FOLEY.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, November 19, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1344. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of the estimated value, by country, of support furnished from military functions appropriations, for the first quarter of fiscal year 1970, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 91-33; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1345. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Administration, transmitting a list of the purchases and contracts made by the U.S. Coast Guard under clause 11 of section 2304(a) of title 10 of the United States Code since April 30, 1969, and a report that no procurements were made under clause 16 of that section, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1346. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improved management of repair and maintenance of public school buildings by the District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1347. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1348. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the project for Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 118. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the Tahoe regional planning compact, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and others to cooperate with the planning agency thereby created, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Rept. No. 91-651). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14227. A bill to amend section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14571. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for certain employees, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12025. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 91-655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Conference. Conference report on H.R. 12829 (Rept. No. 91-656). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 11612. (Rept. No. 91-657). Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Capt. Norman W. Stanley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 14840. A bill to restore an appropriate separation of powers within the Federal Government in the area of equal employment opportunities and to preclude encroachment upon the legislative powers and functions of the Congress in this area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 14841. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next-of-kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 14842. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include payment under part A thereof for the costs of services needed for the treatment of any dental condition or affliction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 14843. A bill to amend the laws relating to the Osage Tribe in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 14844. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate, in the case of shrimp vessels, the duty on repairs made to, and repair parts and equipments purchased for, such vessels in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) (by request):

H.R. 14845. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the establishment of a national policy and comprehensive national program for the management, beneficial use, protection and development of the land and water resources of the Nation's estuarine and coastal zone; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 14846. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 14847. A bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14848. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14849. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to certain medical and dental schools, which are in dire financial distress, to enable such schools to continue, without curtailment, certain service functions, programs and activities which are in the national interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14850. A bill to amend the act of September 13, 1962, authorizing the establishment of the Point Reyes National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 14852. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a visiting scientist and scholar program in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 14853. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 14854. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and improve the food service programs provided for children under such acts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 14855. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 14856. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the payment of a rehabilitation pension to certain persons released from Public Health Service hospitals after treatment for leprosy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14857. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 14858. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SISK, Mr. BARING, Mr. WOLD, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 14859. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself and Mr. LIPSCOMB):

H.R. 14860. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 14861. A bill to amend the Miller Act to preclude recoveries on prime contractors' bonds of extensions of credit irresponsibly made to subcontractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.J. Res. 986. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.J. Res. 987. Joint resolution extending for 4 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.J. Res. 988. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 989. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 990. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled a "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America" to permit the display of all-weather flags at night and without regard to weather conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 991. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Con. Res. 452. Concurrent Resolution condemning the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam and urging the President to initiate appropriate action for the purpose of insuring that American prisoners are accorded humane treatment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam complying with the requirements of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 710. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 711. Resolution urging the President to resubmit to the Senate for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first-use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H. Res. 712. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 713. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BROWN of California introduced a bill (H.R. 14862) for the relief of David Hernandez-Luna and Alicia Leon Guerrero de Hernandez, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

334. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Kadena-son Villagers' Rally for Immediate Withdrawal of B-52, Okinawa, relative to withdrawal of B-52 bombers from Okinawa, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## JAMES BATTLE: "WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA"

### HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 18, 1969*

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the House a very meritorious enterprise. James Battle, a student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, is author of a "What's Right With America" program there. Jim is a senior, an A-student, with a major in space and mechanical engineering. He is a member of the student senate at VPI.

His father, Laurie C. Battle, is known and respected by all the Members of this body and is presently the counsel and staff director of the House Committee on Rules. Laurie Battle distinguished himself as a Member of the Congress serving the people of the Birmingham area, whom it is now my pleasure to represent. He was author of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, better known as "the Battle Act." After 6 years of outstanding service to the then Ninth District of Alabama, he did not seek reelection to the House. He is well remembered with great appreciation by the people of my city.

As the newspaper article enclosed hereafter makes plain, Jim Battle is a student leader representative of the finest qualities of American manhood. It is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues this example of a fine son following in the footsteps of his distinguished father.

The article follows:

SGA SENATE VOTE SUPPORTS BATTLE'S "AMERICA" PROGRAM

(By Art Cover)

The Student Senate voted Tuesday night to support the program "What's Right with America" to be held November 18 on the Virginia Tech campus.

Senator Jim Battle spoke about the program stating that despite the fact that there are many things wrong with America, there also is "a lot our nation has to be proud of."

Battle did not give the exact details of the program for the rally because "its policy will be formally made at a committee meeting Thursday." The committee includes members of the sponsoring organizations. He did say that it would be "in contrast to aspects of the Moratorium demonstration," but would not be "pro-war."

The program tentatively planned includes a "one-half to one hour commentary" and will feature "students and faculty members presenting prepared speeches." Battle pointed out that he was not trying to hold an anti-anti-war demonstration; rather, that the purpose of the rally is to emphasize student belief that America has a lot to be proud of.

Battle emphasized that the supporters of the program did not want people to cut classes, as the supporters of the Moratorium requested students to do, but "to come whenever they can."

Before the beginning of the Senate meeting, Battle passed a petition to the members of the Senate, requesting them to sign it. The petition read as follows:

"The Student Senate, representing the student body of V.P.I., recognizes the great need for a proper perspective of the American scene. While being aware of our nation's problems, we must also recognize that our nation has much to be proud of. We there-