our support of the Ukrainian people, victims of Russian imperialism since 1920, when forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. We take this occasion as well, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the famine of 1933 during which 15 million Ukrainians lost their lives.

With deep dismay, we take note here of the current Soviet policy of mass arrests and the repression of cultural, religious, and intellectual expression in Ukraine. But at the same time, we may take heart in the courage and determination of the Ukrainian people not to let up in spirit in their quest for freedom. We honor Ukrainian independence today, and extend our friendship and support to these freedom-loving people.

THREE BROTHERS RECEIVE THEIR EAGLE SCOUT BADGES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to honor three extraordinary young men, R. Case Runolfson, Robert Runolfson, and Randall Runolfson, 4692 Boone Drive, Fremont, Calif.

In December of 1972, these three young men achieved the rank of Eagle Scout. It is quite an accomplishment for any young man to reach the rank of Eagle Scout, but for three brothers to achieve this goal at the same time is clearly an indication of character.

The rank of Eagle Scout is not easily reached. It requires a great deal of time, effort, and perseverance. These three Scouts were awarded their Eagle Badges in a Court of Honor held on Friday, December 8, 1972, in Fremont, Calif.

Not only do these boys deserve special recognition, but it is truly a tribute to their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Runolfson, and their scoutmaster, Mr. Jerry Nelson, who have given them support, guidance, and encouragement in their efforts to gain this most coveted award.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, January 30, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. O. H. Bertram, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, Toledo, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, Heavenly Father, there are times in our lives when we are not able to match the challenge and the problems that confront us with our own strength and mentality. In moments such as these we come to You, seeking guidance and assurance of Your counsel. We ask that You might grant to the Members of Congress direction for the great responsibilities in guiding our national affairs. There is always the danger that we may speak without thinking and make decisions without Your guidance. May all the discussions and decisions made in these hallowed walls reflect Your will.

We thank You for the peace which has been established. We are grateful for having guided our President, his representatives, and the Members of Congress in this longed-for achievement. May we ever seek to please You in order that we might be spared further conflict, not incurring Your wrath but Your favor. We ask this through Jesus Christ, our Savior. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 26) to amend section 1319 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to increase the limitation on the face amount of flood insurance coverage authorized to be outstanding.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Texas give us a little more detail as to what is proposed to be done?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for that purpose.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a resolution which would increase the aggregate limitation on flood insurance in force under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. It is extremely important that this resolution be taken up and passed immediately if any additional flood insurance is to be made available to the American public. I am informed by the Federal Insurance Administration that no new flood insurance policies will be available for purchase by the end of this week unless this resolution is passed to increase the amount of flood insurance available for purchase from $2.5 to $4 billion.

The flood insurance program was originally conceived as an experimental program. It was designed through the cooperative efforts of the best available technicians and experts within the Federal Establishment and the far-sighted segments of the private property insurance industry. Long years of study and analysis went into the preparation of the original Flood Insurance Act, but no one could be sure at the outset whether the program was really workable.

No one could predict the rate at which the program would take hold; no one could estimate the overall amount of insurance coverage which might be demanded. For this reason, we established an "initial program limitation"—the words of the statute—of $2.5 billion in order that we might see how the program developed and what it required.

The strong upsurge in interest in flood insurance has been phenomenal in recent months. Ordinarily, sales of flood insurance policies are low in the winter months; there is no immediate threat of flooding or of hurricanes. This year, the usual trend has been reversed; flood insurance policies are increasing at the rate of $200 million a month and show every indication of continuing at that rate or a greater one.

The increase from $2.5 billion to $4 billion which would be provided in the pending resolution should be sufficient to carry the program at least through the end of the current fiscal year on June 30. The increase is needed to permit the program to continue operations without disruption of the relationships between the Government, the National Flood Insurers Association, local property insurance agents and brokers, and prospective purchasers.

It is my understanding that the administration will be submitting a greatly expanded Federal flood insurance program shortly. It is the intention of the Committee on Banking and Currency to take up these recommendations and act to provide the greatly expanded flood insurance program for the public.

Mr. Speaker, under consent I have obtained I include here additional material on the Federal flood insurance program.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

FEDERAL FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT

The Federal Government provides financial assistance to the National Flood Insurance Program in two principal ways: (a) through appropriations for the expenses of conducting studies and surveys of flood-prone areas to delineate the areas having special flood hazards to determine the degree of risk and to pay HUD's administrative expenses; and (b) through premium-equalization payments which refund a portion of flood insurance losses and expenses to the flood insurance pool organized by the 100-member National Flood Insurers Association in proportion to the share of risk assumed by the Federal Government in establishing a chargeable rate for the insurance which is lower than the full-cost actuarial rate would be. There is also a catastrophe reinsurance agreement with the reinsurance pool for which an

actuarial reinsurance premium is charged and which may be called upon in years of extremely high losses. (No payments have been required under the reinsurance agreement).

From inception of the program through September 30, 1972, a total of $24,017,000 has been appropriated (net of unobligated funds returned to the Treasury in earlier years), of which $20,930,000 has been used for studies and surveys of flood-prone areas and $3,087,000 for HUD's administrative expenses.

A total of $6,676,000 has been borrowed from the Treasury to make premium-equalization payments in recognition of reduced chargeable rates for flood insurance coverage which are available to over 140,000 policyholders in 1,430 communities which have met land-used requirements for participation in the program.

All net proceeds from the insurance program over and above the statutorily authorized operating allowance (limited to 5% of policyholder premiums in any year) to the insurance companies which participate in the flood insurance pool are returned to the Treasury to be held for losses and expenses in future years. To date, funds returned to the Treasury or accrued to be held for future years aggregate $1,160,000.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 places an initial overall limitation on the program of $2.5 billion of flood insurance in force and outstanding at any one time. Largely as a result of increased sales of flood insurance following Tropical Storm Agnes in late June, the amount of insurance in force has increased at an average of about $175 million per month since September 1, 1972. Actuarial computations indicate that the present authorization of $2.5 billion may be exhausted within the next few days.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM: CONSOLIDATED CUMULATIVE STATEMENT OF SOURCES AND APPLICATION OF FUNDS, AUG. 1, 1968-SEPT. 30, 1972

[In thousands]

	Amount
SOURCES OF FUNDS	
1. Insurance premiums paid by policyholders	$16,380
2. Appropriations from U.S. Treasury (net):	
(a) For studies of flood-prone areas to delineate flood-hazard areas and to establish actuarial premium rates	20,930
(b) For Federal administrative expenses	3,087
Total	24,017
3. Borrowings from Treasury	6,676
4. Income from investment of insurance reserves	499
Total, sources of funds	47,572
APPLICATION OF FUNDS	
1. Payment of flood losses:	
(a) Loss payments	6,817
(b) Expenses of claim adjustment	787
Total	7,604
2. Expenses of selling and maintaining policies:	
(a) Agents' commissions	$2,569
(b) Servicing company expenses	3,665
(c) Related costs (State premium taxes)	269
Total	6,503
3. Insurance reserves:	
(a) Unpaid incurred losses and claims	3,415
(b) Unearned premium reserves	3,607
Total	7,022
4. Federal studies of flood-prone areas:	
(a) Completed studies	7,358
(b) Studies in process	5,779
(c) Funds available for studies	7,793
Total	20,930
5. Federal administrative expenses	3,087
6. Interest on Treasury borrowings	189
7. Operating allowances (profit) to NFIA	43
8. Reserves for future payments	2,194
Total, application of funds	47,572

INCREASE IN AGGREGATE LIMITATION

Section 1319 of the Natitonal Flood Insurance Act of 1968, entitled "Initial Program Limitation" provides that the face amount of flood insurance coverage outstanding and in force at any one time shall not exceed $2,500,000,000.

Reports from the National Flood Insurers Association, which administers the program under contract with the Federal Insurance Administration of HUD, show total insurance in force over the past seven months as:

[In millions]

June 30	$1,535
July 31	1,548
August 31	1,617
September 30	1,736
October 31	1,973
November 30	2,123
December 31 (estimate)	2,318

The slowing-down of policy sales during the winter months which usually occurs does not appear to have taken place this year. As recently as January 10, it was assumed that the present limitation would be adequate for operations well into February because of the anticipated seasonal slow-down.

The rate of increase over recent months has increased to approximately $200 million per month. The figure of $2.5 billion will accordingly be reached within the next few days.

The present law and the existing agreement with the NFIA requires that policy sales cease in order to avoid exceeding the statutory limitation. Unless Congressional action to increase the limitation of $2.5 billion is taken within the next few days, there will be no choice but to suspend the program.

The remarkable increase in the rate of flood insurance policy sales can be substantially attributed to public interest and concern following the devastating flood resulting from Hurricane Agnes last June, from a reduction in the price of flood insurance coverage initiated at about the same time, and from the increasing interest of banks and mortgage lending institutions in securing this flood insurance protection for properties upon which they place mortgages. As of January 1, it is a requirement that all FHA-insured mortgage loans on properties located in flood-prone areas carry Federal flood insurance; the Veterans Administration is expected to follow suit shortly.

Although the increase in interest in the flood insurance program has been largely concentrated in Eastern states because of the connection with Hurricane Agnes, substantial increases in participating communities and policies in force are seen in other areas: in Missouri, number of communities increased 118 percent between June and December and policies in force by 142 percent; in Illinois, communities are up 230 percent and policies up 278 percent; in Michigan, communities are up 350 percent and policies up 242 percent. (A table showing increases in each State will be available on Monday.) Nationwide, the increases are 120 percent for eligible communities and 131 percent in policies in force.

Since the National Flood Insurers Association writes flood insurance policies through a network of "servicing carriers" (generally one for each State) who in turn accept applications for flood insurance from all licensed property insurance agents and brokers, the disruption which would be caused by a stop order will be considerable, and the process of re-instituting the program correspondingly difficult.

EXHIBIT 7

RECORD BY MONTH

(December 15, 1972)

	Number of communities	Number of policies	Coverage (thousands)
January 1970	4	16	392.9
February 1970	6	50	1,181.9
March 1970	13	106	2,328.0
April 1970	23	666	11,846.8
May 1970	59	1980	29,088.3
June 1970	158	5,177	83,246.3
July 1970	199	13,646	217,351.3
August 1970	231	24,290	388,211.0
September 1970	288	39,545	640,726.1
October 1970	328	49,949	802,489.6
November 1970	365	52,333	840,926.7
December 1970	401	54,313	874,219.9
January 1971	434	56,401	901,512.0
February 1971	452	58,679	938,913.0
March 1971	511	62,050	988,315.0
April 1971	585	66,769	1,060,666.0
May 1971	618	72,135	1,134,934.0
June 1971	637	75,864	1,194,569.0
July 1971	664	73,697	1,167,581.0
August 1971	686	72,104	1,144,216.0
September 1971	711	72,982	1,160,834.0
October 1971	766	83,078	1,329,292.0
November 1971	824	86,240	1,380,683.0
December 1971	918	86,980	1,391,810.0
January 1972	971	88,484	1,414,840.0
February 1972	1,014	89,062	1,422,629.0
March 1972	1,098	89,285	1,425,126.0
April 1972	1,101	89,760	1,437,932.0
May 1972	1,134	92,590	1,484,621.0
June 1972	1,174	95,123	1,535,105.0
July 1972	1,192	94,617	1,548,109.0
August 1972	1,227	96,741	1,617,253.0
September 1972	1,267	102,245	1,736,429.0
October 1972	1,330	115,701	1,973,080.0
November 1972	1,372	125,007	2,122,903.0
December 1972 (1/10 est.)	1,430	136,686	2,317,942.0

An immediate increase in the over-all limitation on the National flood insurance is sorely needed at this time. I am informed by the Federal Insurance Administrator that the total amount of flood insurance in force has almost reached the present limitation of $2.5 billion established by the Flood Insurance Act, and that the program must be suspended within the next few days unless action is forthcoming by the Congress.

I am sure there are many in this body who share my opinion that financial protection against the damages wrought by floods is a prime necessity for many property owners. All of us are familiar with heartrending accounts of individuals who have scrimped and saved over the years in order to have a home or a business they can call their own, only to see those years of labor and dedication swept away overnight in a disastrous flood. Federal relief after a disaster, although welcome, can never substitute for the repayment of losses that is available through flood insurance. Disaster relief, even at its most generous, cannot begin to repay the tremendous physical and psychological losses which unfortunate flood victims suffer every year.

The bill before us would increase the aggregate limitation on the amount of insurance in force at any one time from $2.5 billion to $4.0 billion. I am assured that this increase has the approval of the President and the Office of Management and Budget; indeed, this is the same increase which would have been provided had last year's Housing bill become law.

Sales of new flood insurance policies have been increasing steadily week by week and month by month ever since the ravages dealt by Hurricane Agnes last June. During the

month of December 1972, over $200 million of flood insurance was placed on the books; the rate of increase in total policies has continued at almost $4.5 million a day during January. Unless the Congress takes prompt action, the National Flood Insurers Association will have to act to cease all policy sales, causing untold disruption and inconvenience.

I call for prompt action by this body to pass the pending bill and thus permit the continuation of the flood insurance effort.

The National Flood Insurance Program was first provided for by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Many members of this body were instrumental in the design and development of this legislation and have watched with justifiable pride as this fledgling program grew. The success of the flood insurance program—by no means assured, when we enacted the original legislation—has been such that an increase in the over-all size of the program is now justified and is now vital to the continuation of the program.

When we established the program in 1968, it represented a new and untried venture involving concepts of insurance and actuarial science, concepts of government-private organizational cooperation, concepts of local responsibility and Federal encouragement that were frankly untried and experimental. In that light, the Congress wisely placed an overall limitation upon the amount of insurance which could be in force and outstanding at any one time. The program really didn't get started until June of 1969, when the first communities were made eligible for coverage and the first policies sold. In the three and one-half years since, the program has expanded; improvements have been made; greater and greater numbers of communities have become eligible; and flood insurance policy sales have increased accordingly.

The total amount of flood insurance in force reached over $2.3 billion at the end of December. This record of accomplishment and of insurance protection for property owners exposed to flood losses is far beyond the expectations of those of us who assisted at the birth of this program.

I rise to add my strong endorsement to the pending bill to increase the aggregate limitation on flood insurance in force under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.

The flood insurance program was originally conceived as an experimental program. It was designed through the cooperative efforts of the best available technicians and experts within the Federal establishment and the far-sighted segments of the private property insurance industry. Long years of study and analysis went into the preparation of the original Flood Insurance Act, but no one could be sure at the outset whether the program was really workable. No one could predict the rate at which the program would take hold; no one could estimate the overall amount of insurance coverage which might be demanded. For this reason, we established an "initial program limitation" (the words of the statute) of $2.5 billion in order that we might see how the program developed and what it required.

The strong upsurge in interest in flood insurance has been phenomenal in recent months. Ordinarily, sales of flood insurance policies are low in the Winter months; there is no immediate threat of flooding or of hurricanes. This year, the usual trend has been reversed; flood insurance policies are increasing at the rate of $200 million a month and show every indication of continuing at that rate or a greater one.

The increase from $2.5 billion to $4.0 billion which would be provided in the pending resolution should be sufficient to carry the program at least through the end of the current fiscal year on June 30. The increase is needed to permit the program to continue operations without disruption of the relationships between the Government, the National Flood Insurers Association, local property insurance agents and brokers, and prospective purchasers.

Mr. Speaker, is that sufficient reply to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS)?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say $1 billion?

Mr. PATMAN. It would be from $2.5 billion, which is the present limitation, to increase that insurance coverage to $4 billion.

Mr. GROSS. To $4 billion?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does this have the sanction of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I have a letter here from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget which I include at this point in the RECORD:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1973.

Hon. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to your letter of January 18, 1973, proposing an increase in the statutory limitation on the amount of insurance in force under the National Flood Insurance program from $2.5 billion to $4 billion.

This is to advise you that there is no objection to your submitting this proposal to the Congress, and its enactment would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I urge the House to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 26 increasing the limitation on the amount of flood insurance coverage authorized to be outstanding.

It is essential that this limitation be raised at this time in order to meet the growing demand for flood insurance coverage. The damage caused by Hurricane Agnes has brought to the public's attention the vital need for broad participation in the flood insurance program.

This growing use and acceptance of the flood insurance program will strengthen the program by broadening its base and minimizing the risk of flood damage in those communities that are participating through improved land use controls.

I look forward to the continued success of this program and urge the House's support.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 26

Joint resolution to amend section 1319 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to increase the limitation on the face amount of flood insurance coverage authorized to be outstanding

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1319 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "$2,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000".

The Senate joint resolution 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.

UNKNOWN SOLDIER—VIETNAM

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to direct the Secretary of Defense to select and return to the United States the remains of an unknown serviceman killed in Vietnam who will be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery near the Unknown Soldiers of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. My bill would create a monument to all those American fighting men who are "missing in action" and those whose remains cannot be identified.

It is especially important to honor the unknown soldiers of this war. Never has a war been less popular with Americans, and never have the servicemen who fought for their country received so little support from their fellow citizens. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have returned with physical and emotional scars, often getting no thanks and some scorn from other Americans.

Whatever the justifications for, whatever the arguments against this war, one fact remains clear—over 45,000 American men made the supreme sacrifice for their country when they lost their lives in combat. Over 1,200 more Americans are missing. One of the hardest facts for a relative to live with is the knowledge that a soldier's body may never be found. The memorial to these men would cost very little. The crypts for the Unknown Soldiers of World War II and Korea cost only $18,000 each. Although costs have risen over the last 15 years, the expense will be a small price to pay compared to the vast amounts we have spent on this war.

I hope we can all join together—those who supported U.S. involvement and those who opposed it—to support this legislation as an expression of our appreciation for the sacrifices these men made.

WEEKLY EDITOR CARR SETTLE, GREAT JOURNALIST

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, no story of weekly journalism should ever be written without the name of Carr Settle.

To me, this gentle and good man typified everything good that can be said about this proud profession.

To Carr Settle, the publication of a weekly newspaper was more than just a means to a livelihood, it was an adventure in service and dedication. Few men have published weekly newspapers that were the equal of those he edited.

Publishing a weekly paper is a rather specialized profession, particularly in the days when Carr was most active. In those days it was a period of linotype metal, handset headlines, with words like cuts and stereotypes meaning a rather bulky piece of metal and/or wood to be fitted with precision into a steel chase.

Carr was a master workman.

He had pride in what he was doing. No newspaper he put out was thrown together, it had planning. He had courage and a fierce determination to make those communities where he lived a better place.

No man I have ever known lived up to that precept better.

It is not necessary for my purposes here to recount the numerous civic offices he held in Moore Haven and in Monticello. Suffice it to say that where a good citizen would have done his job by walking a hundred yards, Carr walked a mile.

I first met him when I ran for Congress 10 years ago. He had purchased the Monticello News in Monticello, Fla., by this time. Carr had been the editor of the Glades County Democrat and the Clewiston News prior to this time, beginning a legend in Florida journalism in south Florida before moving to a city in what was to be my congressional district.

I learned to respect this man when I had the opportunity to visit him at the newspaper. If time had permitted more visits I would have been the wiser in my own service, for Carr had a way of reducing things to the essentials.

He served as president of the Florida Press Association from 1954 to 1955 and those who know him have told me he was about the best loved man ever to hold that office. He served so many years on the board that it is hard to recount.

I remember when my administrative assistant served with Carr on that board and together they made and seconded the motions to combine the two press associations in Florida at that time, the dailies and the weeklies. Carr was a man of vision and whatever success the Florida Press Association ever achieves, Carr Settle will have to be given a tremendous share of the credit.

He married Florence Lou Flowers on April 3, 1932, and I have few friends who are as well mated. Theirs has been a wonderful life and Flo has made all that he tried to do worthwhile.

She is a brave and courageous lady in her own right. Those of us who know them, know that his marriage was Carr's greatest accomplishment.

They have been blessed with three children. They are Mrs. Fred Koonce of Baton Rouge, La., Mrs. Louis Getch, and Mrs. John Barrow of Monticello.

Five grandchildren have some proud grandparents.

Carr Settle is my friend.

I treasure that friendship and in my own way I wanted to pay tribute to him for what he has done for others.

They are never going to be able to write a book about great weekly journalists without a chapter on Carr.

For all those who had the opportunity to call him friend, we were richly rewarded and blessed.

REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THE REINVOLVEMENT OF AMERICAN FORCES IN FURTHER HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of introducing a bill requiring prior congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina. This is a companion bill to S. 578, introduced in the Senate by Senators FRANK CHURCH of Idaho and CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey.

This bill welcomes the cease-fire agreement recently signed by North Vietnam, South Vietnam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government—Vietcong—and the United States. It further states that no U.S. Government funds may be used to finance the reinvolvement of U.S. military forces in hostilities in, over, or from the shores of North or South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia, without prior, specific congressional approval. The bill will take effect following the 60-day period during which U.S. military forces will be removed, U.S. prisoners returned, and U.S. missing in action accounted for.

Mr. Speaker, the clear implication of the administration's announcement of a cease-fire was that American military involvement in this tragic war was over. President Nixon, in his nationwide address on Tuesday, January 23, referred to the agreement as one "to end the war and bring peace with honor to Vietnam and Southeast Asia." It seems to me that the American people can reasonably expect to be able to look forward to a complete end to American military involvement in Laos and Cambodia as well as North and South Vietnam. President Nixon has now won two successive elections on a pledge to end the war. This legislation would serve notice to all concerned that the Congress of the United States intends to help the President of the United States to keep that pledge.

With the signing of the agreement comes an end to any possible legal justification for the continuation of American military involvement in Indochina. The repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution left the President with only the vague power to protect American troops, but now that we are planning to effectuate their withdrawal from that area of the world, there is no further legal basis for the firing of one more rifle or the dropping of one more bomb. This war has taxed severely the credibility of the American constitutional system, whereby only Congress can declare war and whereby the Senate must pass on all treaties. This has not been a partisan matter, for both Democratic and Republican administrations have stretched the Constitution almost beyond shape in attempting to carry on a war without proper congressional approval. The reason our Founding Fathers included these constitutional requirements was not for window dressing and is not outmoded today; rather, the American experience in Indochina is a textbook example of the need to receive the approval of the popular branch of government before committing American forces to war.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by two recent newspaper reports in the Washington Evening Star and News. One quotes a South Vietnamese official as stating that the U.S. Government, meaning the executive, has given official and private assurances that the United States will intervene immediately if there are substantial cease-fire violations. The second shows that American bombers have continued bombing missions over Laos and Cambodia after the signing of the cease-fire agreement. Both these reports cause me deep apprehension, for both indicate the possibility that the war, in fact, is not over for the United States.

The American people are sick and tired of our involvement in Indochina, and well they may be. For a policy that was, at the very least, wildly misconceived, we Americans have paid dearly, both in lives and in money—56,237 killed through January 20, 1973; 303,622 wounded; and over $136 billion expended since 1950. And of course this does not begin to account for the pain, suffering, and discord this war has caused in this country and in the troubled nations of Indochina.

The American people want their sons home, and to stay. They reject the idea of further U.S. involvement. The recent Gallup poll, taken 2 days after President Nixon announced the cease-fire agreement, shows that, by a margin of 6 to 1, the American people oppose the sending of U.S. troops back to South Vietnam, even if, in the words of the survey, "North Vietnam does try to take over South Vietnam again." I sincerely hope that they can look to President Nixon for an effectuation of their desires. But as their representatives, we cannot also fail to pay heed to these desires. Nor can we be unmindful of the long, tortured history of the past decade, when countless promises of a quick end to our involvement have yielded little else but bitterness and regrets.

Accordingly, I introduce this bill to prevent the reincarnation of the American involvement in the Indochina war. Any further involvement will mean a new

war, requiring prior congressional approval. At that point the constitutional system will allow the representatives of the people to express the popular will once and for all.

OUR MUTUAL COMMITMENTS TO CULEBRA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker—

En el nombre del Padre que fizo toda cosa
Y en el de don Jesucristo, hijo de la Fermosa
Y del Espíritu Santo, que igual que ellos posa
Sobre un varón santo quiero hacer una prosa.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this distinguished Chamber in Spanish, as my first words on the floor of this House, to symbolize my deep feelings on this occasion. "The heart has its reasons which reason know nothing of" and I am addressing your hearts from my own.

The nature of the Puerto Rican society, its complexities, loyalties, contributions as well as its problems and tribulations can be appreciated best by identifying its crucial values. As was written 20 centuries ago, in a deeply religious and human sense, in the beginning was the Word. Fifteen centuries later, this hemisphere was discovered as part of a great Spanish quest. The Word was made flesh for us in Puerto Rico and for millions of other Americans throughout the New World in Spanish. Spanish continues to be the normal mode of expression in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and, God willing, it will remain so to the end of time.

I could not be truer to myself, Mr. Speaker, nor to the community for which I speak nor pay a higher historical tribute to this illustrious body than to open with an invocation in the language of discovery, of unity, and of Christianity.

I am proud to be here as the elected representative of the people of Puerto Rico, and I am deeply grateful to all of you, Mr. Speaker, for the unfailing help and courtesy which I have been accorded.

The fact that I am here today shows, in part, the wholehearted commitment of the people of Puerto Rico to the principles of representative democracy. I was chosen in a free, open election, last November, in which 85 percent of the total electorate of Puerto Rico—1,260,000 people—participated. Our party, the Popular Democratic Party, received more than 54 percent of the votes cast, defeated the ruling party, regained both houses of the legislature, and won all but six of the 78 municipalities.

I mention these facts not out of any sense of partisanship but to underscore the depth and vitality of Puerto Rico's commitment to the democratic process. The preamble of the constitution of our Commonwealth declares that:

The democratic system is fundamental to the life of the Puerto Rican Community.

I am happy to add that our present relationship rests upon the basic principle of self-determination. I wish to read further from that preamble, written 22 years ago:

We consider as determining factors in our life our citizenship of the United States of America and our aspiration continually to enrich our democratic heritage in the individual and collective enjoyment of its rights and privileges; our loyalty to the principles of the Federal Constitution; the coexistence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American Hemisphere; our fervor for education; our faith in justice; our devotion to the courageous, industrious, and peaceful way of life; our fidelity to individual human values above and beyond social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and our hope for a better world based on these principles.

Our democracy has roots that are deep in our history, and which have gained strength and vigor from the cross-fertilization of our institutions with those of the United States. For this, we are profoundly grateful.

I would be remiss if I failed to point out the sadness of the people of Puerto Rico on the deaths of the two great Presidents, Harry S Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson, whose departure we have mourned together in these last weeks. We also share relief and hopeful thanks for the cease-fire agreement recently achieved. Vietnam has been a seemingly endless and agonizing conflict. We are also grateful for the end of compulsory military service during peacetime.

These are historymaking events. It is with a sense of awe that we stand before an unwritten new page, sobered by the experiences of the past, saddened by the losses suffered, hopefully wiser as we face the future, firmly resolved to improve upon the present.

May I translate now, for the record, my Spanish words:

In the name of the Father from whence all blessings come
And of our Lord Jesus, his most beloved Son
And of the Holy Ghost, for together they stand
I shall address you briefly about a saintly man.

The saintly man of the original reference was St. Dominic, the founder of the devotion of the Rosary. Seven hundred years after Gonzalo de Berceo I have used his invocation to honor another saintly man of our times and land, Roberto Clemente. He was a baseball player, known and admired in San Juan and in Pittsburgh, a symbol of excellence in the world of sports. But rather than for his achievements in the ball park we revere him today for his own full measure of devotion to humanity.

His death came as a shock to all Puerto Ricans, for all were aware of his mission of love, had contributed to it, and shared in the goodwill for which it stood. The shock was specially intense because our people identified with Clemente's project their own traditional virtues of kindness, generosity, personal rapport with one's fellow men in sorrow and misfortune. When Clemente forgoes his home, his wife and children, the festivities of New Year's Eve to assist the victims of an earthquake in Managua, he is simply embodying in a heroic manner, our own basic sense of human solidarity with the needy and the destitute.

A black, a Puerto Rican, a minority member several times over, Clemente could have been resentful and hostile. But he chose to be self-denying, magnanimous and brave. Had he chosen the first road to self-expression we would have understood; for his choice of the second we take pride in him.

As the year was about to begin, Clemente's life ended, his body and those of his four companions lost forever in the mysteries of the sea around us, in a selfless effort to aid and assist suffering fellow men in Nicaragua.

It was a tragedy that helped all of us to reflect on the higher purposes of life and brought us nearer suffering mankind. In deaths such as that of Roberto Clemente all of us are ennobled and united not only as citizens, but more profoundly as human beings.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that we in Puerto Rico believe above all else in human values. The United States, which we know and which we cherish, was the first Nation in the world to make those values the keystone of its own existence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are all endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men. . . .

We have memorized these immortal words and taken them to heart. To our great distress these truths are deeply involved and challenged in a present and incredible conflict between the 700 inhabitants of the tiny Puerto Rican municipality of Culebra who wish to live and work in peace and the determination of the Navy of the United States to continue to use the offshore island for target practice for years and years to come long beyond all foreseeable future.

For many years, under various Governors, Puerto Rico has sought to persuade the United States to stop this senseless, inhumane target practice. Culebra is a tiny island. I have walked its perimeter—all the way around—in a few hours. It has one of the most beautiful beaches in the world, precisely where shooting is going on at this moment. People have lived in Culebra from time beyond memory. Seven hundred people—men, women, and children—try to go about their daily lives. Children go to school. They go to church. They pray. They vote. They suffer; they rejoice; they are sick; they are well; they marry; and they, like all other human beings, love their homes and their country. And almost daily the fierce, deafening impact of destruction rains from American war ships upon their little island, bringing fear to their hearts and destroying any hopes that they have of peace and tranquility and a normal life for themselves and their children.

The people of Puerto Rico are deeply loyal to our common values. We share the common defense. In every war in this century, Puerto Ricans have shed their blood along with their fellow citizens from the various States. We are subject to selective service. We have large numbers of volunteers. We accommodate large and important military establishments of the United States, occupying priceless acreage in our overcrowded island. We

have been proud to participate, to be of help to the Union of which we are a part.

And so, the governments of Puerto Rico sought for many years to reach an understanding with the Navy which would free Culebra and its people from the incredible terrors of being an area for naval target practice. We have sought to avoid forcing the issue, despite the increasing appeals of the people of Culebra and the bewildered demands of the people of the balance of Puerto Rico.

It was our hope that the problem could be worked out quietly, by agreement, so as to avoid any real difficulties for the Navy, and to avoid the possibility that the situation might become an international issue which the Communist nations might use as ammunition in their never-ending criticism of the United States and its relationship with Puerto Rico.

Finally—or so we thought—and understanding was reached. On January 11, 1971, the Defense Department and the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico entered into a written agreement. On April 1, 1971, the Defense Department transmitted to the Congress a report stating that all Navy Operations would be transferred away from Culebra by June 1975 and that the Secretary would announce by the end of 1972 where these operations would be transferred. This was confirmed to Governor Ferré of Puerto Rico by a communication from the Secretary of Defense on two occasions, the latest being November 4, 1972, two days before the election in which Governor Ferré was a candidate for reelection, an unsuccessful candidate as it turned out.

Then, to our amazement, despite these commitments, on December 26, 1972, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird announced that he was recommending to Congress that the Navy retain its training in the Culebra complex for the indefinite future and at least through 1985. In doing so, the Secretary of Defense changed radically and without justification his own explicit public statement and the definite promises and program outlined to the Congress in the Defense Department's report of April 1, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot adequately convey to you and the Members of this House the consternation and dismay that exist in Puerto Rico at this incredible turn of events. The people of Puerto Rico, under the wise and restrained leadership of successive Governors of the Commonwealth, had been patient and forbearing. They had received with relief and gratification the news that an agreement for withdrawal had been reached, even though withdrawal was not to be completed for several years. The shocking news of the reversal of position by the United States came with an impact as shattering as the shells that continue to fall on Culebra.

Mr. Speaker, in our joint history, there have been few, if any, instances of broken promises or commitments made and then withdrawn.

We cannot, we must not, allow this breach to continue. We cannot permit it, in the interests of both Puerto Rico and the United States. We must keep faith with the people of Culebra and of Puerto Rico. We cannot continue to allow the Navy to use this area, inhabited by citizens of Puerto Rico and the United States, as a target area forever. We cannot say to the world that the United States places the value of guns and training in the art of obliterating human life above the values of humanity and human life.

I wish to express my profound thanks to the many members of Congress who have joined the Puerto Rican community in its request for compliance with the previous agreement. Senator HOWARD BAKER has introduced a bill to require such compliance, and Senator HUMPHREY is joining him. I have introduced today an identical bill in the House of Representatives. It is an example of restraint, patience and brevity. I shall read it:

Be it enacted . . . That the Department of the Navy is directed to terminate all weapons range activities on the island of Culebra and within three nautical miles thereof not later than July 1, 1975. No funds appropriated by the Congress may be expended for the conduct of such activities after July 1, 1975.

I hope that the Congress will act speedily on these bills as tangible demonstration to all that the United States respects and defends the integrity of this small community; by so doing to its own self the United States is true.

I am ready now, to entertain questions.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I followed with interest the gentleman's remarks, having seen the notice he sent out with regard to this order that he had. I should like to say to him that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and for many years a member of the Real Estate Subcommittee, I am very familiar with the problem of Culebra to which he refers.

As a matter of fact, our committee several years ago, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) made a detailed study of the Culebran situation. We took certain action which required a very substantial adjustment in the kind of activity that was going on at Culebra, in making available to the people of Culebra virtually all of the island, with a relatively small exception. It was our understanding, as it was the gentleman's understanding, that there would be an announcement made this year, or I guess it was at the end of last year in December, as to where this new manmade island would be constructed for use by the Navy in place of the Culebra firing range.

Nobody has given to our committee any information on why the Department of Defense was not able or decided not to honor its agreement, as the gentleman has said; but presumably it was that a manmade island, which would really be effective in training our naval pilots and gunners, just did not work out. I do not know. Our committee, I think, ought to get this information.

However, I think the gentleman, while I can understand that this is a very emotional issue in Puerto Rico, ought to recognize that this House and this Congress and our committee have all in fact attempted to accomplish the kind of thing that he and the Government of Puerto Rico have been seeking to accomplish. Perhaps rather than trying to inflame the situation we ought to make a serious attempt to see what can be done, because I think it is in the gentleman's interest—certainly it is to Puerto Rico's interest—that we maintain a strong Navy, especially with the growth of Soviet naval and submarine activity in Cuba and the Caribbean.

As a matter of fact, with the termination of the war in Vietnam, all of the indications are that our military power in the future is going to be naval power primarily, rather than land power. I do not think that anybody wants to say that our Navy cannot practice, because if it cannot practice somewhere then we are not going to have a very good Navy.

Although the stories with respect to Culebra have sometimes sounded rather heart rending in the press, the fact of the matter is that with the arrangements under which we have been working over the past couple of years, following the action of the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee in the other body, we have eliminated the rather dangerous kind of activity that existed in the past.

I wonder if the gentleman could not perhaps comment on that point, because it does seem to me we are trying to work toward the same end.

Culebra is occupied by a very small number of people after all, and the idea that the Navy is out shooting at individual citizens just is not true. In fact there was some information presented to our committee that the real concern was not for the welfare of the citizens of Culebra but rather for a couple of fancy real estate developers up in New York City who wanted to come down and put up a few high-rise, high-income condominiums on Culebra. If we are talking about trying to save the lives of Culebran citizens, that is a highly important thing. But if we are only trying to make a few bucks for somebody who is speculating in real estate, that is an entirely different matter.

While I think the gentleman's special order is wholly appropriate, I do hope at the proper time we can sit down in hearings by our committee and work out something that will protect not only the interests of Puerto Rico but also the interests of the U.S. Navy.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the gentleman by saying that our position in Puerto Rico and the one I have been trying to express is a most moderate and restrained posture, even if now and then the tone of voice was a little more forceful than I normally use.

What we are talking about here are not the speculations of real estate agents or allegations and rumors. Rather, we

must focus on the unanimous feeling of the people of Puerto Rico. If there is one single issue on which the whole Puerto Rican community feels profoundly and intensely, it is the Culebran question. It is, frankly, remarkable how the government of Culebra and the government of Puerto Rico have been able to maintain normality and tranquility in spite of frequent provocations by professional anti-Americans and by many others who would love nothing better than for this matter to fester.

I certainly will be very happy to discuss this issue with the Armed Services Committees as well as with the executive agencies, and to clarify the whole matter as soon as possible. I have asked to meet with Mr. Laird, and it has been impossible. I have asked to see Mr. Richardson, and it has been impossible. I have asked for the secret report which presumably justifies the reversal of the decision, and I have with me a letter saying that it was impossible.

Under these circumstances I wish to answer the gentleman by saying that just a week ago there was a full town meeting at Culebra, where the mayor was trying to explain the situation, trying to clarify the efforts that have been made in this context. At this meeting he was yelled at, pushed, pulled, and accused of trying to avoid confronting the problem. He was asked:

> Assuming that nothing is done and that June 1975 comes and there is still shooting going on, what are you, Mr. Mayor, going to do?

The mayor answered, and properly so:

> In such an event I would go myself with all humility and stand in the face of the shells and of the guns.

I hope this House will note our forbearance. This period of postponement until July 1, 1975, is being defended at this moment, by the government of Puerto Rico and by myself. It is the purpose of this bill which I am sponsoring and which was introduced in the Senate by HOWARD BAKER, which allows this postponement.

Now, what we object to, not only for Puerto Rico but also for the United States whose interest we want to defend at this point, is for a responsible Secretary of the United States to make one commitment and to sign that commitment in front of everyone, to get the Governor of Puerto Rico to sign it, to get the President of the Puerto Rican Senate to sign it, 2 days before last November's election to reaffirm it, and then 6 weeks later without any explanation, to withdraw it.

That, the people of Puerto Rico, as honorable and as proud American citizens, cannot stand for. This is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not think there is any doubt about the fact, as he said, there has been a good deal of restraint on the part of the Government of Puerto Rico. I certainly would not defend the sequence of events in the Pentagon he has just referred to.

But, as I have already indicated, our committee, so far as I know, has received no information of a secret nature or otherwise with regard to why this change of plans was made. I certainly believe that information ought to be made available to our committee. If it is classified, then it cannot be made available generally; but I just want to assure the gentleman that this is a matter which has received attention by our committee and will continue to receive attention.

As one member of the committee, I think we have been trying to do the best for Culebra and at the same time the best we could for the Navy.

My interpretation of the Secretary's action is simply that the difficulties of trying to replace this range were greater than had been expected, probably budgetarily and otherwise, so there has had to be a deferral. But, this may not be quite so bad because, as the gentleman well knows, all of the discussion so far has been on Culebra. But what about Vieques?

I have myself—and perhaps other Members of this body have also stormed ashore at Vieques at one time or another in training exercises. The shelling that takes place on Vieques is, frankly, a lot worse in extent and variety than what occurs on Culebra. The residents on Vieques are a lot more numerous too, and most of them have been there a lot longer than they have been on Culebra.

So, even if we settle the Culebran situation tomorrow, we are going to have a Vieques problem after that. That is going to complicate further the Navy in its attempt to maintain realistic training procedures so that it can be effective against a Soviet Navy that is growing by leaps and bounds in the Caribbean.

So, all I want to say is that I intend to do all I can as a member of the committee to be helpful to Puerto Rico. But this is something that ought to be worked out within the committee and within the Congress, and in that effort our committee would welcome his help and his advice.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

He has made an eloquent case for remedying the situation on Vieques as well.

These may be the only two islands, inhabited islands, in the world which the U.S. Navy is shelling at present.

The Vieques program, however, I may add, is a separate problem, and we will deal with it separately, and hopefully with the cooperation and understanding of the gentleman and his committee.

I was born on Vieques, may I say, and I know and love that island also.

But we do not want to mix one thing with the other at this moment, except if the gentleman forces me to say that in both instances human beings are involved and the tranquility of people is in jeopardy.

I think it is selling American technology short to assume that we cannot utilize it effectively without impinging upon human rights.

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

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention, on the conclusion of the maiden speech of our distinguished colleague, the Resident Commissioner, to relate to my colleagues what a man of enormous commitment and concern and unique intellect the Resident Commissioner is, and what a joy it is to listen to and associate with such a decent human being. However, the Resident Commissioner's maiden speech renders the necessity of such a footnote essentially moot.

I believe it is safe to state that in my six terms in the House I have never heard, in a maiden speech a more magnificent and ringing declaration of faith in his fellow man, loyalty to this country of ours as well as to the people of Puerto Rico.

I am driven to note, my dear friend (Commissioner BENITEZ) that none of us could have done half as well, not only to provide this House with a thoughtful presentation of problems that currently exist in terms of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but even more than that, to have demonstrated superior oratorical and philosophical skill and commitment, as the gentleman has done on this day of his maiden speech.

For all of that and more I commend the gentleman in the well.

Mr. Speaker, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to the United States, DON JAIME BENITEZ, was elected on November 7, 1972, for a 4-year term. He is a Popular Democrat, a long-time educator, and a man of letters.

Mr. BENITEZ was born in Vieques, on October 29, 1908. He attended public schools in Puerto Rico, and received his university education in the mainland as follows: Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., bachelor of law, 1930, master of law, 1931; University of Chicago, master of arts, 1937.

Mr. BENITEZ served as instructor and associate professor of social and political science at the University of Puerto Rico from 1931 until 1942, when he was appointed chancellor of the university. He remained in that office until 1966, when under the terms of the new law for university reforms he was chosen president of the institution.

Mr. BENITEZ has also had a distinguished public career. He presided on the Committee on the Bill of Rights of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, 1951–52. He was a U.S. delegate to the University Convention in Utrecht in 1948, and was a member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO from 1948 until 1954 during which time he was delegated to the Convention in Paris in 1950, and in Havana, in 1952, Mr. BENITEZ also served as president of the National Association of State Universities in 1957 and 1958.

Resident Commissioner BENITEZ published volumes include: "The Concept of the Family in Roman and Common Law Jurisprudence," 1931; "Political and Philosophical Theories of Jose Ortega y Gasset," 1939; "Reflections on the President," 1950; "College Initiation and the Social Sciences," 1952; "The United States, Cuba, and Latin America," 1961; "By the Tower," 1963; "The University of the Future," 1964; "On the Cultural and Political Future of Puerto Rico," 1966; "Twenty-five Years of University Guid-

ance," 1967; "Crisis in the World and in Education," 1968. Mr. BENITEZ has also contributed extensively to well-known journals, on a variety of subjects, ranging from literary criticism to political and sociological analysis. Among these publications are: "La Torre"—"The Tower"—The University of Puerto Rico Literary Review; the "Revista de Occidente"—"Ocidental Review"—Madrid; "Sur"—"South"—Buenos Aires; and "The Saturday Review of Literature"—New York.

DON JAIME BENITEZ has received honorary degrees from a number of colleges and universities, including New York University, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Temple University, University of Miami, University of the West Indies at Kingston, Jamaica, Interamerican University at San German, Puerto Rico, and Catholic University at Ponce, Puerto Rico.

Mr. BENITEZ is the son of Mr. Luis Benitez and Mrs. Candida Rexach. He was married to the former Luz A. Martinez on August 15, 1941; they have three children, Clotilde, Jaime, and Margarita Inés.

Mr. BENITEZ. I thank the gentleman from California and say that his generosity is only commensurate with that of this House.

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

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate our very able colleague from Puerto Rico—and I am honored to say my close, personal friend—on his maiden speech and to officially welcome him to the House. I am especially gratified that Dr. BENITEZ has chosen the issue of Culebra as the primary subject of his maiden speech as very few other issues so forcefully describe the apparent indifference of the administration to the problems which confront not only the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico but Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking people throughout the country. I am pleased to join with DON JAIME in discussing this critical issue and, as he knows, I will address myself to it in greater detail in my special order which follows.

I believe our colleagues will be interested to know something of the Resident Commissioner's impressive background. A distinguished educator and political leader, Dr. JAIME BENITEZ is a graduate of Georgetown University from which he was also awarded a law degree. He has been awarded a graduate degree from the University of Chicago and has been the recipient of honorory degrees from Inter-American University, New York University, Fairleigh Dickinson University and Catholic University of Puerto Rico. Beginning as a professor of political science in 1931, JAIME eventually rose to become rector of the University of Puerto Rico and, in 1966, was named its first president. A prolific and accomplished writer, the Resident Commissioner is the author of numerous books, essays, and has made many contributions to learned journals. He has represented the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico at numerous international, hemispheric and national conferences. Further, he is a noted patron of the arts and under his direction the theatre department was established at the University of Puerto Rico.

His many years of dedicated and able service to the people of Puerto Rico were properly recognized when he was elected as the Commonwealth's Resident Commissioner to the United States. I am delighted to have him with us in the Congress and I am looking forward to working with him closely, both on the Education and Labor Committee, and elsewhere, on issues of concern and importance to the Puerto Rican community on the island and the mainland.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am particularly delighted that the Commissioner is going to be a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, because he is known as the "Father of Education" in Puerto Rico, and there is no man in this country who has done more to bring up the level of educational opportunities to poor people than Commissioner BENITEZ, and I am delighted to serve with him.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENITZ. I yield to the Delegate from the Virgin Islands.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished Resident Commissioner both for the eloquence of his statement and also the forcefulness of his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for bringing so eloquently to this body the problem of Culebra. As a neighbor of both Puerto Rico and Culebra, in the Virgin Islands, I am well aware of the problem in Culebra. As a young boy, in my youth, I worked on a finca in Culebra, and I am aware of the human element involved.

I commend the Resident Commissioner, also, for the responsibility of his approach, for the Resident Commissioner is only asking the Department of Defense to do what it said it would do in November of last year and then changed its mind within 6 weeks. I think it is the honorable thing for us to do.

What is involved here is our credibility in the Caribbean.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Resident Commissioner for his presentation.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice as forceably as possible in protest to the spectacle of the United States, the world's most powerful nation, continuously and senselessly terrorizing its own peaceful citizens on the Puerto Rican Island of Culebra by shelling, bombing, and strafing.

It staggers the mind that the military of this great Nation, with its might so recently and horribly unleashed against an Asian population, chooses to perpetuate an image of brutality in yet another part of the world.

The U.S. Navy, rejecting the free use of the neighboring and uninhabited island of Desecheo, stubbornly and callously elects to shell and bomb and strafe the island of Culebra, which is home to hundreds of helplessly protesting Americans.

I join my colleagues in a demand that the masters of the Pentagon move now to honor the commitments made in 1971 and 1972—to find an alternative site on which to practice their exercises for death and destruction. The island of Culebra and its hapless residents have borne the brunt of the Navy's games of terror for all too long.

THE CULEBRA SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to join with my colleague from Puerto Rico in bringing out the need for Congress to take action on the issue of Culebra.

For almost 37 years a small American community has been subjected to continued naval and aerial bombardment and the explosion of various types of mines, missiles, and other armaments in connection with testing and training activities of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. As part of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range, the 28-square-mile island of Culebra—located in the Caribbean approximately 20 miles east of Puerto Rico—has been increasingly bombed, strafed, and invaded by U.S. naval and military forces. Its approximately 850 inhabitants—U.S. citizens—live in a state of constant fear of their own lives and safety and the well-being of their homes, real property, and their livestock. The islanders are almost the virtual prisoners of the Navy and have been callously prevented from developing a viable or productive economy.

Many communities throughout the country welcome the presence of a military facility but, in the case of Culebra, there have not been the usual economic benefits associated with most military establishments. Until recently the Navy had not even seen fit to assign a Spanish-speaking officer to Culebra to serve as liaison with the islanders. A very small percentage of the island's work force is employed by the Navy. In fact, the Navy seems to have ignored the problems of the island or the aspirations of its citizens. For many years the Culebrans were not even permitted to enjoy a large number of their own beautiful beaches. An official Navy report revealed that Culebrans were not allowed to bury their dead in that part of the municipal cemetery which happened to lie in a safety zone. The same document reported that the Navy let a number of its bulldozers remain idle while there was a municipal construction project which could have used some assistance.

The economy of Culebra is seriously underdeveloped and its residents have certainly suffered economically from the continued naval presence. The annual per capita income has been estimated at $700—less than half that of the rest of Puerto Rico—and the adjusted unemployment rate is over 50 percent. There is no industry, little tourism—even though its beaches surely compete very favorably with those of any place in the world—and very few important commercial establishments. The Culebran economy has a real potential and, with proper planning and management, it

would certainly flourish in the absence of the continued military activity.

An especially tragic feature of this situation is the fact that an equitable solution appeared to be in sight. However, these hopes and aspirations have been cruelly and needlessly dashed by the Secretary of Defense and others in the military establishment. In January 1971, an agreement was reached between the Secretary of the Navy, officials of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the citizens of Culebra. This accord terminated an 18-month-long cold war which was continually marked by intimidation, deceit, and indifference on the part of the Navy and its representatives. This document—the Culebra Agreement—was almost universally interpreted as a commitment on the part of the Navy to take positive initiatives to find suitable alternatives to the Culebra test facility and to cease its firing and training operations on and about the island. Subsequent to the signing of this agreement, however, the Navy persisted in dragging its feet to identify appropriate alternatives to some other site. It persisted in its rather cavalier attitude and in its duplicity.

As an example, the Navy virtually ignored the findings of one of its own reports on the Culebra issue—prepared at Congress' direction under provisions of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1971—which identified six possible alternative locations. This document—"Culebra: Overview and Analysis, April 1, 1971"—clearly stated that—

An artificial island could be built in a number of places around Puerto Rico.

It further concluded that Culebra could be "replaced" for at most $50 million, the cost of constructing an artificial island.

As I reported to the House in 1971, the Navy study noted that the alternatives which had been identified made no substantial difference with respect to the operations in the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range area in terms of unit training, integrated training, readiness evaluation, and weapons training. Combined training operations would not suffer losses in capability if such training were transferred to an artificial island. Even though the Defense Department study revealed that an artificial island would have the ability to satisfy the Navy's minimum training and testing requirements, no moves were taken in this direction.

Further, this 1971, Culebra investigation reported that the uninhabited island of Desecheo, which the Government of Puerto Rico offered to the Navy gratis, would be of more than "sufficient size to serve as an impact area for NGFS—naval gunfire support—training."

Nevertheless, acting under another congressional mandate contained in the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1972 and in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Culebra Agreement, the Navy and Defense Departments undertook a further study of the Culebra situation. It appeared that, at long last, some positive initiatives were being taken to end the Navy's presence and to have its training moved to some other location. This sentiment—representing the sentiment of those involved in the Culebra negotiations and the understanding of the Puerto Rican people—was reinforced when former Secretary Laird, in announcing the initiation of this latest study on April 1, 1971, claimed that it was aimed at relocating the range after June 1975. There was a clear implication that the Secretary of Defense had concluded from his study of the situation and in consultation with the President and other administration officials, that the Navy could and should transfer its training operations away from Culebra by June 1975, and that he would make a final determination at the end of last year as to where the naval training activities could be transferred.

This understanding was confirmed on several occasions by DOD officials, both in writing and in testimony before congressional committees. As late as last November, for example, in a private message to former Governor Luis Ferré, Mr. Laird claimed that by the end of 1972, he would make a final decision as to where to relocate the naval training target areas now on Culebra and whether any additional actions should be taken.

Nonetheless, on December 26, Secretary Laird reversed his previous position by recommending to the Congress "that the Navy retain its training targets in the Culebra complex." Even in his letters to the chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees announcing his decision, Laird clearly stated that he intended that the study result in the transfer away from Culebra of the remaining Navy training operations. However, as it now stands, the Navy will not further study the matter until the early 1980's and it is anticipated by the Pentagon that training and bombing will continue on the island at least until 1985.

Mr. Speaker, by specifically directing the Defense and Navy Departments to study "all possible alternatives, geographical, and technological, to the training now taking place in the Culebra complex" and "to prepare a detailed feasibility study of the most advantageous alternative to the weapons training now being conducted in the Culebra complex and the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range," I believe the Congress has made it abundantly plain that we want to have the training on and bombing of Culebra stopped and to have these activities moved elsewhere. How much longer, Mr. Speaker, are we going to sit idly by and allow the will and sentiment of the Congress to be thwarted by a bunch of arm chair generals and admirals and their civilian cronies who simply want to play war games or practice military and naval tactics which, in the main, are obsolete at best? I am firmly convinced that no strategic military purpose is being served by the bombardment of Culebra and that the national security will not be affected one iota by transferring these questionable activities to another location.

As I have previously observed, it would be to the Navy's advantage to be able to build an artificial training facility as it could be constructed to the Navy's own specifications and requirements and would permit the use of more sophisticated weaponry rather than the somewhat outmoded types primarily in use on Culebra. In addition, expert testimony was presented before a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee 2 years ago that electronic firing and sighting could be implemented rather than the explosive ammunition now being utilized.

Of more overriding importance, however, is the human factor and the serious damage which the continued naval presence on Culebra is doing to our inter-American relations. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about an area inhabited by over 800 American citizens—men, women, and children who are simply trying to peacefully live their lives under the most trying of circumstances. Living, working, going to school, farming, fishing, and just relaxing are daily challenges.

As former Governor Ferré so aptly noted in a letter to President Nixon 2½ years ago:

Unless we can find a just and agreeable solution, our efforts to strengthen the ties between Puerto Rico and the mainland, to have Puerto Rico serve as a bridge of understanding to Latin America for the United States, will suffer a severe set-back.

Frankly, the attitude displayed by the U.S. Government toward the Culebra issue has seriously exacerbated already existing tensions in our hemispheric relations. Developing peoples in the Americas, as well as the vast majority of island and mainland Puerto Ricans, see this as an issue of colonialism. The continued bombings of the island and the ineptitude on the part of the administration in dealing with the matter has made Culebra a living symbol of this Government's indifference toward the needs and aspirations of Spanish-speaking people, both in the United States and in the American Republics.

The time for words is long past, Mr. Speaker, and it is incumbent upon the Congress to take affirmative steps to effectively resolve this problem once and for all. This is an issue which certainly goes beyond the narrow bounds of partisanship as both the former Governor and the present Governor of Puerto Rico, as well as all political factions in Puerto Rico, are in universal agreement that the Navy must cease its activities on Culebra, and remove its operations to another location. In addition, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), a Republican, has introduced legislation directing the Navy to terminate all weapons range activities on Culebra no later than July 1, 1975.

I am pleased to join in introducing in the House companion legislation to that sponsored in the other body by Senator BAKER and in the House by the distinguished Resident Commissioner, Dr. BENITEZ. I urge our colleagues to join in sponsoring this measure and in assuring that the Navy will in fact withdraw from Culebra at the earliest possible date. Because of the Defense Department's intransigence and its complete failure to abide by agreements negotiated in good faith by officials of the Puerto Rican Government, there is no alternative, but for the Congress to take the initiative to end this depressing chapter in the history of our relationship with Puerto Rico.

I wanted to reserve this time because I was present at the last Congress when we voted on the Military Construction Act of 1972 and I was present when it was said that there was no need for the Congress to take action in view of the agreement that had been entered into between the Defense Secretary and the Governor of Puerto Rico. Based on reliance on that agreement, we did not proceed to mandate what should be done.

It seems to me that this time when the military construction acts come before us we have a responsibility to act; that we can no longer rely on promises made by the Secretary of Defense or the President of the United States, because that opportunity was already given and we find such promises are not kept.

Therefore I rise to support the Resident Commissioner and specifically to answer my colleague from New York earlier during the colloquy to say that I insist we have public hearings on this subject at the earliest possible opportunity. We have to consider the legislation that is being proposed by the Resident Commissioner, which I support in full and am cosponsoring; and we have to take action so that the will of the Congress is incorporated into the legislation to insure that when the people of Puerto Rico read that a promise is being made they will know that a promise is going to be kept. The only way we can make sure the promises are kept is by having them be the promises of the Congress of the United States.

Therefore I want to say to you that we must specifically take action to see to it that the congressional mandate is not left as a matter of reliance on good will but that it is enacted into law.

For that reason I am here today strongly to support the initiative of the Resident Commissioner.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADILLO. I certainly yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join HERMAN BADILLO, my distinguished colleague from New York, in urging—as I did over 2 years ago—that the House of Representatives support legislation to require the U.S. Navy to end the bombing and strafing of a section of the tiny island of Culebra, part of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Not only have the citizens of Culebra—American citizens, by the way—suffered for 37 years under the nerve-shattering effects of supersonic booms, gunfire, rocket fire and heavy, low-flying air traffic, they have now been double-crossed by the Department of Defense in an underhanded and politically craven maneuver.

Early in 1971, then Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird announced that, in response to increasing pressure from the people of Culebra, a study was being undertaken to select a new firing range and to stop target practice on Culebra by June 1975. He promised to announce before the end of 1972 where the gunnery range would be relocated.

Right up to the Puerto Rican gubernatorial election last fall, Laird assured incumbent Gov. Luis A. Ferré that he stood by that commitment. However, when Ferré was defeated by challenger Rafael Hernandez Colon, whose political party is more closely alined with the mainland Democratic Party, that commitment suddenly ceased.

The Culebrans have now been told that the Navy plans to continue using their homeland for air gunnery and naval target practice until 1985 or later, despite Laird's earlier promise to get the Navy out by 1975.

It is obvious that Secretary Laird took the Navy's written agreement with the people of Culebra about as seriously as the U.S. Government historically has taken its treaties with the Indians. Such promises were made to be broken.

Department of Defense tactics have shifted from a written commitment to find alternative sites for its war games to a lukewarm promise to see "whether" and "if" alternatives can be found. Meanwhile, the bombing and shooting of land inhabited by American citizens—to their moral, physical, economic, ecological, and psychological harm—continues unabated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am no stranger to this sickening situation. The people of Culebra know that I have a special interest in the welfare of our brothers and sisters in the Caribbean and that I can communicate with Spanish-speaking peoples in their own tongue. I do not regard them as second-class citizens.

As I told this body almost 3 years ago, I unequivocally support the Culebran people in their efforts to regain control of their island and I am fully committed to assisting them by any legitimate means possible.

It was then that I met, and since have continued to meet, with representatives from the Puerto Rican community both in Washington and in New York, as well as with other U.S. Senators and Representatives who have expressed concern for Culebra. Other steps I took included making a written appeal to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, in his capacity as chairman of both the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Construction, urging him to hold hearings to investigate whether or not the Navy should be permitted any future use of Culebra as a weaponry testing site.

In 1970, I sent a representative from my New York office who is fluent in Spanish to personally reaffirm to then Governor Ferré my support for the Culebran people.

It is with this record of action and from this context that I rise again today to challenge you, my colleagues in the House, to join with Mr. BADILLO, me, and the other speakers here today, to demand that the Department of Defense honor its pledge to the Culebran people to end the slow and torturous destruction of their precious homeland.

The Navy's action—all too similar to the treatment this country accords other third world peoples—shows contempt for the rights, welfare, and even lives of those less powerful than ourselves. And in this case, we are talking about our own fellow Americans.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I want to take this opportunity to publicly recognize her contribution to the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Commissioner, you may not know it, but the person who was most responsible for seeing to it that Puerto Rico was included as a State under the benefits of the Higher Education Act of 1972 was the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM). She is a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Last year when the bill came up, Puerto Rico had been excluded from full participation in the benefits of the higher education programs, and it was her support, together with that of the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), which made it possible for us to get the necessary support in the committee so that Puerto Rico could be included as a State.

I know that you will particularly appreciate this, because you have been the one who has done the most to encourage higher education programs in Puerto Rico. These programs will be increased in the years to come, and the main reason for this has been the strong support that we have had from the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM). I think that you and the people of Puerto Rico should know of her contribution.

I am delighted that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) has joined with us today.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the colloquy that I had just a moment or so ago with the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, I would like to say that I just have been in touch with the staff of the Committee on Armed Services. I was disturbed that this material was not available. But I was assured by the staff that the study to which the Resident Commissioner refers is in the committee files. It is a study, but the chairman has made it clear that it is available to any Member of the House, and certainly it would be available to the Resident Commissioner. So I think that perhaps we can get the information that was referred to earlier.

The only requirement, of course, is that, with all classified documents, they have to be inspected in the committee rooms by the Member himself. They cannot be reproduced or taken out of the committee room. But I think this might go far toward solving the problem to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. BENITEZ. I would comment first by reading the letter I received from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. D. O. Cooke, on the date of January 22, 1973, in answer to a letter of mine requesting this information:

DEAR MR. BENITEZ: In your letter of January 18 to Secretary Laird, you request a copy of the Culebra study forwarded to the Chairman of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

This study, as you may know, is a classified document and, as such, does not serve the purposes you desire;—

The purpose I desired was reading it and studying it, as it appears in my letter:

However, it is currently under review for declassification and release. We will let you know the result of this review as soon as it is completed.

Sincerely,

D. O. COOKE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This was the communication to which I referred earlier.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman would yield to me futher, that is very true. What the Secretary is saying is one cannot get a copy of this document for his own use, because it is a classified study, but as a Member of the Congress the gentleman is entitled to see that document, to read it, and to study it. The only thing the gentleman cannot do is photostat it and give it to the newspapers, but I am sure the gentleman does not want that.

The fact of the matter is that the information is available. I have not seen it myself, but I am going to go over and look at it. I would urge that the gentleman study it and perhaps the reasons contained in it would help to solve some of the questions that have been raised.

Mr. BENITEZ. No, thank you very much. I am not interested in reading a secret document which nobody else can read except one representative of Puerto Rico, in which presumed secrets are divulged for those mysterious reasons why the Navy cannot act properly in compliance with its public commitments. If there were to be secret reasons, then there was no justification or propriety in making the public commitment. Those public commitments should be discussed publicly and not secretly. I do not have any desire to be bound by the secrecy of having to read some classified documents which will later preclude me from challenging the validity of the statements therein.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANGEL. I should like to take this opportunity to support my colleagues from New York who have tried to bring about some changes in this insane behavior on the part of our country and at the same time to share the same concerns that the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico has as a new Member of Congress.

I find it very difficult to be constantly referred to secret briefings and secret reports when most of us as Americans want to feel proud of what this country is involved in.

I would like to commend the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico for not wanting to look at secret documents about Culebra. There are so many areas with which we are concerned that affect our people, including the flow of narcotics into this country, which are handled through secret documents. We, as representatives of the people, ought to have access to such information. Somewhere along the line we are going to have to respond to world pressure as to what we should be and should not be doing.

Whether we are talking about the Pentagon papers or whether we are talking about briefings by representatives from the CIA, I think we as Members of Congress and more importantly as citizens of the United States have a responsibility to tell the people what role we have played historically involving our troops in Southeast Asia.

Now that treaty terms have been reached between the factions involved in part of the Indochina conflict, it is time we turned our attention to the war this Nation has waged against this Caribbean island since 1936.

The approximately 850 inhabitants of the 28-square-mile island of Culebra are American citizens. But this Nation's Department of the Navy has been allowed to deprive them of the fundamental right to the pursuit of liberty and happiness so eloquently lauded by our country's founders.

For every day, including Sundays, tons of shells, hundreds of high-powered bullets and sophisticated missiles crash into and around this island and explode with apocalytic fury.

Culebra, only 20 miles off the coast of Puerto Rico, has the ignoble distinction of being the target and testing range for the guns, mines, missiles, and other armaments of the Atlantic Fleet, despite the demands of the island's citizens that the Navy shift its activities elsehere.

But, despite their demands and those of the honorable Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico that this insane activity against a populated area be stopped, the Navy and Pentagon have not even seen fit to begin serious planning to move the testing and practice to an uninhabited area.

In normal Pentagon style, however, the Navy Department signed an agreement with the Puerto Rican and Culebran people in early 1971 which intimated that a serious effort would be made to find a new target site. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, late last year, then proceeded to ignore this agreement and the congressional mandates supporting it and announced that there would be no serious efforts at ending the Culebra shelling until at least 1985.

This was in the face of a congressional study that showed an artificial island could be built for the same purpose at a cost of $50 million. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues would agree that such an expenditure for a permanent, uninhabited target site would be much preferable to the loss of life that is a near-certainty if we continue our present course in Culebra.

It is my hope that our Navy is not so callous as to require human suffering as an ingredient to realistic testing and practice-use of its weapons systems.

President Nixon, too, has allowed himself to become a part of this tragedy. During a campaign speech, he promised that the shelling of Culebra would be brought to an end.

Even this promise appears to have been only lip service aimed at stopping the increasing cry to end all naval actions on this island.

The real justification for the vehemence of the protest is not simply the booming explosions or the possibility of danger to the island's inhabitants, but the real damage that has, and apparently will continue to occur to Culebra and its people at the hands of the Navy.

But the House Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Real Estate, in the 91st Congress, took sworn testimony of shells being dropped next to the Culebra City Hall, in the midst of swimming areas being used by Culebran children, and even next to a boat carrying the Governor of Puerto Rico.

While the Navy callously recommends that further development of Culebra be limited to avoid danger to even more citizens, the peaceful seagoing people of this island simply ask that the American Armed Forces remove their arrogant presence from the island. The kinds of accidental or international incidents reported by the island's people would have led to million-dollar law suits long ago, had they occurred on the continental United States.

There are even reports of Navy planes strafing fishing boats, probably with the same "just for the heck of it" glee that has characterized some of our aerial activity in Indochina.

For all of the booming shells and near disasters, still the people of Culebra exercise miraculous patience in their pleas to our President and to us in Congress to stop the bombing.

When Navy officials are questioned about the rationale behind this insensitive approach to target practice, they cite the need to find out exactly how their new guns, gunners, and missiles would work in combat situations.

Mr. Speaker, in God's name, how can we arbitrarily choose a peaceful Caribbean people to subject to "combat conditions?"

There is only one course for this Nation to follow with respect to Culebra, an immediate, total end to any military activities on this island and full reparations for any damages we have caused in this 36-year war.

For these reasons, I am supporting and recommending to my colleagues, the bill offered by the honorable Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico that would put an end, once and for all, to this madness. My hope is that this can become law before we are guilty of even more damage to yet another part of humanity.

I hope the majority of the Members of Congress will use their vote to say this is immoral and there should be no excuse for us to use people as guinea pigs to show how powerful we are militarily.

Mr. BADILLO. I think the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. BADILLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my efficient and honored colleague, the gentleman from New York.

I wish to express my sentiments and join those expressions which have been made prior by the other gentleman from New York and the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

I wish to say for the RECORD that when some of us made inquiry precisely concerning this question quite some time ago, we were left under the impression by the replies, verbally or otherwise,

which we received that this matter had been happily resolved. So it is with a great deal of disappointment that I find it necessary to get up and express my alarm and join with these other illustrious Members of the House.

I cannot conceive of any reason, in view of the prior answers, why this very bad practice persists and continues. I wish to assure the gentleman and my colleagues that I stand with him shoulder to shoulder in this matter.

Mr. BADILLO. I thank the gentleman from Texas very much. I am very grateful for his remarks.

What the gentleman has referred to is exactly the point we are trying to get across, that Members of Congress were led to believe a solution had been arrived at. For that reason we wanted to introduce this measure at the earliest possible moment so we could have public hearings and find out exactly what is happening, so that Congress might take action by enacting into law its position in order to avoid a repetition of exactly this kind of thing in the years to come.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, most Americans, concerned about the war and the rising cost of living, have not had time to note what is happening on the tiny island of Culebra, which belongs to Puerto Rico. Recent events there, however, dramatically illustrate our Nation's present heartless attitude toward small and powerless groups.

Fewer than 1,000 people live on Culebra, but it has been their home for generations. After World War II, to the dismay of its residents, the U.S. Navy started using Culebra as an artillery range, threatening the lives and emotional health of its people. Their constant protest finally led to a commitment in April 1971, that the Navy would relocate its firing range by the end of 1972. When that time came, however, Secretary of Defense Laird announced that—despite the promise to relocate—the target practice would not only continue until 1985, but would increase in volume. The citizens' indignation had made no impression on the Navy.

On the contrary, in the recent Puerto Rican elections the Navy openly supported the incumbent Governor, knowing he would not press for removal of the firing range. The Governor's Democratic opponent, Rafael Hernandez Colon, won the election by a landslide. Many eminent Puerto Ricans have joined him in his insistence that the U.S. Navy cease shelling the little island. A cattle breeder put the case simply:

> I am a member of the Independence Party, but I became a member only after the Navy burned down our chapel two years ago. Burned it twice.

Can we allow this arrogant disregard of other human beings, other American citizens, to continue? We must insist that the Congress give the Navy a clear mandate to pursue the construction of an alternate training site and a timetable in which to complete such action and withdraw from Culebra, and I am pleased to be a sponor of legislation introduced by Mr. BENITEZ which would terminate all weapons range activities on the island by July 1, 1975.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the cease-fire in Vietnam has brought, if nothing else, an end to the bombing by American planes in both the north and south of that country. But no cease-fire has yet been declared by the Defense Department in Culebra, a tiny bit of American territory which is part of Puerto Rico. For over 20 years, Culebra has been used by U.S. military forces as a gunnery range.

The 1,000 inhabitants of Culebra—all of whom are American citizens—were assured that the Navy would cease its use of the island for target practice by 1975. This was confirmed in an agreement signed that month between representatives of the DOD and of the island's inhabitants. Yet late last year—after the election which in Puerto Rico saw the Republican Party's local affiliate soundly defeated—the Secretary of Defense changed his mind. He announced that bombing in Culebra would continue until 1985 or later and at an increased volume.

Whatever the motivation for the change of course by the Defense Department, the new policy is pocked with a lack of honesty and a lack of sensitivity.

A certain callousness seems to have affected the judgment of our military leaders during the Vietnam tragedy. Its effects are often seen outside of Southeast Asia, as in Culebra. But the ending of American involvement in Vietnam should mean an end also to the old way of doing things. Culebra would be a fine place to start.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the problems faced by the citizens of a tiny island known as Culebra due to continued, unnecessary bombardment by the U.S. Navy, and to announce my support for legislation, which I am cosponsoring with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BADILLO) to cut off Navy firing on that island by July 1, 1975.

For more than 20 years, this small, 28-square-mile island just off the coast of Puerto Rico has suffered perhaps the most outrageously conceived bombardment in the annals of American history. It has been bombed, strafed, and invaded by U.S. naval and military forces conducting "tests" and "training maneuvers." The 750 inhabitants have lived in constant terror, fearing for their lives as well as the well-being of their property and livestock. Indeed, they have been virtual prisoners of the Navy, prevented from developing a viable economy, and prohibited from enjoying some of their own fine beaches.

In 1971, after an 18-month cold war marked by intimidation and deceit on the part of the Navy, an agreement was entered between the Secretary of Navy, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the citizens of Culebra under which the Navy was to take positive steps to find suitable alternatives to its Culebran test sites, and to cease firing and training operations on and near the small island.

The Navy has not lived up to that agreement. It has remained in the area, and its continued presence has been a threat and an affront to the people of Puerto Rico.

And the Navy plans to continue this affront. Only recently, the outgoing Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, recommended, in a report to the President, that the Navy maintain its training sites on Culebra and continue its bombardment. He suggested that the possibility of eliminating the "need" for these sites, and of finding alternative sites, be explored after 1985.

This is an outrage. Not only is it a continued affront to the people of Puerto Rico and a continued, unnecessary danger to 750 American citizens, but it is an insult to our Spanish-speaking citizens on the mainland United States as well.

There are millions of people of Puerto Rican descent in the American Spanish-speaking community. Most of these citizens are located here on the east coast.

Many of these Americans have very strong ties to their brethren in Puerto Rico. Because of these ties, they are heartsick at the inhumanity with which the U.S. Government is treating their brother citizens in Culebra.

They see that the military testing endangers the lives and property of their fellow citizens.

They see that this bombardment is an unnecessary encroachment upon peaceful American citizens who are simply attempting to live their lives—to work, to go to school, and to farm—under most trying circumstances which make mere relaxation a major daily challenge.

They see also that this Government has largely neglected the needs of its Puerto Rican citizenry over the years, and consider its actions in Culebra to be symbolic of this indifference to the needs and aspirations of Spanish-speaking Americans.

They see their brethren being treated like cattle—mere pawns in a silly war game—and they wonder what might be in store for them should the military claim a need for their homes—or even their lives—for some military "test."

Thus, quite understandably, this barbarous bombing and strafing, along with the Defense Department's duplicity in refusing to fulfill the terms of an agreement which it voluntarily entered, is seriously aggravating relations with the Spanish-speaking community.

Because of this and because no humane person could condone this activity, it is urgent that legislation ending the cruel bombardment of Culebra be enacted, and I urge all my colleagues to join Mr. BADILLO and myself in support of such a bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend and colleague from New York (Mr. BADILLO) in condemning the ill-considered decision of the former Secretary of Defense to have the Navy continue bombing the Puerto Rican Island of Culebra and to permit its use for naval training and testing until the 1980's.

Particularly unconscionable is the cruel hoax which was perpetrated by the Navy and Secretary Laird in leading the Culebrans, officials of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and even Congress to believe that serious efforts were being made to transfer the naval training and bombing activities to some other location. It

was only at the very last minute—in a clearly politically motivated move—that the Navy would continue using the island well into the next decade. This move is in complete violation of the letter and spirit of an agreement signed 2 years ago by former Navy Secretary Chafee with Culebran and Puerto Rican officials.

As a member of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee in the 92d Congress, I know what a disastrous affect the Culebran issue has had on our already questionable Latin American policy and frequently strained relations with our hemispheric neighbors. The Navy's obvious indifference to the plight of the Culebrans and the continued bombing of this small island is interpreted as another act of colonialism and the suppression of the self-determination of a Latin people.

Furthermore, the continuing bombardments and refusal of the Navy to leave seriously aggravates relations with minority communities in this country as Culebra is considered as simply one more example of the Government's apathy toward the needs and aspirations of minorities, especially our Spanish-speaking brothers.

In 1971, and again in 1972, Congress enacted legislation directing the Defense Department to take certain specific action aimed at locating possible alternatives to Culebra. Clearly Congress intended—and certainly continues to propose—that the Navy transfer its operations in the Culebra complex of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range to some other location.

I understand that a number of perfectly acceptable alternatives, including the construction of an artificial island, have already been identified. Congress was thus directing Secretary Laird to provide detailed information on the best alternative. Most everyone assumed that this would be done and that Secretary Laird would comply with his own previously announced commitment to transfer naval training operations away from Culebra by June 1975.

Tragically this was not the case.

Secretary Laird instead chose to reverse himself and renege on a formal commitment made by the U.S. Government to the people of Puerto Rico.

I, for one, cannot and will not tolerate such deceit by a Government official and do not consider this decision as legitimate. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, which has immediate jurisdiction in this matter, I intend to exert all possible efforts to insure that the commitment is fully honored and that meaningful action is immediately undertaken by the Navy to transfer its activities out of Culebra at the earliest possible date but in no case later than 1975.

I commend Mr. BADILLO and our distinguished new colleague from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ) for bringing this critical issue to our attention and I urge others in this body to join with them in exerting all necessary pressure on the Defense and Navy Departments to reverse Secretary Laird's misdirected and poorly conceived decision.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN ORVAL HANSEN OF IDAHO INTRODUCES MANPOWER TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 3272, the Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1973 for the purpose of consolidating the many existing manpower programs, and building upon the solid accomplishments of the manpower foundation created by the Congress in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

With minor modification, the bill I introduce today is similar to one I introduced in May of 1971, the Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1971. At that time, the MDTA faced an impending expiration date with no adequate legislative substitute. Congress in its wisdom extended the MDTA to assure that the Nation's unemployed citizens would receive the education and training needed for employment.

Once again, I point out to my colleagues that the MDTA expires in less than 6 months, on June 30, 1973. Now is the time for definitive action on our part to assure the continuation of needed manpower programs for the unemployed. This is my primary purpose in bringing this matter before you today. We need manpower legislation that will not destroy the vast manpower education and training resources and effective network of relationships established by the Congress under the MDTA.

I am aware that there are "styles" in legislation, as well as in other facets of our lives. Throughout all of its amending processes the MDTA received the almost unanimous approval of both Houses of the Congress. It was considered to be an essential and beneficial program, one which extended the hand of opportunity to unemployed adults who wanted to help themselves. Through my years in this House I have supported the MDTA and its programs. I know what they have meant to many citizens of my State who wanted to become economically self-sufficient, and could do so because MDTA made possible the necessary education and training.

From the recent spate of official and unofficial surveys, studies and pronouncements concerning our manpower programs one might conclude that manpower programs are now going out of "style," that they are no longer needed although the needs they address remain. Through the diligent efforts of the present administration the rate of unemployment is steadily declining. Nonetheless, an unemployment rate of 5.2 percent for the month of December 1972 represents some 4.5 million jobless, many of them returning Vietnam veterans. Training is not the only solution to our manpower and unemployment problems; training, however, is and must remain an important facet of our total manpower policy—at least until the unlikely day when the total output from our Nation's public and private schools meshes perfectly with the job market.

My bill, the Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1973, strongly reflects the principles of revenue sharing and decentralization as advocated by the administration. In it, the responsibility for program decisions rests in the hands of those who know best what the problems are and what the solutions should be—elected officials and local program administrators. The manpower and employment problems of my State of Idaho are distinctly different from those of some of our eastern seaboard States, for example; and, I think the citizens of Idaho know best how to solve them. My bill would return this responsibility to them, and strengthen their capability to effectively administer manpower programs.

Another major facet of my bill is the continuation of a significant role for the public school systems in our Nation's manpower programs. Under the existing MDTA, strong and very beneficial relationships have been developed between the education community and manpower and other human resources agencies. These relationships were facilitated because the MDTA directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to arrange the needed education and training giving priority to training by the Nation's public school systems. Educators and business and industry have long needed to step up their dialog, and MDTA gave impetus to this with resulting benefits in more relevant and effective education and training programs. This dialog between the worlds of education and the work place must continue and expand. The Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1973 would assure the continuation of an effective role for the Nation's public schools in the national manpower program by vesting them with statutory responsibility for this function.

At their meeting in Chicago on December 6, the House of Delegates of the American Vocational Association adopted some of the most far-reaching resolutions pertaining to education and training and manpower. One, entitled "Public Education and the National Manpower Program" states succinctly the contributions of the Nation's public schools to the manpower program, and sets forth an ideal for comprehensive manpower legislation. I would like to share it with you.

RESOLUTION: PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL MANPOWER PROGRAM

Whereas, effective education and training programs are a vital component of the Nation's manpower program and assist citizens

to acquire the education and skills needed for employment and upgrading their skills; and

Whereas, in a knowledge-based society such as the United States which is characterized by changing expectations regarding work and its place in human life, education for work must include cognitive and affective skills as well as the psychomotor learnings traditionally associated with skill acquisition; and

Whereas, in institutional training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the public education systems have demonstrated their capacity and commitment to serve a broader range of educational needs with such capability evidenced by the manpower training skills centers which are now helping disadvantaged youth and adults throughout the United States to acquire the education and skills needed for employment; and

Whereas, institutional training programs administered by the public school systems have served over 1.2 million trainees since 1962 and such programs are found by independent evaluation to be the most effective component of the national manpower program in terms of placement, post-training attachment to the labor force, and in increased earnings; and

Whereas, a study by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States has supported the value of training conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act; and

Whereas, the education systems of the United States are the only publicly-created institutions that touch the lives of all citizens and thereby have the potential to be the key institution in the community for the provision of human services and the fulcrum for social change; and

Whereas, institutional change relative to occupational and career preparation has been accelerated by the involvement of state and local public education agencies in programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act; and

Whereas, the Manpower Development and Training Act is scheduled to expire on 30 June 1973,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the American vocational Association support manpower legislation in the 93rd Congress that will acknowledge these findings and include a definitive and responsible statutory role for state and local public education and training agencies in the planning and administration of education and training programs required in the national manpower programs; and, which will assure a continuity of involvement of the appropriate federal human resources agency having primary responsibility for education at the fedreal level; and

Be it further resolved, that such manpower legislation shall be comprehensive in nature and shall include but not be limited to:

1. The equitable involvement and participation of those citizens who are least competitive in the labor market due to discriminatory practices, lack of education and training skills required for employment, and linguistic and other cultural barriers.

2. A strong national program of job development in public service employment as a component of the national manpower program. Such program should provide the appropriate education and training to enable participants to compete effectively in state and local merit systems.

3. A correctional rehabilitation program that will provide alternatives to incarceration for first offenders; an effective training program for inmates of correctional institutions in jobs that are relevant to the labor market; and, support and assistance after sentencing or incarceration.

4. A revitalized and expended Neighborhood Youth Corps program under the aegis of the local public school systems that would provide job relevant education and training, in addition to the income maintenance required to assist youth to remain in school.

5. Assurances of appropriate judicial review by all affected program participants, to include appeal to the appropriate federal responsibility, and, if necessary, through the United States court system.

I want to conclude my remarks by underscoring to my colleagues the necessity of early action on manpower legislation in this 93d Congress. The Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1973 would build upon the structures which have been effectively operating for the past 10 years and which have provided some 1.2 million people with the education and skills they needed for employment. I advocate the changes reflected in the Manpower Training and Employment Act of 1973, and commend the measure to your consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks, a brief analysis of the major provisions of H.R. 3272.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Section 2 sets forth the basic purposes of the act—to provide occupational training to unemployed and underemployed individuals, to assist in the relief of skills shortages both in critical and in emerging occupations.

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT, AND EVALUATION

Title I establishes the National Manpower Advisory Council, and directs the Council to prepare an annual report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, research, utilization, training and evaluation; it further sets forth provisions for evaluation, information, and research programs and for training and technical assistance.

TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Title II describes the various manpower training services, and activities that may be conducted with assistance under this act, including the Job Corps under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It further sets forth the requirements for State participation under the act, including the establishment of State manpower advisory councils; provides for a comprehensive manpower planning system at the State level; establishes State apportionment of benefits; describes participant eligibility and allowance payments; and, sets forth the responsibilities of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor.

LABOR MARKET INFORMATION AND EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Title III establishes a labor market information and job-matching program; career and employment development programs in both public and private agencies; career training through public service employment with public and private nonprofit agencies; and, an emergency employment assistance program to provide relief to designated job-distressed areas.

MISCELLANEOUS

Title IV contains provisions relating to the authority of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into contracts, arrangements, or agreements to carry out the purposes of the act; maintenance of State effort for vocational education; appropriations, advance funding, limitation on the use of appropriated funds; acceptance of voluntary services; and, the effective and termination dates of the act.

THE SMALL COMMUNITIES PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND TRAINING ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill entitled "The Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1973." I am very pleased that a number of my colleagues, LEE HAMILTON, JOSEPH M. McDADE, CHARLES THONE, HENRY HELSTOSKI, DON FUQUA, KEN HECHLER, FRANK CLARK, JAMES ABDNOR, WILLIAM LEHMAN, WALTER FLOWERS, and JAMES G. O'HARA, are joining with me as cosponsors of this proposal. This bill was originally introduced early in 1972.

It was designed to build upon and complement the legislative recommendations contained in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1971, which was pending at that time. Most of what I proposed at that time, and am now reintroducing, was included in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972 which was reported to the House by the Committee on Banking and Currency late in the last session of Congress.

The committee's bill represented the fruit of nearly a year's intensive study and analysis by the Subcommittee on Housing. The chairman and members of that subcommittee, led by our colleagues, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, LENOR K. SULLIVAN, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, and WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, did a thoroughly commendable job with that bill. Their comprehensive and objective study of Federal community development and housing production efforts resulted in a bill with the potential to significantly improve the quality of housing and urban environment in both small and large communities.

Since first coming to the Congress in 1969, the highest priority in my efforts for my district and the Nation has been working for the development of a growth policy that would fulfill the needs of a region experiencing rapid social and economic change.

In 1971–72 I conducted hearings in the First Congressional District of Arkansas to determine, from the people who are on the scene and deal with the problems every day, what type of Government assistance was needed in order to accomplish this objective. Pinpointed was the need for funds or credit for financing improvements in health care, housing, education, job opportunities, public services, recreational resources and other public works projects—areas with which, I believe, most other nonmetropolitan regions also need assistance.

The Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1973 is designed to respond to these needs of small communities and urbanizing areas outside our metropolitan areas. My bill recognizes, as does the Housing Subcommittee, that the difficulties plaguing the large cities and those of the countryside are interrelated. When residents have a nonmetropolitan area and migrate to a

city in search of economic survival and are ill-equipped for that labor market they become an additional tax burden to the city.

If we fail to encourage growth and revitalization of our small towns, we will be unable to slow the continuing migration of their residents—and their problems—to large urban centers. We will be unable to achieve the balanced growth which is essential to the environmental, economic, and social health of the entire Nation.

The proposals contained in the Small Communities Planning, Development and Training Act of 1973 can be enacted separately or incorporated into the omnibus housing and urban development bill which the Housing Subcommittee is expected to report. I urge the subcommittee to, again, give careful and sympathetic consideration to these proposals.

My bill is intended to increase our recognition and understanding of the severity of problems of our people in the nonmetropolitan areas—problems that are often rendered invisible by the glare of the publicity cast on the difficulties of our large cities. The troubles of the cities cannot be minimized. A large majority of our population grows increasingly crowded into small areas of our land. Each year over half a million more Americans migrate from nonmetropolitan to metropolitan areas.

In fact, however, the problems of the communities of the countryside are not unlike those of the metropolitan areas. They are extremely severe and are worsening.

During the past 50 years there have been important national population changes with far-reaching effects. Since 1920, while the national population has almost doubled, the urban population has almost tripled. While the nonmetropolitan areas have not shared the population increases, today about 30 percent of the Nation's people live in nonmetropolitan areas. The composition of this group of citizens has changed significantly: the proportion of farmers has decreased substantially and the numbers of unemployed and underemployed, the weak, and the old have increased sharply. The decades of country-to-city migration have left nonmetropolitan areas with long-term problems of a critical nature.

In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee during the 92d Congress, representatives of the Coalition for Rural America gave this description of what the present pattern of national urbanization has left in its wake:

> One half of our rural citizens live in poverty; 60 per cent of the nation's inadequate housing is found outside the major metropolitan areas; 30,000 rural communities lack adequate water systems and more than 45,000 have no sewer systems at all; the infant mortality rate in rural areas exceeds the national average by 20 percent, and for nonwhite infants it is almost twice as high.

This lack of basic modern facilities and amenities directly affects the health of nonmetropolitan residents. It encourages the young to leave and it adversely affects efforts to achieve the balanced economic development of our country which could aid us in protecting our living environment.

Title I of the Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act provides for the establishment of a Community Development Bank. The bank would be a Federal corporate agency raising its funds through the sale of taxable obligations in the credit market and lending those funds at a lower-than-market rate to States, counties, cities, towns, and other public bodies. My bill—in section 105(d)—would direct the bank to give preference to the processing of loan applications to applications of communities with populations of less than 50,000. Because their obligations are unrated by the security-rating services or because their borrowings are in small amount, these communities most often bear the high interest rates required by private investors.

As a result, they find it most difficult to provide the facilities needed to accommodate present and future community needs. A preference for nonmetropolitan area communities would direct the bank's activities into the area of most critical need in the field of municipal finance.

My bill recognizes that in nonmetropolitan areas nonprofit groups are often empowered to undertake what are essentially public facility projects. Section 105(a)(2) of the bill makes such nonprofit groups eligible for the bank's loan assistance.

Title II of the bill would amend the public facility loan program, which has been administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to enable this program to more effectively serve the needs of nonmetropolitan communities in financing essential public facilities.

This title of the bill would not be necessary if the bank proposal, containing a small community preference, is enacted. I realize, however, that the bank has, in the past, faced formidable opposition—unfortunately from some of the groups it is intended to benefit. If the Community Development Bank is not established, a modified public facility loan program would certainly be a necessity.

The present public facility loan program, which the administration is attempting to curtail, has operated at a $40 million program level. The authority for the program is broad enough to allow for public facilities of all kinds, including water and sewer facilities, health care facilities, recreation facilities, gas utilities, and city streets and county roads. HUD has, in the past, estimated that the application demand for public facility loans for small communities would be more than triple the amount of funds available. This is despite the fact that the interest rate for loans, set by HUD Secretary, has been 5⅞ percent. Under the existing program, interest rates on loans are set by statute at one-half of 1 percent above the average rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the Federal Government comprising the public debt, or 3 percent, whichever is higher.

I propose to amend the public facility loan program to give nonmetropolitan communities an alternative method of financing which would result in lower interest costs to them, at a very small loss to the Federal Government. Except in periods of tight money, most municipalities can get loans for public facilities in the tax-exempt money market at a lower rate of interest than the statutory lending rate used in the existing program. As a result, most of the program activity is with small municipalities in the South and Southwest which are outside most principal money markets, or whose projects and financing prospects are marginal. Furthermore, Federal direct lending programs are strongly opposed by the Treasury, and it is doubtful that a higher program level can be obtained.

In 1970, however, housing legislation contained an alternative financing mechanism for public bodies sponsoring new community projects which I feel can be of great benefit to nonmetropolitan communities wishing to use the public facility loan program. Under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development guarantees the taxable obligations of State and local public bodies issued to finance new community projects, and makes grants to those bodies to cover the difference between the interest rate on the taxable obligations and the interest rate which the obligations would bear if they were tax-exempt obligations.

My bill would provide this new method of financing as an alternative to direct loans in the public facility loan program, with one modification. Under title II, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would simply make grants to cover 40 percent of the interest cost on the community's taxable obligation. The reason for this change is that the job of estimating the difference between the taxable and tax-exempt rate is simply too much of an administrative burden, especially in the case of nonmetropolitan communities. This alternative method of financing would make the program more broadly available to small communities throughout the country, reduce interest rates for those communities willing to issue taxable obligations, and stem part of the loss to the Treasury that is involved in tax-exempt financing and that is increasingly alleged as an inefficient subsidy to public borrowers.

The total amount of borrowing guaranteed by HUD could not exceed $200 million. If the interest rate on this $200 million of nonmetropolitan community obligations averaged 7½ percent, the total interest payable would be $15 million. HUD would pay 40 percent of these interest charges, or $6 million. Thus, for the sum of $6 million, HUD could finance $200 million worth of public facility projects. And, the total interest paid on the $200 million—$15 million—would be taxable by the Federal Government.

Title III of the bill incorporates the entire community development block grant program which was proposed by the House subcommittee in the 92d Congress, with slight modification. It would attempt to assure that $500 million be provided annually for nonmetropolitan areas in the form of block grant funds

and that this money would be distributed with due consideration given to the needs and wishes of people and groups most directly involved in rebuilding communities in the nonmetropolitan areas.

My bill would direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take into account locally developed plans and ideas for community development programs, and to utilize, whenever possible, program administration advice from interested local individuals, groups, and organizations with demonstrated competence in planning and carrying out development programs in nonmetropolitan communities.

Title IV of the bill provides for the establishment of a National Community Affairs Institute that would be comparable in purpose and activity to the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. Since its beginning in 1968, the Urban Institute has fulfilled the high expectations held out for it as an urban research and development institute of the first order. Already the institute has rewarded the confidence of those who supported its founding by developing a program of studies and activities of direct revelance to the solution of many urban problems.

The Institute's research efforts, for example, have included the development of "urban indicators" that would allow us, over a period of time, to monitor the vital signs of city condition in respect to housing, poverty, education, health, transportation, recreation, economic developments, and other matters. In addition, the Institute has done research in the areas of income maintenance programing and an analysis of the "exploitation thesis" of metropolitanwide maldistribution tax burdens and public benefits.

The National Community Affairs Institute proposed in title IV of the bill would mobilize this kind of research and evaluative capability for the solution of similar problems affecting nonmetropolitan communities. The Institute would study new and improved modes of governmental service financing, the process of urbanization of countryside areas, structures, and processes and adaptation to rapid technological and economic development, citizen group participation in the community development process, and much more. In addition, the Institute would provide technical assistance to small communities to help develop strategies for the solution of general and specific problems. Finally, it would provide timely, independent, and continuing evaluation of Federal, State, local and private programs aimed at meeting the problems of nonmetropolitan communities.

Like its urban counterpart, the Institute would be supported by contracts with and grants from Federal agencies and private organizations, and could contract with public and private bodies for services and studies meeting mutual needs.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take all steps necessary to provide for the establishment of the Institute, utilizing the broad research and development authority contained in existing law. The Secretary would have the flexibility to establish the Institute in any manner he deemed appropriate, with one exception: The Director of the Library of Congress would serve as chairman of the new Institute's board of directors. The purpose here is to assure that the Institute will be responsive to the Congress in legislating for nonmetropolitan communities.

Title V of the Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1973 provides for a fellowship program for the training of professionals and other specialists in the broad fields of planning and development of communities in nonmetropolitan areas. The existing urban studies fellowship program, authorized by the Housing Act of 1964, would be amended to add this new program.

Under the urban studies fellowship program, about 100 fellowships are awarded each year by the HUD Secretary for the training of professionals in various fields of urban studies. Stipends and allowances for up to two dependents are permitted. Tuition and fees are paid directly to the institutions by HUD. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be authorized to provide these additional fellowships—a number at least equal to the urban studies fellowships—for training in planning and development for nonmetropolitan communities upon the recommendation of the board of directors of the National Community Affairs Institute which would be established by title IV of this bill.

I believe provisions of my bill would enable many communities in nonmetropolitan areas to begin solving both their immediate and long-term problems. I urge all Members of the House to support the bill.

SUPREME COURT AND LEGALIZING ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today still badly shaken following the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on January 22 legalizing abortion.

I have been a foe of abortion because I cannot accept that it can be right—that it can be legal—to end one human life for the personal convenience of another human being.

I must stand up and protest this gross disregard for human life which is now the official law of the United States of America. I have lived 44 years, and I have always deeply loved my country. This is the first time in all those years that I have been in deep despair over the future of my country.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 261—which would offset the recent Supreme Court decision on abortion.

If I had been alive in Nazi Germany, I like to think that I would have had the courage to stand up and protest the inhumane actions of my government. I feel very much the same today. My initial reaction to the Supreme Court's decision was that I did not want to be a part of a government which abandoned all respect for life. I seriously considered resigning from Congress. But then I decided that the preferable course would be to stay and do whatever I can to remedy the Court's action. The vehicle I have chosen in order to turn around this shocking new policy of our Government, of which I am so deeply ashamed, is to stay and fight for adoption of the constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 261—which I introduced today.

I am speaking today for those who cannot speak. I am speaking on behalf of our unborn children. Those who are concerned with equality of rights should not forget a group who are now in more need of constitutional protection than any other in our society—our most helpless minority, our unborn children.

The fundamental right of life itself is being neglected and denied to many of our fellow humans. To remedy this grave situation, I have introduced today a constitutional amendment — House Joint Resolution 261—that will insure that the unborn, the aged, the ill, and the incapacitated have a right to life that is every bit as valid as that guaranteed all of us under the 14th amendment.

Because of the Supreme Court's decisions in Roe against Wade and Doe against Bolton both decided January 22, 1973, the necessity for this amendment is now clearly evident. It is the only effective recourse open to those of us who value every human being's right to life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to read these decisions in their entirety, but I insert a summary of them in the RECORD at this point:

[Supreme Court of the United States]

DOE ET AL. v. BOLTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF GEORGIA, ET AL

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

(No. 70-40. Argued December 13, 1971—Reargued October 11, 1972—Decided January 22, 1973)

Georgia law proscribes an abortion except as performed by a duly licensed Georgia physician when necessary in "his best clinical judgment" because continued pregnancy would endanger a pregnant woman's life or injure her health; the fetus would likely be born with serious defects; or the pregnancy resulted from rape. § 26-1202 (a) of Ga. Criminal Code. In addition to a requirement that the patient be a Georgia resident and certain other requirements, the statutory scheme poses three procedural conditions in § 26-1202 (b): (1) that the abortion be performed in a hospital accredited by the Joint Committee on Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH); (2) that the procedure be approved by the hospital staff abortion committee; and (3) that the performing physician's judgment be confirmed by independent examinations of the patient by two other licensed physicians. Appellant Doe, an indigent married Georgia citizen, who was denied an abortion after eight weeks of pregnancy for failure to meet any of the § 26-1202 (a) conditions, sought declaratory and injunctive relief, contending that the Georgia laws were unconstitutional. Others joining in the complaint included Georgia-licensed physicians (who claimed that the Georgia statutes "chilled and deterred" their practices), registered nurses, clergymen, and social workers. Though holding that all the plaintiffs had standing, the District Court ruled that only

Doe presented a justiciable controversy. In Doe's case the court gave declaratory, but not injunctive, relief, invalidating as an infringement of privacy and personal liberty the limitation to the three situations specified in § 26–1202 (a) and certain other provisions but holding that the State's interest in health protection and the existence of a "*potential* of independent human existence" justified regulation through § 26–1202 (b) of the "manner of performance as well as the quality of the final decision to abort." The appellants, claiming entitlement to broader relief, directly appealed to this Court. *Held:*

1. Doe's case presents a live, justiciable controversy and she has standing to sue, *Roe* v. *Wade, ante, p.* —, as do the physician-appellants (who, unlike the physician in *Wade*, were not charged with abortion violations), and it is therefore unnecessary to resolve the issue of the other appellants' standing. Pp. 7–9.

2. A woman's constitutional right to an abortion is not absolute. *Roe* v. *Wade, supra.* P. 9.

3. The requirement that a physician's decision to perform an abortion must rest upon "his best clinical judgment" of its necessity is not unconstitutionally vague, since that judgment may be made in the light of *all* the attendant circumstances. *United States* v. *Vuitch,* 402 U.S. 62, 71–72. Pp. 10–12.

4. The three procedural conditions in § 26–1202(b) violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Pp. 12–19.

(a) The JCAH accreditation requirement is invalid, since the State has not shown the only hospitals (let alone those with JCAH accreditation) meet its interest in fully protecting the patient; and a hospital requirement failing to exclude the first trimester of pregnancy would be invalid on that ground alone, see *Roe* v. *Wade, supra.* Pp. 12–15.

(b) The interposition of a hospital committee on abortion, a procedure not applicable as a matter of state criminal law to other surgical situations, is unduly restrictive of the patient's rights, which are already safeguarded by her personal physician. Pp. 15–17.

(c) Required acquiescence by two co-practitioners also has no rational connection with a patient's needs and unduly infringes on her physician's right to practice. Pp. 17–19.

5. The Georgia residence requirement violates the Privileges and Immunities Clause by denying protection to persons who enter Georgia for medical services there. Pp. 19–20.

6. Appellants' equal protection argument centering on the three procedural conditions in § 26–1202(b), invalidated on other grounds, is without merit. P. 20.

7. No ruling is made on the question of injunctive relief. Cf. *Roe* v. *Wade, supra.* P. 20.

319 F. Supp. 1048, modified and affirmed.

[Supreme Court of the United States]

ROE ET AL. v. WADE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF DALLAS COUNTY

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

(No. 70–18. Argued December 13, 1971—Reargued October 11, 1972—Decided January 22, 1973)

A pregnant single woman (Roe) brought a class action challenging the constitutionality of the Texas criminal abortion laws, which proscribe procuring or attempting an abortion except on medical advice for the purpose of saving the mother's life. A licensed physician (Hallford), who had two state abortion prosecutions pending against him, was permitted to intervene. A childless married couple (the Does), the wife not being pregnant, separately attacked the laws, basing alleged injury on the future possibilities of contraceptive failure, pregnancy, unpreparedness for parenthood, and impairment of the wife's health. A three-judge District Court, which consolidated the actions, held that Roe and Hallford, and members of their classes, had standing to use and presented justiciable controversies. Ruling that declaratory, though not injunctive, relief was warranted, the court declared the abortion statutes void as vague and overbroadly infringing those plaintiffs' Ninth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. The court ruled the Does' complaint not justiciable. Appellants directly appealed to this Court on the injunctive rulings, and appellee cross-appealed from the District Court's grant of declaratory relief to Roe and Hallford. *Held:*

1. While 28 U.S.C. § 1253 authorizes no direct appeal to this Court from the grant or denial of declaratory relief alone, review is not foreclosed when the case is properly before the Court on appeal from specific denial of injunctive relief and the arguments as to both injunctive and declaratory relief are necessarily identical. P. 8.

2. Roe has standing to sue; the Does and Hallford do not. Pp. 9–14.

(a) Contrary to appellee's contention, the natural termination of Roe's pregnancy did not moot her suit. Litigation involving pregnancy, which is "capable of repetition, yet evading review," is an exception to the usual federal rule that an actual controversy must exist at review stages and not simply when the action is initiated. Pp. 9–10.

(b) The District Court correctly refused injunctive, but erred in granting declaratory, relief to Hallford, who alleged no federally protected right not assertable as a defense against the good-faith state prosecutions pending against him. *Samuels* v. *Mackell,* 401 U.S. 66.

(c) The Does' complaint, based as it is on contingencies, any one or more of which may not occur, is too speculative to present an actual case or controversy. Pp. 12–14.

3. State criminal abortion laws, like those involved here, that except from criminality only a life-saving procedure on the mother's behalf without regard to the stage of her pregnancy and other interests involved violate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which protects against state action the right to privacy, including a woman's qualified right to terminate her pregnancy. Though the State cannot override that right, it has legitimate interests in protecting both the pregnant woman's health and the potentiality of human life, each of which interests grows and reaches a "compelling" point at various stages of the woman's approach to term. Pp. 36–49.

(a) For the stage prior to approximately the end of the first trimester, the abortion decision and its effectuation must be left to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician. Pp. 36–47.

(b) For the stage subsequent to approximately the end of the first trimester, the State, in promoting its interest in the health of the mother, may, if it chooses, regulate the abortion procedure in ways that are reasonably related to maternal health. Pp. 43–44.

(c) For the stage subsequent to viability the State, in promoting its interest in the potentiality of human life, may, if it chooses, regulate, and even proscribe, abortion except where necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother. Pp. 44–48.

4. The State may define the term "physician" to mean only a physician currently licensed by the State, and may proscribe any abortion by a person who is not a physician as so defined. Pp. 34–35, 48.

5. It is unnecessary to decide the injunctive relief issue since the Texas authorities will doubtless fully recognize the Court's ruling that the Texas criminal abortion statutes are unconstitutional. P. 51.

314 F. Supp. 1217, affirmed in part and reversed in part.

BLACKMUN, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which BURGER, C. J. and DOUGLAS, BRENNAN, STEWART, MARSHALL, and POWELL, JJ., joined. BURGER, C. J. and DOUGLAS and STEWART, JJ., filed concurring opinions. WHITE, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which REHNQUIST, J., joined. REHNQUIST, J., filed a dissenting opinion.

The constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 261—which I introduced today, Mr. Speaker, would negate the above-summarized decisions and would reestablish the right of all human beings, regardless of age, to life. I include the text of my Constitutional I include the text of my constitutional 261—at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 261

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1: Neither the United States nor any State shall deprive any human being, from the moment of conception, of life without due process of law; nor deny to any human being, from the moment of conception, within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws.

"Section 2: Neither the United States nor any State shall deprive any human being of life on account of illness, age, or incapacity.

"Section 3: Congress and the several States shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By its incredible 7-to-2 decision, denying the equal protection of the law to the unborn child, the U.S. Supreme Court has, in one stroke, canceled the right which the Declaration of Independence says is the first of all the rights of man—the inalienable right to life which is self-evident.

The Declaration of Independence does not say that all men are "born" equal. It says that all men are "created" equal.

Human life begins at conception and not at birth. Even advocates of abortion admit this fact.

A pro-abortion editorial in the Journal of California Medicine, September 1970, freely speaks of—

The scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra—or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected.

Mr. Speaker, it seems, everyone really knows except the U.S. Supreme Court.

Indeed, the Court seems not to have even looked at the reality of when human life begins. The Court passes over the facts and lamely states that—

> We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any concensus, the judiciary at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.

No speculation was necessary. New York courts have already acknowledged that, in the contemporary medical view, the child begins a separate life from the moment of conception. The U.S. Supreme Court should have determined whether and when we can legally kill a being who is acknowledged to be human by all sides, instead of passing over this issue.

Apart from strictly scientific facts, everybody does, indeed, know that a human infant is always the natural result of a human pregnancy. No concensus from any disciplines are required to know this. Even a woman who seeks an abortion does so because she does not want to have a baby, not because she is disturbed by any mere "piece of tissue"—or whatever euphemism is used to avoid speaking of the child as human. Abortion always kills a living human being. The abortionists themselves speak of an unwanted "child," not of something else that is unwanted but an unwanted "child."

But now, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has, in effect, declared that if a human being is unwanted, he can be eliminated. Where will the line be drawn between those who can legally be eliminated and those who cannot? The line our highest Court itself attempts to draw, that the law might take some notice of the child who has "the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb"—curiously, the Court itself calls her a "mother"—is purely arbitrary. As Dr. Eugene Diamond has said arbitrary time limits based on so-called viability are about as sacred as the 4-minute mile and, indeed, it is well-known that some legally aborted babies have lived.

We have a shocking history in recent years of babies that have been aborted alive. My colleagues might remember when I called their attention to a baby that had been aborted alive at the Washington Hospital Center. An attendant found it squirming in a refrigerator. There were 26 babies aborted alive in the first few months after New York legalized abortions. Some of them have been adopted and are living with loving families today.

So let us not deceive ourselves as to what it is we are talking about. We are talking about human beings. And when the Supreme Court in its decisions refers to the "potentiality of life," it is ignoring the medical and scientific facts. What we are talking about is the "reality"—the "actuality" of life, not the "potentiality" of human life.

The High Court refers in its decisions to "meaningful life." Inherent in that is one of the greatest dangers facing our country. The ominous phrase, "meaningful life," can be applied to other lives besides those of the unborn—the sick, the unfit, the feebleminded, the old, the senile. If they are unwanted and their lives are not "meaningful," how can they claim protection under the law according to the new criteria of the U.S. Supreme Court? My amendment—House Joint Resolution 261—would protect them as well.

Who of us is competent to assess whose life is meaningful? Is the man who comes home from work and falls asleep drinking beer before the television set leading a "meaningful" life? Is an unemployed migratory farmworkers leading a "meaningful" life? Is a person who is crippled "meaningful"? Is a child who is retarded "meaningful"? Who judges? Who decides? Who has the power and the audacity to say that another individual has a "meaningful" life and another human being does not.

But that is what the Supreme Court, in its shocking decision, has done. Threats of so-called mercy killing and other types of elimination of the unfit are not idle threats. Extermination policies of this kind, beginning with abortion, have been massively carried out within all too recent memory in Nazi Germany.

For nearly a generation, the world has been asking itself, "How could the German people under Hitler have stood by while the smoke poured from the chimneys of the Nazi death camps? How could this tremendous horror happen in the 20th century of civilization? How could civilized people slaughter 6 million other human beings because they were Jewish?"

Mr. Speaker, that shocks the conscience of the world and will continue to do so throughout history. But we ought to remember the warning of George Santayana, who said:

> Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

And let us look at recent world history, let us look at Nazi Germany. Where did they begin? They began with abortion. And then they went on to exterminating those who were infirm and retarded and in mental institutions. They conducted medical experimentation that resulted in the deaths of these other human beings who did not, in the judgment of the Nazi regime, lead "meaningful" lives. And it was a short step from there to exterminating the Jews, who, in the judgment of the Nazi regime, did not lead "meaningful" lives and did not fit in with the concept of super race.

Well, we are on the first step, with this decision, toward the same kind of calamity for the United States of America. Can we allow it to happen to the greatest nation in the history of the world? Can Americans stand idly by while our carnage through abortion mounts? More human lives have been slaughtered through abortion than in all the wars in our history. Think about that.

The Supreme Court has proved by this single decision that the Justices, who are the final arbiters of the judicial meaning of our Constitution, have not only abandoned any pretense to respect the spirit of that Constitution, with equal justice under the law, but they have, as they have as with so many other recent decisions, ignored the will of the American people.

This decision comes at a time when legislators, politically responsive to the people by whom they were elected, have repeatedly repudiated liberalized abortion. Some 37 State legislatures have rejected liberalized abortion proposals. In New York, which had enacted its liberalized abortion law by one vote, the legislature reversed its decision and repealed that law, and it would have died, except that Governor Rockefeller vetoed it.

Connecticut and Pennsylvania's legislatures have also changed their minds on liberalized abortion laws they had previously passed. Governor Shapp also vetoed the action of the Pennsylvania legislature. Last November in North Dakota the people, by referendum, rejected abortion by a vote of 77 percent. The voters rejected it in Michigan by a 63-percent vote. The people have rejected proposed laws which the U.S. Supreme Court, by judicial fiat, has now imposed on the entire country.

I wonder if these Supreme Court Justices reflected upon the social consequences of trying to impose on the Nation a legal abortion policy which cannot and will not be accepted by millions upon millions of Americans. This has brought upon the Supreme Court and the Government itself disgrace and contempt which neither the Court nor the legal system or the Government can afford at this time when lack of confidence in our Government presents such a crisis.

The Supreme Court has not resolved the abortion issue by this decision. The Court has instead opened up another fissure in our already divided society.

Mr. Speaker, 116 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down another infamous decision—also by a lopsided majority, a decision of which we as Americans have been deeply ashamed ever since. That was the Dred Scott decision, which declared that all Americans were equal under the law, unless they were black and were born in slavery. One human being had the legal right to own another human being. Slavery was constitutional because of the Dred Scott decision. But now we have gone beyond that. If it was shocking to think that one human being could own another, what is it to say that one human being can legally kill another with impunity. That is where we are today with the Supreme Court decision on abortion.

Because this infamous new decision denies, cancels, and nullifies and declares of no effect whatsoever the constitutional rights that have always been accorded within our legal system to the unborn, it will go down as "the Dred Scott decision of the 20th century." Its consequences are incalculable.

Civilized nations have always tried to protect their minorities. The advance of civilization has often been equated with the law's increased protection of its weakest and most helpless members. To declare now that one of our minority groups, the most helpless of all, can be legally exterminated on demand is shocking indeed.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the rule of law;

it is the law of the jungle when one human being can decide to destroy another human being for his convenience.

Unborn children have traditionally, under our judicial system, had legal rights which have been protected. They have had the right to sue for injuries which they sustained before birth. They have had the right to inherit equally with their brothers and sisters when their father died before their birth. They have had the right to have guardians appointed to protect their interests. There have been decisions upheld by the same Supreme Court where parents, because of their religious beliefs, refused to have transfusions of blood in order to save an unborn child. The courts have declared that such a parent must have these transfusions of blood to save that unborn child whose right to live is superior to their right to practice their religious beliefs.

All this legal history has now been jettisoned by the Supreme Court decision on abortion.

What value will the Supreme Court uphold if it cannot uphold the value of human life itself. What good are property rights, which the unborn have always had, if they do not have the right to life?

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Americans are as shocked as I am by this black mark on American history, and will support the Constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 261—which I introduced today. Let us prove that America is not morally bankrupt, even if the Supreme Court is. Let us prove that we still cherish and value human life, even if the Supreme Court does not.

The Supreme Court has made its decision. Now the Congress, the State legislatures, and the American people themselves must make their decision to override the Supreme Court decision by amending the Constitution.

ISLAND OF CULEBRA

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, over a half century ago, Henry Adams observed that—

> During a million or two of years, every generation in turn had toiled with endless agony to attain and apply power, all the while betraying the deepest alarm and horror at the power they had created.

If he were alive today, one wonders whether his talent for expression would be equal to describing the present and potential impact of weapons upon the minds and actions of men.

These words came to mind when I read of the plans of the U.S. Navy to extend the shelling of the Puerto Rican island of Culebra until 1985 instead of the promised date of June 30, 1975. The urgency of this situation is obvious.

On November 4, 1972, former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird declared to the Governor of Puerto Rico, the President of the Puerto Rican Senate, the mayor of Culebra, and the people of Culebra and of Puerto Rico, that use of Culebra for shelling purposes would be terminated no later than June 30, 1975. Despite this declaration, the Navy has subsequently conducted a new secret study which concludes that no less than 10 more years of shelling of Culebra are necessary in order to provide for "the common defense."

I rise today to protest the extension of the shelling of Culebra in the name of providing for the common defense of our country. I do not believe that the security of the United States requires target practice off the shores of this island.

The fact that our Government has made a commitment to the government and the people of Puerto Rico, and yet seems to have no regard for that commitment, corrupts the very ideals we hope this Nation stands for and the trust which we hope others have for us.

One need only think of what it would be like to have the U.S. Navy decide to shell his or her neighboring town to understand how the people of Puerto Rico feel about the shelling of Culebra.

The people of Puerto Rico are being used, in essence, as guinea pigs for the operation of the U.S. Navy. It is unfortunate that the only way to see the inadequacies of the shelling operation is upon the occurrence of some incident or accident that could possibly occur.

It is an understatement to say that the shelling has an adverse effect on the environment. This kind of damage is irreversible. Another 10 years of the shelling will only cause more harm and leave more scars across the face of this battered island.

The people of Culebra are justifiably indignant when told to evacuate areas of the island on which they live. Fishermen are told where they can and cannot fish for their livelihood, and many have claimed that their equipment has been damaged.

I strongly support legislation to require the termination of all weapons range activities conducted on or near the Culebra complex as of July 1, 1975.

The people of Puerto Rico and Culebra have been promised that the shelling would stop by 1975 at the latest. This promise must be kept.

BOB SIKES HAS NOW SERVED WITH 2,000 IN HOUSE, SENATE

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Floridians are proud of the record of service of the dean of our delegation, generally referred to as the "He Coon," my friend and colleague, ROBERT L. F. SIKES.

As he begins his 33d year in the U.S. House of Representatives, it is interesting to note that only six of the present Members have served longer.

Even more interesting is the fact that BOB SIKES has now passed the 2,000 mark in the number of Members of the House and Senate in that time. When he took the oath of office for the 17th time to begin his service in the 93d Congress, he could look back with pride on having now served with 1,655 House Members and 406 Members of the U.S. Senate.

This is a remarkable record.

I think it also significant to note that BOB SIKES is the last Member of the Congress whose father served in the Civil War.

If you were to look back on a well-worn Congressional Directory issued when BOB SIKES came to the Congress in 1941, you would find only six names among the membership of the House of Representatives who are listed in the 1973 edition.

They are WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, dean of the House with 23 terms, LESLIE C. ARENDS of Illinois, and GEORGE H. MAHON of Texas with 20 terms, W. R. POAGE of Texas with 19 terms, WILBUR D. MILLS of Arkansas, with 18 terms, and F. EDWARD HÉBERT of Louisiana with 17 terms.

This distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. HÉBERT, came to the Congress with BOB SIKES, but there was a short break in the service of Mr. SIKES when he was on active duty in World War II.

I think it further interesting to note that three of the seven senior Members of the House are from Texas. I think it fair to say that the Lone Star State has furnished more than its share of distinguished leaders in the Congress, and continues to do so today.

BOB SIKES is a wise leader and great friend to all of the Members of my delegation. When he came here in 1941, Florida had only five Members in its delegation in the House.

With the beginning of the Congress, we now have 15, and I believe that the Sunshine State is just beginning to have a great impact on this great institution as we move forward in the ranking of the States.

We are proud of BOB SIKES and his record. Not only has he served a long time, he has served with distinction and ability. He continues to do so today.

CENTRAL NARCOTICS REGISTER

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1972, an article authored by Nat Hentoff appeared in the Village Voice. Mr. Hentoff raised the question of whether it served a useful purpose to require officials to report the names of student drug abusers to the health department "so that those names can be placed on the central register of the city's addicts." Those who oppose the listing of the names agree that all such necessary statistical information required for evaluation purposes should be furnished by the school authorities.

I thought Mr. Hentoff's question was a valid one and that we ought to ascertain from the government officials having jurisdiction over the matter what their positions would be. I contacted the names below and I am distressed to say that not everyone felt compelled to respond in a matter of importance. Those responses that were received are attached.

At this point in time, the city of New

York no longer has control over what to do in this matter since the State public health law effective April 1, 1973, mandates a central registry of the names of all the persons who are undergoing or awaiting admission to an approved narcotic addiction treatment program.

The responses are not unanimous in their point of view but certainly do provide information to form a point of view.

The following letter was sent to the names listed below:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1972.

DEAR ———: There has been a great furor raised concerning the legal requirement in the New York City Health Code that school age children who are currently under treatment for narcotic addiction must have their names placed on the City Narcotic Register. Chancellor Harvey Scribner, of the Board of Education, has taken the position that it not only serves no purpose to report the names of the students to the Narcotic Register but, in fact, it is detrimental to do so. He does it, he says, because the law requires him to do so although he would prefer that the law be changed, eliminating the requirement. The Narcotic Register allegedly is kept for research purposes and not for police purposes, although some find that hard to believe.

Opponents of the Health Code regulation argue that it will inhibit school children from requesting help. It may also discourage teachers who detect such children in their classrooms from placing their students in narcotic addiction programs because of the fear that those children ultimately would carry the stigma throughout their lives, even after rehabilitation. This is a matter which concerns more than 25,000 school children in New York City since more than that number have been estimated by the New York City Board of Education to be hard narcotic users.

I would appreciate knowing your position in this matter. Do you believe that it is helpful to have these students' names filed with the Narcotic Register (the proposal of those who oppose this requirement is that the number of student narcotic users be filed with the Register for research purposes, but not the names) and if you do, what benefits follow from such disclosures? If you are opposed to the recording of these names, I would appreciate having your statement to that effect.

Your comments on this matter and how it should be handled would be of great importance to me in formulating my own position.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

LIST

The Honorable Patrick Murphy, Police Commissioner, 240 Centre Street, New York, New York 10013. (Response follows.)

The Honorable Elliott Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. (Response follows.)

Gordon Chase, Administrator, Health Services Administrator, the City of New York, 125 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013. (Response follows.)

Mary C. McLaughlin, M.D., Commissioner of Health, Department of Health, 125 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013. (Response follows.)

Hollis S. Ingraham, M.D., Commissioner of Health, State of New York, Department of Health, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany, New York, 12208. (Response follows.)

The Honorable Nelson Rockefeller, Governor, State Capitol, Albany, New York. (No reply received.)

The Honorable John V. Lindsay, Mayor, City of New York, City Hall, New York, New York. (No reply received.)

Myles Ambrose, Special Assistant to Attorney General, Office of Drug Abuse, Law Enforcement, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530. (Interim response only.)

John E. Ingersoll, Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, 1405 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20537. (Response follows.)

Ewald B. Nyquist, Commissioner of Education, Education Department, Albany, New York 12224. (No reply received.)

Jerome H. Jaffe, M.D., Director, Executive Office of the President, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, Washington, D.C. 20500. (Interim telephone response only.)

Joseph Monserrat, President, New York City Board of Education, 510 East 86th Street, New York, New York. (No response received.)

Seymour P. Lachman, Vice President, New York City Board of Education, 100 Avenue P, Brooklyn, New York 11204.

Murry Bergtaum, Member, New York City Board of Education, 144–20 88th Drive, Kew Garden Hills, New York 11367. (No response received.)

Isiah E. Robinson, Jr., 40 West 135th Street, New York, New York 10037. (Response follows.)

Mary E. Meade, Member, New York City Board of Education, 55 Austin Place, Staten Island, New York. (No reply received.)

———

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
New York, N.Y., January 5, 1973.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: In response to your letter of October 6, 1972, regarding the Narcotics Register. I have reviewed the provisions of the New York City Health Code and the purposes of the Narcotics Register.

The function of the Health Services Administration's Narcotics Register is to collect data concerning drug abuse in New York City, analyze the data and evaluate changing patterns of drug abuse throughout the City. The Register cooperates with other City and government agencies including the New York City Police Department in an attempt to improve reporting and by providing statistical information.

The Register does not disclose identities and releases only statistical data and studies which emanate from them.

In view of the confidentiality of the information, the New York City Police Department has no objection to *supplying* data to the Narcotics Register of the Health Services Administration. Since this Department has no relation to the Narcotics Register, other than that of a supplier of information, I believe that some of the questions you raise could be better considered by the Health Services Administration which maintains the Narcotics Register itself.

Sincerely,

PATRICK V. MURPHY,
Police Commissioner.

———

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., November 10, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in further response to your letter of October 6 expressing your concerns about the New York City Health Code requirement that school-age children under treatment for narcotic addiction must have their names placed on the City Narcotics Register.

There is no question that the data to be derived from the Narcotics Register are extremely valuable. Such a resource makes it possible to estimate the number of narcotic addicts in specific age groups, ethnic groups or other categories of interest, provides a basis for studies of the experience of addicts over time and serves as a tool for various additional kinds of research on the addiction problem. Such information is crucial in developing policy and programs in the area of narcotic addiction. Recently it was necessary for the Office of Management and Budget to obtain a national estimate of the number of narcotic addicts for purposes of national policy and programming. The New York City Narcotics Register was the only resource which had hard data available to serve as a basis for such an estimate.

Experience in various fields of health and social problems has indicated that it is essential to report names to a case register when the purpose of that register is to link records from a number of sources so that the number of unique individuals can be determined, and information on an individual from various sources can be combined. Attempts to accomplish this kind of record linkage without names, but using other items of information, have not proved at all successful.

When information by name of individual is reported to a central resource for research purposes, as in the Narcotics Register, there must be adequate safeguards against disclosure of such information to any individual or agency. It is my understanding that the law which requires reporting of cases to the Narcotics Register also protects the records in the Register against subpoena and against inspection by persons other than authorized personnel of the New York City Health Department. As you indicate in your letter, however, there is much concern over the possibility of unauthorized disclosures of information.

Since this issue has been raised in other contexts as well, in February 1972, I appointed an Advisory Committee on Automated Personal Data Systems. This Committee is charged with the task of assisting the Department in developing recommendations for safeguards against harmful consequences which may result from the use and management of automated personal data systems, including recommendations relative to the issuance and use of the social security number and recommendations of measures for redress of such harmful consequences. These recommendations are to include specification of actions that may be taken to achieve their implementation, including Federal and State legislation, administrative action by Federal and State departments, agencies and officials, and actions by private organizations which use automated personal data systems. The report of this Committee is expected to be completed in December 1972. I shall be glad to share this information with you when it is available.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

———

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
New York, N.Y., October 31, 1972.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Thank you for your letter of October 6, regarding the New York City Narcotics Register.

David S. Seeley, Director of the Public Health Education Association, in a letter to Commissioner Cimino raised precisely the questions which concern you regarding the Health Code reporting requirements and confidentiality of the Register. Dr. Cimino's response which seems sensible to me, is attached.

Perhaps a member of your staff would like to meet with Dr. Robert Newman who has just been appointed Director of the Narcotics Register. Bob's number is 966–6312, and he would be pleased to hear from your office. Needless to say, I would be delighted

to meet with you on the subject anytime you say.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

GORDON CHASE,
Administrator.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH,
New York, N.Y., October 31, 1972.

MR. DAVID S. SEELEY,
Director, Public Health Education Association, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SEELEY: Thank you for your letter of September 1, in which you very articulately express your concerns regarding the New York City Narcotics Register and the relevant Health Code regulations governing reporting and confidentiality. I shall try to address this response to the specific points you raised.

There is considerable misunderstanding regarding the functions of the New York City Health Department Narcotics Register. Its purpose is not to simply count addicts, as is so frequently implied in the news media. Were this the primary objective, then it would truly be difficult to justify the Register's existence, especially since there are many inherent limitations which would render even the most carefully prepared approximation of prevalence just that: an approximation.

Rather, the Narotics Register is a unique source of extremely useful epidemiological data. In approaching the menace of addiction in our City in a rational way, it is critically important to know what hypothesis can be supported regarding the natural course of addiction, which population groups are already most involved in drug abuse, and where addiction is most heavily located. Additionally, the Register has proven itself an excellent means of helping evaluate various prevention and treatment programs. Clearly, the more complete the reporting of drug abusers is, the more effectively these functions can be carried out.

It has always been the position of the Health Department to provide absolute confidentiality to all individual records received by the Narcotics Register. There has never been the slightest wavering in the Department's firm adherence to this position. While one can obviously never predict the future, I sincerely believe that the chances of deviating from the present uncompromising policy are extremely remote. We are very much aware of the futility of mandating compliance with reporting regulations when there is a fear that there may be resultant harm to the individual being reported. The relatively complete reporting which we have achieved to date is not due to zealous enforcement of legal requirements, but rather to the consistent assurance, in word and in deed, that confidentiality will be protected. Without firm safeguards, we recognize that a Register such as this would be meaningless. Thus the commitment to the existence of a Register must by definition be complemented by an equal commitment to confidentiality.

I appreciate the concern you express regarding section 11.07(c) of the Health Code and the fact that reports of "drug abuse" are not expressly protected in the wording of section 11.07 (a). We have already taken steps to introduce an amendment to the existing Code which would explicitly and unequivocally prohibit any disclosure of individual information collected by the Register.

The status of the Register is constantly being evaluated by our staff and I presented the issue to the members of the Board of Health at the October meeting. There was unanimous agreement by the Board to review the purposes and potentials of the Register on an ongoing basis.

Regarding the specific question of reporting school-age known or suspected drug abusers, we do not feel that this presents a special case, nor that additional safeguards are indicated. It is our position that total confidentiality must be provided *all* records received by the Narcotics Register. Perhaps those who focus their concern on school children are implying that less than stringent rules against disclosure may be appropriate for older age-groups. We reject this view because we are convinced that unequivocal confidentiality must apply to the adult as well as the child, to the self-reported hard-core heroin addict as well as to the individual reported by a physician who suspects drug use, etc.

For similar reasons, we have not considered "dropping" names from the Register even when a person is certified as being "cured". First, the concept of cure is probably inappropriate for a chronic and notoriously relapsing condition such as drug addiction. Secondly, with the broad scope of the Register function specified previously, it is as important to learn which persons, under which conditions, are *not* subsequently reported as active drug users as it is to be able to follow the course of those who *are* subsequently reported. Finally, as stated above, our rigid adherence to the principle of confidentiality must be applied to *all* reports in the Register, and it would again imply less than total commitment to this principle if we removed certain names from the data files.

The suggestion that some or all of the reports received by the Register could serve a useful purpose even if not identified by name is not feasible. Neither the nature of the addiction problem, nor changing trends over time, nor even the process of quantifying the problem could be achieved without the inclusion of names and other identifying information.

Finally, I agree that the knowledge that reports will be sent to a Register may deter persons who want and need help from seeking treatment, *if the reports are not protected by the strongest possible assurances of confidentiality.* This has been recognized since the days of Hippocrates, and is explicitly acknowledged in New York State legal decisions rendered as long ago as the 1820's. Without confidentiality, a Narcotics Register would serve no useful purpose, and would pose an extraordinary potential infringement of liberties. *With* confidentiality, it can be a major help in dealing with one of the most tragic problems which has ever confronted our society.

To summarize, I appreciate and share your concerns. We are by no means working at cross purposes in our mutual insistence for absolute confidentiality of all records. The sort of citizen participation which your letter represents will probably prove even more effective in achieving our aims than the most carefully worded laws.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. CIMINO, M.D., M.P.H.,
Commissioner of Health.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
October 11, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Since January 1972 Dr. Joseph A. Cimino has been Commissioner of Health and Chairman of the Board of Health. Since your letter was directed to me in that position I assume you want the official statement from that office.

I have sent your leter to Dr. Cimino. I am sure you will get an early response.

Sincerely yours,

MARY C. MCLAUGHLIN, M.D., M.P.H.,
Deputy Health Services Administrator.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Albany, October 16, 1972.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I have given your letter of October 6 a great deal of thought. You solicit my views on the New York City Health Code's requirement that children under treatment for narcotic addiction have their names placed on the City Narcotic Register.

The discovery and reporting of persons who are afflicted with a disease or illness is often the necessary first step in the epidomiological study of an illness. However, the history of public health is full of illustrations where the reporting of disease was opposed on grounds that it would subject individuals to undeserved penalties and to social ostracism. One illustration is the great furor in New York City early in this century when the City Health Commissioner Biggs made tuberculosis reportable for the first time. As unpleasant as the maintenance of tuberculosis registries was for individuals at that time, study and use of data accumulated played a large role in bringing about a reduction in unnecesary deaths and suffering.

There are always pros and cons on these issues. Obviously, if Chancellor Scribner is correct and no purpose is being served by the register, then it is difficult indeed to justify its operation. Yet, the New York City Board of Health had their own reasons for enacting this requirement. Perhaps things are not as bad as Chancellor Scribner indicates. In any event, his objections become academic since the last session of the Legislature enacted a similar statewide requirement, effective April 1, 1973, mandating a central registry of the names of all the persons who are undergoing or awaiting admission to an approved narcotic addiction treatment program. Specifically, this requirement is set forth in Section 3356 and 3372 of the New York State Public Health Law. The actions taken by the New York City Board of Health are consistent with this law.

I am enclosing a photocopy of the two mentioned Sections for your information; they are part of a new Article 33 of the New York State Public Health Law which was developed by the Joint Legislative Commission on Drug Addiction chaired by Assemblyman Chester Hardt from Erie County. There was a great deal of preparatory study before enactment, and the new Article was debated in at least two sessions of the New York State Legislature before its passage in 1972.

Sincerely yours,

HOLLIS S. INGRAHAM, M.D.,
Commissioner of Health.

PHOTOCOPY

§ 3356. Central registry confidentiality

1. The department shall establish a central registry as part of which the following information shall be assembled:

(a) the name and other identifying data relating to each reported addict;

(b) the status of each addict awaiting admission to an approved program or programs;

(c) the status of each addict in an approved program.

2. Identifying data in such registry with respect to an individual addict shall be available only to a practitioner attempting to ascertain the status of an addict seeking treatment with him or admission to a program with which he is associated.

Added L.1972, c. 878, § 2.

Effective Date. Section 7 of L.—1972, c. 878, provided that this section is effective April 1, 1973.

§ 3372. Practitioner patient reporting

It shall be the duty of every attending practitioner and every consulting practi-

tioner to report promptly to the commissioner, or his duly designated agent, the name and, if possible, the address of, and such other data as may be required by the commissioner with respect to, any person under treatment if he finds that such person is an addict or a habitual user of any narcotic drug. Such report shall be kept confidential and may be utilized only for statistical, epidemiological or research purposes, except that those reports which originate in the course of a criminal proceeding other than under section two hundred ten of the mental hygiene law shall be subject only to the confidentiality requirements of section thirty-three hundred seventy-one of this article. Added L.1972, c. 878, § 2.

Effective Date. Section 7 of L.—1972, c. 878, provided that this section is effective April 1, 1973.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE LAW ENFORCEMENT,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1972.

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

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: Your letter to Myles Ambrose of October 6, 1972, refers to the very difficult problem of the legal requirement in the New York City Health Code that school age children who are currently under treatment for narcotic addiction must have their names placed on the City Narcotic Register. Mr. Ambrose is currently out of town, and, in his absence, I want to acknowledge receipt of your letter.

Please be assured that your letter will be brought to his personal attention as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER H. JONES,
Executive Officer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in response to your recent letter requesting my views on the New York City Health Code requirement that the names of addicted school children be reported to the City Narcotic Register.

I must state at the outset that the details of this requirement or the reasons therefor are unknown to me and I am unable to provide you with a truly informed opinion. Such a requirement, at best, would be of extremely limited value to law enforcement authorities and would certainly be of no value to our own enforcement effort.

As a general rule, I am inclined to the view that Government officials—Federal, State and local—need as much sound information as possible on which to make policy decisions. The interest in identifying student addicts and providing them with treatment should be motivated principally by concern for their welfare and should not in any way stigmatize them. Nevertheless, only a careful study of local practices and requirements could properly weigh the respective potentials for harm and benefit in such a reporting system.

I would suggest that you further consult Dr. Jerome Jaffe, Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention for an opinion as to the necessity or desirability of requiring such records for medical purposes.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. INGERSOLL,
Director.

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., October 19, 1972.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is to acknowledge your letter of October 6, 1972 with respect to the Narcotic Register under the New York City Health Code. I think it fair to point out that Chancellor Harvey Scribner's position on this matter is at variance with the Board's posture for the last few years. He has taken this position as a matter of law, for which we cannot fault him.

Since the day we took office as the Interim Board, we have been trying to get two points at issue clarified by the Board of Health in this city.

1. The purpose and use of the Narcotic Register as it applies to school children.

2. An agreement on the design and type of form to be used by the school system.

On the first point at issue we have been given a lot of broad generalities which amounts to research purposes. Accordingly, we have insisted for this purpose to be served total numbers by grade, school, borough and age group, which is all that is necessary, since the number of Joneses or Smiths would have no relevance. We have also been advised that the names are vitally necessary and would be held in the strictest confidence. We were assured that such names would not be used for police purposes or any other way that would do violence to the student's future.

When the question of referral and treatment surfaced, we were told that the Narcotic Register would not be used for that purpose because there are not enough facilities available for such referrals or treatment.

Recognizing the fact that names must be reported to comply with the City Health Code, we asked, "Under what conditions or by what mechanisms or procedures are names dropped or removed from the Narcotic Register?" We were told that there are no such conditions, mechanisms or procedures for dropping or removing names from the register.

These and other concerns raise many doubts in our minds about the possible use and abuse, purpose and objectives of the Narcotic Register. Accordingly, we have been loathed to issue general policy directives as suggested by the Health Department but have restricted our policy to the reporting of known addicts to the Narcotic Register.

One of our biggest handicaps is our inability to get from each school the kind of reports that can be documented as valid evidence of the extent of drug use and abuse. On the other hand, what we do get could be valid but it in no way resembles the apparent inflated guesstimates of Commissioner Curran, Abraham Beame, The Fleischmann Commission, or any other reports that are used, quoted and believed as gospel. It is the comparisons of our reports with these outside guesstimates that create the impression that we are either hiding the problem or, worse still, are burying our heads in the sand.

Assuming that these guesstimates are nearer the truth, as most people have been led to believe, we are shocked into disbelief when the political commitment to the City, State and Federal governments are demonstrated by the closing of treatment and referral centers and the redirection of prevention programs through a reduction of funds.

If we agree that there is a problem, then it is going to take the collective efforts of all agencies of government to solve it. The school system certainly cannot and should not be made to bear the total burden and responsibility for it.

I appreciate your interest in my views and trust that we can count on your good office in addressing viable solutions.

Sincerely,

ISAIAH E. ROBINSON,
Member.

LAZAR LIUBARSKY—PROFILE OF A SOVIET JEW

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jewry has been discussed many times on the floor of this Congress and in the country over the past several years. Yet, the Soviet Government, despite international pressure, is continuing its harassment of its Jewish population.

Lazar Liubarsky is one of the few Jews in Rostov to apply to emigrate to Israel. Since he submitted that application he has been charged with having violated paragraph 190–1 of the RSFSR criminal code pertaining to "slandering" the Soviet system. The alleged slander consists of signing a large number of petitions addressed to Soviet authorities. Moreover, he has recently been accused of "revealing state secrets." Those who have knowledge of the situation know that these charges are bizarre and solely used for the purpose of harassment and intimidation.

Lazar Liubarsky is chief engineer for the Institute of High Tension Networks in Rostov. Being alone in the struggle in a town where there are no Western correspondents and few Western tourists, Liubarsky has been isolated from other Jews who are active in the Jewish struggle.

Mr. Liubarsky was subject to much harassment even before his arrest. He was interrogated by the KGB. His daughter was sent threatening letters at her school. She was asked to denounce her father, because he wanted to emigrate to Israel. When he was arrested on July 18, 1972, an extensive search was made of his home and notes he had made during the 1970–71 interrogations were confiscated. Even when his wife went to Moscow to engage a lawyer for his defense, her request was refused by the chairman of the presidium of the Moscow Association of Lawyers, as in the Markman case.

His case may have far-reaching implications in other Soviet cities. The Soviet authorities have attempted to link his alleged activities with those of Moscow activists with reference to initiating and signing "slanderous" petitions.

Mr. Speaker, we must speak out about the intolerable treatment of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. I urge our colleagues to support the congressional efforts to bar most favored nation privileges to the Soviet Union unless it lifts from the necks of the Soviet Jews wishing to leave the U.S.S.R., the requirements that ransom be paid and cease the appalling treatment against its own Soviet Jewish citizens.

A CASE OF INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE IN ADVERTISING

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important in our society that racial antagonism not be escalated by unthinking action of individuals or corporations.

In late December, an advertising poster for the motion picture, "Black Gunn," was hung in New York subways which I felt could only be deemed an incitement to violence. In this instance the inflammatory rhetoric pivoted on racism and thus was doubly to be deplored.

The correspondence which I had with Chairman William Ronan of the MTA and Columbia Pictures follows. I am pleased to report that the matter has been concluded in a way which is helpful to everyone:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1973.

WILLIAM J. ROWAN,
Chairman, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, New York, N.Y.

DEAR BILL: I want to bring to your attention a very distressing situation which should concern the MTA.

In the subways there is presently an advertisement for a picture known as Black Gunn which contains the following language:

"For every drop of Black blood spilled. . . . A white man pays."

Surely that can only be deemed an incitement to violence and must be deplored. While I know that the MTA does not handle advertising directly, and that it's done by a licensee, the MTA does have a responsibility in this matter. Advertisements for the picture carried in the newspapers do not contain this inflammatory language. This is not a matter of censorship as you well know, since the advertisement is commercial in nature and its does not have the protection of the First Amendment.

I have brought this matter to the attention of Commissioner Eleanor Holmes Norton and I know she will be in touch with you shortly.

All the best to you in the New Year.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1973.

Mr. STANLEY SCHNEIDER,
President, Columbia Pictures Corp.
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SCHNEIDER: I was distressed to see an advertisement of Columbia Pictures describing the picture Black Gunn reciting in its advertising copy, in the subways, the following language:

"For every drop of Black blood spilled . . . . A white man pays."

This is surely an incitement to violence and I ask that you have the placards and other media using that language withdrawn forthwith from circulation.

This is not a matter of free speech or censorship, in that Columbia Pictures is using the language solely for commercial purposes. Frankly what bothers me most is that there will be Blacks and whites, rightfully offended by the language, who may ascribe it to the Black community rather than Columbia Pictures, which I believe deserves censure for its use.

I would appreciate a prompt response from you.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY,
Brooklyn, N.Y., January 15, 1973.

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

DEAR ED: This is in reply to your letter dated January 4, 1973 regarding the subway advertisement for the picture Black Gunn.

I agree with you that the wording on the poster was in extremely poor taste. All of the posters with the language "For every drop of Black blood spilled. . . . A white man pays" were removed during the first week of this month. These posters were replaced by others which read "Jim Brown is the dynamite dude named Gunn! When the man comes up with mob violence its time to Gunn him down."

It is regrettable that deplorable incidents such as this occur, even on an infrequent basis. New York Subway Advertising Company, Inc. has been directed to exercise greater caution and judgement in the posting of all future copy. They have also been directed to gain approval from this Authority when the slightest doubt exists.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Chairman.

COLUMBIA PICTURES,
New York, N.Y., January 18, 1973.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Mr. Stanley Schneider has asked me to thank you for your letter of January 4, 1973 on the subject of the copy contained in our initial advertisement for the motion picture, Black Gunn.

Columbia Pictures has shared your concern over the copy in question and chose to eliminate it from the film's media campaign almost immediately after its first appearance. The copy which first appeared in newspapers on Sunday, December 17, was withdrawn from use on Thursday, December 21.

It was also used on the Black Gunn subway posters and these were replaced with entirely new displays with the copy eliminated on January 2, 1973.

I might add that in the initial use of this copy it was never the intention of Columbia Pictures nor the Zebra Advertising Agency, creators of the line, to do anything but to call attention to a new motion picture whose story dealt with the desire for vengeance on the part of a restaurant owner played by Jim Brown following the murder of his brother by members of an organized crime syndicate.

Nevertheless, the points raised in your letter are indeed valid and cannot be overlooked. Thank you for voicing them.

Sincerely,

RICHARD KAHN.

BISHOP ALBERT R. ZUROWESTE OBSERVES 25TH ANNIVERSARY AS BISHOP OF BELLEVILLE DIOCESE

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, January 28, it was my privilege to attend the concelebrated Mass of Thanksgiving at St. Peter's Cathedral in Belleville, Ill., marking the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste's 25th anniversary as bishop of Belleville.

This silver jubilee of Bishop Zuroweste's Episcopal ordination was a day of prayer and thanksgiving in honor of a remarkable man who has dedicated his whole life to the service of God and the betterment of his fellow man. The bishop's spiritual leadership and dedication have been inspiring to all who have come in contact with him. Few men have had the impact Bishop Zuroweste has had on the people of the Belleville diocese, which includes most of southern Illinois.

Bishop Zuroweste's jubilee message underscores his dedication. It is a message of humility, love, and hope, and sense of purpose. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

JUBILEE MESSAGE

On January 28, 1973 I will observe the 25th anniversary of my episcopal ordination. The principal liturgical ceremony will be a concelebrated Mass in the Cathedral. This Mass of Thanksgiving for the graces and divine gifts bestowed upon me as a successor of the Apostles will be offered in union with the clergy, religious and laity of the Diocese. I ask all of you to join with me in prayer that Christ and His Blessed Mother will continue to watch over us and guide our footsteps along the path of righteousness and virtue. Above all, I pray that this anniversary will be an occasion of spiritual renewal and rededication to the service of Christ and His Church for all in the Diocese.

An anniversary is a time of memories, the recalling of past events that have influenced one's life. Many joyful memories crowd into my mind as I think of the devoted priests, religious and laity with whom I have had the privilege to work. They have influenced my life by their love for God and fellowmen, and their dedication to Christ and His Church. They have been with me through good days and days in which the shadow of the cross pressed heavily upon us. To all I owe a debt of gratitude for their support and encouragement through the years.

The world of 1973 is a different world from the world of 25 years ago. While it is true that human nature is the same, attitudes have changed. These attitudes are visible to all serious thinking people. Some changes have been for the good, others flaunting God's commandments and Church Law, have brought discontent, dissatisfaction and sadness.

Today we hear more about the love of neighbor and less about the love of God. And yet this is one commandment: the love of God first and then the love of neighbor. We cannot observe one without observing the other. Only by a return to love of God and neighbor through a spiritual renewal will peace and hope be found. In these troubled times there is reason for hope. Christ is still with His Church and the Holy Spirit continues to guide and rule it.

Every age has had its upheavals and men have bewailed them. This is truly an age of challenge and we must meet this challenge with courage and perseverance. Let us not lament but let us be alert to the opportunities God is presenting to us at this period by His providence. Every great historical rebirth has been issued in a long night of struggle, and finally emerged only after torturing trials. Our present day evils are not intrinsically different from those of earlier times. We simply hear more about them.

In observing this episcopal anniversary my prayer is for a renewal of our loyalty to the Holy Father and to Christ's Church. I ask again that each of you rededicate yourself to a Christian life and to Christian principles. In particular, do I appeal to the youth

of our Diocese on which the future of our Church depends. I am aware that the obstacles placed in your path to virtuous living are tremendous. Yet I have confidence in your ability to overcome these obstacles and live according to the teachings of the Church. It is in the observance of God's law and the avoidance of sin that you will find true peace and happiness.

In The Messenger today are presented some of the programs and projects undertaken during the past quarter of a century. What good has been accomplished is due to the cooperation, sacrifices and dedicated services of clergy, religious and laity. Without this loyal support, the past 25 years would have been most difficult. Today with all my heart I say thank you and God bless you.

As Third Bishop of Belleville, Bishop Zuroweste is known as a great teacher and spiritual leader. In a special supplement to the Diocesean newspaper the Messenger the following editorial appeared. Entitled "Thank You Bishop Zuroweste . . . For Your Years of Dedication and Service," it captures the essence and spirit of this great man:

Undoubtedly St. Paul was the greatest missionary in the history of the Church. To help him bring the Gospel to all men he chose a young man by name of Timothy to be his companion on his missonary journeys. Eventually Paul consecrated Timothy a Bishop and placed him in charge of the Church at Ephesus.

Later, when Paul was a prisoner in Rome, he wrote to his protege to explain what a Bishop is and what a Bishop is expected to do. Paul was never one to mince words. He exhorted Timothy to stir up God's grace that is in him by virtue of his high office. It was quite obvious to Paul that Timothy, who received the power of a Bishop from his own hands, likewise was given the fullness of the priesthood.

Paul, therefore, did not hesitate to tell his protege quite frankly: "Stir up the grace of God which is in you by the laying on of my hands."

Paul reminded Timothy that God had called him to be a Bishop not for his own sake, but to do the work of the Church. Paul declared to the young Bishop: "He has redeemed us and called us, with a holy calling, not according to our own works, but according to his own purpose."

Paul placed the obligations of the Episcopacy squarely before Timothy: "Preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season, reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and teaching . . . but be watchful in all things, bear with tribulations patiently, work as a preacher of the Gospel, fulfill your ministry." Paul made it quite clear that a Bishop must be a teacher and a defender of the doctrine of Christ, a priest at sacred worship and a minister for governing the Church.

Twenty-five years ago Bishop Albert Zuroweste was entrusted with his own "Ephesus", and like Timothy was reminded that he, too, was given a holy calling, not according to his own works, but according to God's own purpose.

One can be sure that at the time Bishop Zuroweste was fully aware of the Scriptural exhortation: "to preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season . . . be watchful in all things . . . bear tribulations patiently . . . and work as a preacher of the Gospel."

And today . . . having listened well . . . our Bishop can reflect on the recent words of Pope Paul himself commenting on a similar anniversary: "An anniversary such as this is always a source of happiness because it recalls the service you have given to the People of God. The fundamental achievement of your twenty-five years is that you have made it possible for Jesus Christ to live through faith and love in many hearts and in many communities."

Few priests are asked to shoulder the heavy responsibilities of the Episcopacy. Yet twenty-five years ago Monsignor Albert R. Zuroweste was chosen to accept this burden for the welfare of the Church. At age 46 he was a comparatively young priest to be accorded this distinguished position of trust.

With his consecration as our third Bishop we were assured that the sacramental life of the Church here would flourish, that Christ in the Holy Eucharist would be present as victim and as food; and that the spiritual needs of the People of God would be satisfied.

Just as Timothy followed in Paul's footsteps, so the modern day Bishops share the office of Apostle for those who are members of Christ through Faith and Baptism. For twenty-five years Bishop Zuroweste has given himself completely to this task, leading the faithful in prayer and sacrifice and service. He has been teacher and pastor, father and guide to the people entrusted to his care. Unstintingly he has given of himself in the many-faceted role of administering the Diocese of Belleville.

In conclusion, I include the article in the Friday, January 26, edition of the Messenger detailing the celebration:

PEOPLE OF GOD TO HONOR BISHOP ZUROWESTE ON HIS SILVER JUBILEE

BELLEVILLE.—Sunday, January 28, will be a day of joy and celebration in honor of Bishop Albert R. Zuroweste's 25th anniversary of Episcopal Ordination.

But it also will be a day of prayer, thanksgiving and petition. Bishop Zuroweste sets the tenor of the celebration in his Jubilee Message to the People of God (page one of today's supplement). He writes:

"I ask all of you to join with me in prayer that Christ and His Blessed Mother will continue to watch over us and guide our footsteps along the path of righteousness and virtue. Above all, I pray that this anniversary will be an occasion of spiritual renewal and rededication to the service of Christ and His Church for all in the Diocese."

The People of God will gather at the afternoon Mass and at the evening reception to thank Bishop Zuroweste for his years of service. Many highlights of the past quarter-century are recalled in the supplement included in today's edition. (See center section.)

The jubilee celebration, sponsored by the Priests Senate special committee, will open with the Pontifical Concelebrated Solemn Mass of Thanksgiving at 3 p.m. in the Cathedral of St. Peter. The reception will begin at 5 p.m. (see related story on page one).

Joining the People of God of the Diocese will be visiting members of the U.S. Hierarchy and civic dignitaries.

From its inception the anniversary was meant to be a public function involving the laity, religious and clergy of the entire Diocese. Accordingly, religious and lay groups are assisting the Priests Senate committees.

The processional will form at the Cathedral grade school at 2:30 p.m. and be prepared to leave this area at 2:45 p.m. Forming the escort will be the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus color and honor guard of 60 members directed by Master C. W. Gruninger, the Catholic War Veterans color and armed guard, clergy and ministers. The priest-concelebrants, the visiting Cardinals and prelates and their chaplains, will join the procession as it moves into the Cathedral square, escorting the Jubilarian into the Cathedral.

Mass will begin promptly at 3 p.m., Father Joseph Schwaegel, liturgy chairman, assures. For this reason he asks everyone planning to attend Mass to be inside the Cathedral before that hour. Attendance at the Mass will fulfill one's Sunday obligation, he added, and Holy Communion will be distributed at 18 stations in various parts of the Cathedral.

Areas are reserved for clergy, for the Sisters (south nave) and for the family. All other pews, and the auxiliary seating which will bring the capacity to 3,000 persons, are not reserved.

Twelve priests of the Diocese will be concelebrants with Bishop Zuroweste and associate pastors of the Cathedral will be masters of ceremonies.

His Eminence John Cardinal Cody of Chicago will give the anniversary homily following the Gospel of the Mass.

Lay and Religious representatives will participate as lectors, commentator, leader of song, readers of the General Intercessions and in the Offertory Presentation of the Gifts.

John Scherrer, president of the diocesan board of education, and Robert Klostermann, principal of Mater Dei High and chairman of the association of secondary principals, will be lectors. William Fenoughty, the head commentator of the Cathedral, will be commentator. Father Theodore Cholewinski, OMI, will be the congregational leader of song.

The General Intercessions will be read by Sister Irene McGrath, ASC, provincial leader of the Adorers of the Blood of Christ; Sister Joan Markus, SSND, chairman of the association of elementary principals, representing the diocesan elementary schools; Mrs. Marie Heyer, international president of the Daughters of Isabella, representing the lay women of the Diocese; Fred J. Schlosser, Jr., associate administrator of Good Samaritan Hospital, Mt. Vernon, president of the Diocesan Catholic Hospital Association; Joseph H. Igel, representing the lay men of the Diocese; Michael Merrifield, president of the senior class, St. Henry Prep, representing the youth of the Diocese.

In the Offertory processional, the Presentation of Gifts will be made by:

Brother Francis Skube, Diocesan Brothers of Christ the King; Brother Henry Heidemann, SM, representing the high school brothers; Sister M. Angelona, PHJC, representing the women religious; Mrs. Mary Wesseln, president of the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women; Arnold Kinsella, president of St. Peter's Fraternity, Third Order of St. Francis; Michael George, president of the Diocesan CYO; and Sheila O'Malley, Denise Aldridge, Michael Waller, Brian Dowell, representing the students of the Catholic elementary schools of the Diocese.

Robert J. Hachmeister will be choir director and C. Dennis York will be organist. The 100-voice choir consists of members of the Belleville Diocesan Chorale and the Belleville Philharmonic Chorale. String instrumentalists from the Philharmonic will join the woodwind, brass and percussion sections from the Althoff Catholic High Band.

The principal music, chorale and congregational selections in the Order of Service are the Triumphal March processional; "O Clap Your Hands" hymn of greeting; Franz Schubert's Glory to God in the Highest; "The Lord Is My True Shepherd" offertory processional; "Rejoice in Hope", The Our Father in Gregorian Chant; "Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring" (Communion hymn), Crown Him With Many Crowns", the thanksgiving song; the recessional hymn, "Hallelujah".

The program for the Pontifical Concelebrated Mass is published in a 24-page sou-

venir booklet to be distributed to all in attendance. In addition to the Order of Service, the souvenir contains a full color print of Bishop Zuroweste's portrait together with a dedication, "The Role of the Bishop." Congregational hymns also are included in the special booklet.

Shuttle buses to the reception hall will begin trips from the Cathedral shortly after the close of the Mass.

DECISION TO HOMEPORT IN GREECE

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two excellent editorials from the Washington Post, January 6, and the New York Times, January 22, which praise a recent joint report issued by two subcommittees of the Foreign Affairs Committee on "The Decision to Homeport in Greece." Without regard to how one feels about that decision, this report, like much of the recent work of that committee, is illustrative of the kind of thorough oversight performance that is essential if Congress is to reassert its appropriate role in foreign affairs. Chairman THOMAS E. MORGAN and his colleagues on the committee are to be commended for their efforts.

The two editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1973]

"HOMEPORT" IN A POLITICAL STORM

A joint report by two House Foreign Affairs subcommittees (Europe and Near East) scores the Pentagon for deciding to "homeport" a carrier task group in Athens, on grounds that the step tends to strengthen not only military rule in Greece but also the impression of American support for such rule The subcommittees complain in persuasive detail that administration officials cooperated inadequately with their inquiry and they express the fear that, in this matter as in others, the Pentagon led the State Department by the nose.

The "horse" to be sure, has already been "stolen": homeporting is a fact in Greece. Because long stays at sea were leading skilled sailors to leave the Navy, with results harmful to Navy capabilities, the Pentagon in 1970 decided to "homeport." Under this "administrative arrangement," not to be confused with a "base," married officers and enlisted men bring their families over during their tours and bachelors see more of the world ashore. Athens was chosen over alternative sites in Italy, the Navy stated, entirely for reasons of naval logistics and family convenience.

The Navy had such a license to exclude political considerations, one gathers, not simply because State was slow out of the starting gate but because for some time it has been administration policy not to put heat on Greece to restore representative rule; the colonels took over in 1967. Outsiders, including Congressmen, are hard put to know whether the basis of this policy is a calculated judgment that a relaxed pose would produce more progress towards democracy than pressure or simple indifference put forward under the cover of a Nixon Doctrine low profile, or a determination that "orderly" military Greece was easier to deal with than "disorderly" democratic Italy, or something else.

We would add that it is not only the Nixon administration which appears insensitive to conditions in Greece. Appallingly, an organization supposedly dedicated to the free flow of ideas—Distripress (Association for the Promotion of the International Circulation of the Press)—has planned its general assembly this year in Athens, where the press sits under tight and arbitrary controls.

In any event, the foreign affairs subcommittees' report and the hearings preceding it represent, in our view, a serious and responsible project, apart from the majority conclusions of the report. It is as much by congressional laziness as by executive pushiness that excessive power in foreign affairs has passed to the President and his aides. Solid and sustained congressional attention to the nitty gritty is essential if the essential balance—one might better say the appropriate tension—is ever to be satisfactorily gained. As a full committee, House Foreign Affairs has in the past contented itself mostly with handling the aid bill. More recently, its subcommittees have gotten lively, holding the downtown departments to closer account on specific issues, conducting comprehensive investigations and in general accumulating—by the slow steady route which is the only route open to it—the stature to become effective participants in the capital's ongoing dialogue on foreign affairs.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1973]

MAKING FOREIGN POLICY

(By Graham Hovey)

The United States Navy's successful drive to make Athens its largest "homeport" in Europe provides a timely case study of how foreign policy is made in the Nixon Administration.

Much more is at stake here than the bestowing of Washington's most dramatic blessing to date on a military dictatorship that has been cast out of the Council of Europe and suspended from its association with the European Common Market.

More is involved than the stationing of 6,600 Navy officers and men and 3,100 dependents in the Athens-Piraeus area at a time when the United States is supposedly lowering its overseas profile in line with the so-called Nixon Doctrine.

An account pieced together by two House Foreign Affairs subcommittees reveals typical Administration foreign-policy behavior: deviousness, refusal to give Congress essential information, the predominance of short-run military needs over long-term political values and Pentagon domination of the State Department.

The Navy has adopted overseas homeporting as a means of keeping skilled men who now quit the service because sea duty requires long absences from their families. The carrier task group based on Athens will return to that port every month or two instead of being away at least six months on each deployment, as is now the case.

What the record shows is that the Navy decided on Athens even before preliminary studies of other Mediterranean ports had been completed and four months before the State Department "authorized" the Defense Department to conduct specific surveys on the acceptability for the carrier group of alternative ports in Italy.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Russell Fessenden told the House subcommittee that, with the initial surveys barely under way in early February 1971, the Defense Department asked State for "informal guidance" on a Navy study "which clearly identified Athens as the preferred location" for the carrier task group.

"In late February," said Mr. Fessenden, "the (State) Department suggested to Defense that alternative ports in the Mediterranean be studied, particularly in Italy." But it was not until June that State actually authorized the Italian surveys.

It was hardly a surprise then that the surveys, carried out by the Navy, pointed decisively to Athens, the Navy's original choice. When asked by Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, a subcommittee chairman, which Italian port came nearest to Athens in meeting the Navy's requirements, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, replied:

"It would be difficult for me to make a judgment because I found them all so clearly inacceptable. . . . Athens just stood out loud and clear as the only one that really satisfied a substantial number of the criteria."

Yet, the Defense Department refused to give the subcommittees the full surveys and the Navy refused to testify on a summary of the appraisals which Congressmen found inadequate and which they did not receive until two weeks after Admiral Zumwalt had testified.

In a bulky but revealing paragraph of their report, the subcommittee majorities summarized both their own frustrations and the extent of Pentagon domination of State in the making of policy:

"Where the Defense Department was farsighted in planning for the Mediterranean homeport, the State Department did little to counter the initiative; where the Defense Department was decisive in proposing Athens, State was hesitant in insisting on altrenative port studies; when Defense parried this insistence by ordering quick surveys of a few Italian ports, the State Department accepted these results, even though the surveys would be difficult to defend as justifications for the Athens choice; finally, when the Defense Department refused to give the subcommittees further information on the alternative ports . . . the State Department was left with the unpleasant task of testifying in open session without any D.O.D. (Department of Defense) assistance on what the D.O.D. surveys showed!"

Yet, it would be wrong to blame only military arrogance or agggressiveness or State Department timidity. It is not the Navy's job but that of its civilian superiors to give proper weight to the liabilities of buttressing a repressive regime in Athens.

It is not only the Pentagon that defies Congress with impunity and undercuts the role of the legislative branch in the shaping of national policy. The attitudes and tactics employed in the homeporting decision surely reflect faithfully the views and practices of the President himself and his White House coterie.

It is a blunder for the United States to increase its military visibility in Greece. But this affair is far more serious as yet another example of what the subcommittees call the "unwillingness of the executive branch to acknowledge major decisions and to subject them to public scrutiny and discussion."

CAN THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE DELIVER THE MAIL?

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a little item which appeared in the January 29, 1973, U.S. News & World Report:

Ten tickets to professional football's Super Bowl game which were mailed in New York to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce on January 5, via certified airmail arrived in Wash-

ington on January 16—2 days after the game had been played in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are receiving this type of complaint. The simple fact is that the new Postal Corporation is not accomplishing its primary job. And that job is to deliver the mail in a reasonable length of time.

Eleven days from New York to Washington is not reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, there are several bills in Congress at this time to repeal legislation which set up the Postal Corporation.

I hope this does not happen.

But unless Congress accepts its responsibility and does something to improve the mail service it might happen.

It is easy for the Postmaster General to say to us:

Don't worry, boys, we will take care of the problem, it isn't the worry of Congress anymore.

But let me tell you this, Mr. Speaker, I am the link to the Federal Government with the Fifth District of Indiana and I certainly cannot tell my people to write to the Postmaster General.

The mail service is still a responsibility of Congress.

And Congress should act.

We should act within the framework of the present law. Congress should decide what is reasonable time for someone to receive his mail.

Then we should determine how this can be accomplished.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I intend to introduce amendments to this act, which will be designed to improve the mail service.

My amendments will not destroy the Postal Corporation. I am in favor of this concept. I am in favor of politics being out of the post office, but I am also in favor of good mail service and this is what the people of the Fifth District of Indiana and the United States are not getting.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of an editorial written by James H. Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. This editorial was written for the association's publication, Postal Record.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of Congress will take the time to read this editorial. There are important facts in this editorial, facts that should receive wide circulation among all Members of the House and Senate.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S ANNUAL REPORT

(By James H. Rademacher)

The Postmaster General used to report to who selected him for the position he now that the establishment is a quasi-corporation, he reports to the Board of Governors who selected him for the position he now holds.

The Report of Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen for Fiscal 1972 was published last month. It is an interesting document; in some ways commendable, in many other ways alarming.

Most alarming is the revelation that all major classes of mail, except third class, actually lost in volume during the year. First class mail was off by 1.1 billion pieces, or 2.2 per cent. The last time a decline in first class volume happened was in 1934, in the heart of the Great Depression. Second class mail last year was down by 0.8 per cent, and fourth class mail continued its moribund trend, declining by 5.5%.

The Postmaster General frankly admits the decline is due to increased postage rates. This is undoubtedly true, but an assist should be given to the steady disintegration of the service. Americans, in increasing numbers, are looking elsewhere to achieve communication. They are beginning to forsake the Post Office.

On the credit side of the ledger, third class mail (which is now conceded to be the most solid money-maker among all classes of mail) rose in volume from 20.5 billion to 21.9 billion, an increase of 6.7 per cent. This spurt in volume was one of the principal reasons why the United States Postal Service was able to reduce its net (i.e. exclusive of appropriations for public service considerations) deficit from $204 million to $175 million.

The USPS recaptured in revenues 84.8 per cent of its costs. No other agency of government comes anywhere near this record. But, this was true of the old Post Office Department, also. It regularly returned to the Treasury approximately 85 per cent of its costs.

Another source of economy was the sweeping (and, to our way of thinking, foolish and unjust) decision to freeze all new hirings. The Postmaster General takes pride in the fact that the postal labor force was reduced during Fiscal 1972 by 22,511 persons. He claims productivity rose during the year by 24 per cent. (The National Association of Letter Carriers, on the other hand, claims that morale decreased by about 50 per cent.)

The Postmaster General takes great pride in the revelation that the average time to deliver a first class letter dropped during the year from 1.7 days to 1.6 days. (More than 60 per cent of all first class letters are local.) Any improvement is greatly welcome, but it must be remembered that 10 years ago, the time of delivery was only 1.3 days per letter.

The total revenues of the USPS for the year were $7,884 million, an increase of 18.3 per cent over the previous year. The total volume was 87 billion, an increase of only 0.2 per cent. Total operating expenses were $9,522 million, an increase of only 6.3 per cent, a figure manufactured mostly by the decision not to replace retired or deceased postal employees, and by trying to force other employees to take up the slack, whether they wished to work overtime or not.

But, in all the mass of figures in the Annual Report of the Postmaster General for Fiscal 1972, there is one that stands out with chilling clarity: The *per capita* use of the mails in Fiscal 1972 dropped 0.5%, from 421 pieces per person per year to 419 pieces.

A very small percentage, you might say. Quite right. But it is the first time the Postal Establishment has stepped backwards in forty years.

The nation's progress and the nation's literacy have been gauged over the years by the steady and often phenomenal increase in the use of the mails by the average citizen. This is the first time in our entire history, during a non-depression year, that the *per capita* use has dropped.

We are not yet in a depression. But, are falling postal figures a *cause*, or a *result* of economic disasters?

Whatever the reason, no one can reasonably applaud policies espoused by the United States Postal Service, which certainly seem to minimize service, to discourage use of the mails, and to encourage the public to go elsewhere when they wish to communicate with their fellow citizens.

Despite the seeming euphoria of the Postmaster General, his Annual Report gives cause for thoughtful people to worry about the future of the mails, and the future of the nation.

THE NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

According to press stories, a record holiday mail volume was processed by the United States Postal Service without major mishaps with a "minimum number of cards and fruit cakes arriving late." This sounds like an opinion of one of the "fruit cakes" and not someone who has access to the facts. Most every postal employee will agree that it was the Christmas during which the worst snafu of the mails in history occurred.

The Union has never been bombarded with as many protests from members and postal customers alike as it was during Christmas Operation 1972. In many areas, mail volume was as much as 10% greater than that delivered the previous holiday season. Yet, the overtime involved to handle that volume which exceeded all expectations was significantly less than ever used in previous years. The reason—millions of Christmas cards were delivered after Christmas and at the convenience of USPS which had little or no regard for the sanctity of the Christmas message.

Throughout the country, Postmasters reported total cleanup of Christmas mail on Saturday, December 23, 1972. We do not question this statement as it relates to individual post offices. We do strenuously object to the public being misinformed and to the subsequent allegations of the public that postal workers had delayed the Christmas cards and parcels.

An example of the distortion of the facts is the situation which existed at Clearwater, Florida. Reports indicated that mail arriving in the Clearwater area on December 20 was not delivered until after Christmas. According to Union sources, 900 bags of mail were on hand when carriers returned from their Christmas Day off. Similar situations were in evidence throughout the Nation. Included in some of the "horror" stories are:

At Wilmington, California, a local jewelry store advertising a "give away" for December 17 had that announcement delivered December 29. Other incidents of circulars being delivered long after the date of sales were reported at this office. Although mail from Chicago, Illinois to Pasadena took only two days in some instances, it took another five days to effect delivery between Pasadena and Carson, California, 30 miles distance.

The scandal of the year developed on Long Island where Union officials reported more than 200,000 pieces of mail on hand after Christmas. Overtime was limited and together with the freeze, most cards mailed after December 16 were delivered between December 26 and New Year's Day on Long Island.

Christmas mail addressed to the Allentown, Pennsylvania "Morning Call" from Massachusetts and dated December 20 was delivered in Allentown on December 30. At this same city, the publishers of this newspaper deposited several birthday greetings on Thursday, December 14 for local delivery. All were delivered the following Tuesday, December 19.

At Newark, Delaware, the workroom floor was clean on December 23. But during the period December 26-December 30 almost 75% of the mail delivered was Christmas cards, some dating back to December 14. First-class mail was backed up so badly on December 29, carriers received overtime to process it.

Back to Florida—the prospering city of Seminole seemed to be the victim of serious delays. Evidence received at Union Headquarters revealed copies of first-class envelopes which were delayed up to 12 days between postmark and time of delivery. One envelope required 11 days to travel 15 miles. Another air mail envelope from Pennsylvania required 11 days for delivery. A Christmas card, properly addressed including Zip Code required seven days for delivery in the same city.

A signed affidavit addressed to the National President includes evidence of delays at Sylmar, California where a first-class letter required four days to be delivered to a distance of five miles. On January 3, 1973, a box of spoiled cheese arrived from Wisconsin with a postmark of December 11, 1972.

A group of Bridgeport, Connecticut merchants is planning to report directly to the Postmaster General concerning unbelievable delays of mail service in New England. The merchants report such glaring inefficiencies as the delay of two packages mailed December 6 at nearby Lynbrook, New York which arrived at Bridgeport December 19. A first-class letter mailed in Pennsylvania December 11 arrived at the store of a merchant December 23. The merchant complained that it now takes up to 12 days for package delivery between some cities in New York and Connecticut.

At Plymouth, Michigan, all mail was reported cleaned up on Christmas Eve. On December 26, 16 sacks of first-class letters and 85 sacks of parcel post were curtailed. Again on December 27, six sacks of first-class letters were curtailed. On December 28, 15 sacks of first-class letters and 100 sacks of parcel post were curtailed. On December 30, five sacks of first-class letters and 47 sacks of parcel post were curtailed.

As the Amsterdam, New York "Evening Recorder" titled its editorial on December 20—"Not All Ho-Ho-Ho"—we really don't know what USPS is trying to prove. The editorial could have well been written by a Union official as it declares:

"It set out to make a Federal Department beset by political pressures into a business-like, efficient organization to handle, transport and deliver the mails, but a public-be-damned attitude isn't really business-like, is it? And is it business-like to decrease the service at the same time you are increasing its cost? Hardly! Perhaps without realizing it, the Postal Service is giving real impetus to competing private enterprise parcel services. It seems to us that the public has a real stake in what happens to the Postal Service. If it does not like the mail slowdown, the curtailment of service and increased cost, the public had better make itself heard before it is too late."

The situation became so acute, postal unions at Palm Beach, Florida paid for a ½-page advertisement in the local press warning the public that the Postal Service is surely in deep trouble. The unions set the record straight as to where the responsibility lies for the continuing deterioration of service. Inglewood, Calif. Branch 2980 also had a half-page ad published stating true facts of delivery policies.

It is now apparent that the USPS intends to carry out its inferred threat that only cards mailed by December 15 are guaranteed delivery by Christmas Eve if mailed for local delivery. The problem of delayed delivery of Christmas mail can now be traced directly to the managed mail system and the methods of distribution and dispatch at sectional centers. In order to establish new records for economy in operation, undoubtedly some sectional heads determined to store all Christmas mail postmarked December 16 and thereafter to be delivered during the so-called light volume period, December 26-December 30.

It is also apparent that the USPS is heading toward the priority mail policy. This would mean that mailers desiring prompt delivery of their envelopes would be required to pay a specific rate of postage. Meanwhile, those mailers who do not require immediate delivery will be paying a lesser rate. The United States Postal Service is showing its hand and the Union now must make similar decisions. We will try to inject into the forthcoming negotiations language intended to provide the Unions with some rights with regard to mail deliveries, curtailments and overtime conditions. If unsuccessful at the bargaining table, it will become necessary for the Union to ask Congress to decide whether or not USPS can make the determination on delivery dates of mail upon which is affixed postage which has heretofore guaranteed expeditious handling.

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. ARMSTRONG) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, for 1 hour, on January 31.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, January 31.

Mr. DRINAN (at the request of Mr. BADILLO) for 30 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. RUTH.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. WYATT in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BADILLO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DRINAN in five instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

308. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Service, for fiscal year 1973, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

309. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

310. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 25, 1958, as amended, and the Presidential Transition Act of 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

311. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a study of a certain segment of the Oklawaha River for potential additional to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

312. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

313. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report covering calendar year 1972 on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

314. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing the continued occupancy under lease arrangement by the Social Security Administration of space in Chicago, Ill., pursuant to the Public Building Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 132. Resolution to create a select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 93–2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 176. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. Res. 132. Resolution

to create a select committee to study the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. (Rept. No. 93-3). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 3209. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act, to prohibit discrimination by creditors against individuals on the basis of sex or marital status with respect to the extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3210. A bill to prohibit discrimination by any federally insured bank, savings and loan association, or credit union against any individual on the basis of sex or marital status in credit transactions and in connection with applications for credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3211. A bill to prohibit discrimination by any party to a federally related mortgage transaction on the basis of sex or marital status, and to require all parties to any such transaction to submit appropriate reports thereon for public inspection; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 3212. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 3213. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 3214. A bill to prohibit any instrumentality of the United States from using as a prefix to the name of any person any title which indicates marital status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 3215. A bill to exempt child care services from the ceiling on expenditures for social services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to deduction for business expenses for care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who resides with and maintains a household for another person or persons (while such person or any of such persons is employed or self-employed) shall be considered as performing covered services in maintaining such household and shall be credited accordingly for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 5 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 3219. A bill to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. THONE, and Mr. O'HARA):

H.R. 3220. A bill to establish more effective community planning and development programs (and expand the related provisions of existing programs) with particular emphasis upon assistance to small communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina:

H.R. 3221. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 3223. A bill to require the termination of all weapons range activities conducted on or near the Culebra complex of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. VANIK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 3224. A bill to require the termination of all weapons range activities conducted on or near the Culebra complex of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range; to the Committee on Armed Servcies.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3226. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend certain transitional rules for allowing a charitable contribution deduction for purposes of the estate tax in the case of certain charitable remainder trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 3228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed as a child-care deduction, and to eliminate the income ceiling on eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3229. A bill › amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3230. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with respect to the terms of office of officers of local labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3232. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3233. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend section 1905 of title 44 of the United States Code relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3236. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3237. A bill to regulate the interstate trafficking and sale of hypodermic needles and syringes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3238. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3240. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3241. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 3242. A bill to amend section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of affiliated banks for purposes of the common trust fund provisions of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 3243. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3244. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by

the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such a mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the payment of aid or assistance under approved State public assistance plans to aliens who are illegally within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 3249. A bill to establish a Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3250. A bill to provide that the appropriation requests of certain regulatory agencies be transmitted directly to Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3251. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the allocation of frequencies for telecommunications for the purpose of formulating an allocation system to achieve the maximum use of the frequencies for such communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3252. A bill to abolish the Federal Communications Commission and transfer its functions to a new Federal Broadcasting Commission, Telecommunications Common Carrier Commission, and Telecommunications Resources Authority, and to the Secretary of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3254. A bill to transfer to the Secretar of Commerce all the functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Communications Commission relating to the allocation of frequencies for telecommunications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3255. A bill to restore the independence of Federal regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3256. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to orders of Federal courts intended to desegregate public schools as required by the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3257. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 3258. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3259. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American Forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3260. A bill to establish and implement a national transportation policy for the next 50 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to provide for the registration of manufacturers of cosmetics, the testing of cosmetics, and the labeling of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 3262. A bill to prohibit States and political subdivisions from discriminating against low and moderate income housing, and to give a priority in determining eligibility for assistance under various Federal programs to political subdivisions which submit plans for the inclusion of low and moderate income housing in their development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to extend minimum wage and overtime compensation protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, to improve standards of overtime compensation protection, to provide improved means of enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 3264. A bill to compensate victims of crimes of violence in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 3265. A bill to establish a District of Columbia Urban Development Corporation; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 3266. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax or payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the act of September 18, 1964, authorizing the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. WYATT, Mr. PIKE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BYRON, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HUNT, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. MALLARY):

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 with respect to the limitations on expenditures made for the use of communications media in order to oppose the candidacy of a legally qualified candidate for Federal elective office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. GUYER):

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend the Federal Campaign Act of 1971 with respect to the limitations on expenditures made for the use of communications media in order to oppose the candidacy of a legally qualified candidate for Federal elective office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments for 4 additional years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 3272. A bill relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, utilization, and evaluation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to public museums; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3274. A bill to strengthen interstate reporting and interstate services for parents of runaway children, to provide for the development of a comprehensive program for the transient youth population for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of temporary housing and psychiatric, medical, and other counseling services for transient youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide relief to certain individuals 62 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through a system of income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 3276. A bill to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 3278. A bill making appropriations to carry out programs of the Veterans' Administration to expand Veterans' Administration hospital education and training capacity, and to provide grants to establish new State medical schools, to expand and improve medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration, and to assist certain affiliated institutions in training health personnel, for fiscal year 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3281. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3282. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to permit the waiver of matching requirements in special and unusual circumstances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 3284. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed

Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 3285. A bill to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 3286. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3287. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the service requirement for pension eligibility based on World War I service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 3289. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointments to Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 3290. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointments to Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 3291. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointments to Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3292. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 3293. A bill to repeal section 15 of the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964, to remove certain limitations on the amount of grant assistance which may be available in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States" approved October 14, 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 3295. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. YOUNG of GEORGIA, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 3296. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. MOSS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 3297. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3298. A bill to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 3299. A bill to provide that certain provisions of the Natural Gas Act relating to rates and charges shall not apply to persons engaged in the production or gathering and sale but not in the transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 3300. A bill to retain November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses paid by him for special education furnished to a child or other minor dependent who is physically or mentally handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 3302. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in order to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3304. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and to create a new title in the Consumer Credit Protection Act in order to license consumer credit investigators; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3307. A bill to provide for payments to compensate county governments for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the feasibility of broadening the purposes of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to train civilian physicians to serve in medically underserved areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3309 A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3310. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3311. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3312. A bill to authorize a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3313. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to remove the steamer *Glen* from Manistee Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote additional protection for the rights of participants in private pension plans, to establish minimum standards for vesting, to establish an insurance corporation within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an employer corporation to establish a plan under which its employees may purchase and hold stock in such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3317. A bill to reduce solid waste pollution and litter which is caused by glass containers by making safer and more efficient the process of recycling glass containers by requiring that glass containers be made of clear glass; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 3318. A bill to provide maternity benefits for pregnant wives of certain former servicemen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3319. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 3320. A bill to require the Secretary of

Transportation to prescribe regulations governing the humane treatment of animals transported in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3321. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3322. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3323. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of material harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to change the age and service requirements with respect to the retirement of Justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3325. A bill to provide for the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California to hold court at Santa Ana, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3326. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations which shall have jurisdiction over certain labor disputes in industries substantially affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the issuance to certain persons of judicial orders to appear for the purpose of conducting nontestimonial identification procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that a person found guilty of willfully failing to appear as required while charged with a felony and free on bail be liable to receive the same penalty provided for the felony charge pending when he failed to appear; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3329. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to Federal habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3330. A bill to permit an interested U.S. citizen to request a consular or immigration officer to review the presumed immigrant status determined for an alien by such officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for the taking and holding of hostages by inmates of Federal prisons, and for the making of certain agreements with such inmates to secure the release of such hostages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3332. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18, United States Code (respecting transportation of kidnap victims in interstate commerce), to eliminate a constitutional infirmity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3333. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution designating August 26 of each year as "Women's Equality Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the Congress to provide by law for the imposition and carrying out of the death penalty in the case of certain crimes involving aircraft piracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution to establish a national policy relating to conversion to the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the restrictive emigration policies of the Soviet Union and its trade relations with the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Holy Crown of Saint Stephen should remain in the safekeeping of the U.S. Government until Hungary once again functions as a constitutional government established by the Hungarian people through free choice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of the Congress with respect to the delegation of functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity to other Government agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Res. 172. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H. Res. 173. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 174. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 175. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 3334. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Rios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 3335. A bill for the relief of Euwie Elisha Knott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 3336. A bill for the relief of Jamie Interior Capule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3337. A bill for the relief of Gerald Levine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 3338. A bill for the relief of Loretto B. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 3339. A bill for the relief of Delmira Martinez Sandoval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 3340. A bill for the relief of Loren Ted Ward, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOOD AND LESS FOOD

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, since the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I represent, is one of the most rural congressional districts in the entire Nation, our people, naturally, are deeply concerned about actions which affect farm prices and production.

Right now our people are worried about the cutback of the rural environmental assistance program.

I would like, at this time, to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent column written by Margery Burns. She is a farm wife who has a deep understanding of the problem down on the farm and what causes those problems.

I urge my colleagues and all of those other people who get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read this column by Mrs. Burns. It might broaden their understanding of what is happening in and to rural America:

FOOD AND LESS FOOD

Speaking of food . . . and food costs . . . and farmers . . . .

The weather seems to be more successful in getting higher farm prices than all the efforts of the farmers. So far!

It seems strange that most people can't understand that when more and more farmers are forced out of business, food prices will go up no matter what the government or consumers want.

You see, if only a few farmers have food products to sell, they can easily control the prices of their products. And the controlled scarcity of food will shoot those prices as high as they are in other countries. Remember, the people in China pay most of their income for food, and the Russian people, with government controlled agricultural, uses about half of their income in order to eat.

The greatest safe-guard we have in this country for reasonably priced food is to keep a large number of farmers on the land.

So what happens this year? The weather hits with rain and storms all over the country, and those rains and storms kept farmers