



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 16, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We know that in everything God works for good with those who love Him.—Romans 8: 28.

Eternal Spirit of God, the light of the minds that seek Thee, the life of the spirits that find Thee, and the love of the souls that serve Thee, grant unto us a renewal of heart as we wait upon Thee in this our morning prayer. By Thy spirit make us ready for the responsibilities of this day, equal to every experience and adequate to serve the present age.

The world around us is full of the rumblings of discontent and disturbances which breed disorder. In these hours help us to keep our faith, that strong in Thee we may face these facts courageously and confidently, ever seeking liberty and justice and peace for all.

Bless our land with Thy favor and strengthen us to walk in the way of Thy commandments: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 5 BY MIDNIGHT, MAY 18

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to S. 5, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, known as the Truth in Lending Act, may have until midnight on Saturday, May 18, to file the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

CXIV—855—Part 11

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days I will introduce a bill providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Establishment of an African Institute for Cultural and Technical Interchange. I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives who believe in the future of Africa to join as sponsors of this bill.

The time is now for all in our United States to recognize that Africa's role in tomorrow's world will be significant.

There are already in existence two institutions which make possible cultural and technical interchange between our country and the nations of Asia and our country and the nations of Latin America. There seems valid and compelling reason for the existence of an institute to accomplish these identical aims between our country and the nations of Africa.

The bill I will introduce establishes a commission to determine whether such a need is real at this time, and how best to accomplish it. It makes no provision for the actual establishment of such an institute until an in-depth study first ascertains whether or not justification exists.

I hope I may count on your support.

LOAN-SHARK AMENDMENT

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that conferees on the truth-in-lending bill have reached final accord on the form of the loan-shark amendment adopted by the House.

Although my separate bill on loan sharking had been pending for a considerable time, the Committee on the Judiciary had not been able to find time in its busy schedule to hold public hearings prior to floor action on the amendment. However, since the day the House acted, earnest efforts have been made to elicit the views and advice of representatives of a broad spectrum of the financial world. Legal craftsmen in the Congress and the Department of Justice have brought a wealth of talent to bear upon the issue. Doubtless, the final product will not fully please everyone. It may be too broad for some and too narrow for others.

Yet, I am confident that the new form

will preserve the essential substance of the original House amendment; that it will effectively reach its intended target, the heartless loan shark of organized crime who preys upon destitute and desperate people; and that it will not jeopardize the lawful operations of legitimate lending institutions.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be absent on May 2. For that reason I am not recorded on rollcall No. 113. I would like the Record to show that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 141]

| | | |
|---------------|------------|----------------|
| Baring | Hagan | Morse, Mass. |
| Bell | Hall | Olsen |
| Bolton | Halleck | O'Neill, Mass. |
| Broomfield | Hanley | Passman |
| Cabell | Hardy | Pool |
| Carter | Hawkins | Purcell |
| Clark | Hébert | Rarick |
| Collier | Holland | Resnick |
| Colmer | Howard | Rivers |
| Conyers | Irwin | Rosenthal |
| Cramer | Karsten | Scheuer |
| Culver | Kee | Selden |
| Dawson | Kelly | Skubitz |
| Downing | Kuykendall | Stubblefield |
| Eckhardt | Long, La. | Taft |
| Esch | Long, Md. | Teague, Calif. |
| Fraser | McDonald, | Teague, Tex. |
| Frelinghuysen | Mich. | Tenzer |
| Gettys | Mailliard | Vander Jagt |
| Griffin | Mayne | Wilson, |
| Gross | Moore | Charles H. |
| Gurney | Moorhead | Young |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

13565

THE 1967 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 312)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to submit to Congress the 1967 Annual Report of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The Seaway had its second best year in nine years of operations—registering a total of 44 million tons of cargo. The record season for Seaway tonnage was 1966 when 49.2 million tons were moved through the Montreal-Lake Ontario waterway. We hoped that the Seaway would reach the 50-million ton mark in 1967, but a strike plus some slackening in demand for grain, resulted in reduced traffic.

While overall tonnage was somewhat disappointing, there are many bright spots in the report. General cargo, for example, increased to six million tons from 5.5 million. Iron ore shipments also were higher with 16.4 million tons moving through the Seaway locks to the steel mills of the Midwest. These increases indicate the growing appreciation of the waterway's advantages as a means of reducing transportation costs.

The Seaway has truly placed Midwest ports on the sealanes of the world. More than 600 salt-water vessels made 1,284 trips into the Lakes in 1967.

However, reduced traffic, along with an adjustment in the division of toll revenue between Canada and the United States caused income to fall from \$7.1 million to \$6.1 million.

Despite this loss, \$4 million was returned to the U.S. Treasury. This makes a total repayment of \$28.9 million since the Seaway opened in 1959.

A major concern of the Corporation is the need to repair Eisenhower Lock. The Corporation retained the Corps of Engineers to direct the work which will continue until 1971. Fortunately, it will not interfere with the navigation seasons. In my budget for fiscal year 1969, I requested that funds be made available to cover the cost of repair.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 1968.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3300) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 3300, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed that the committee substitute amendment would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, initially I would like to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, for the outstanding presentation which was made yesterday in behalf of this legislation.

I think the record that has been made on the floor of the House in support of this bill is a splendid one. I am proud of the work that the full committee has done on both sides of the aisle on this particular bill.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to join the gentleman in complimenting our good friend, WAYNE ASPINALL, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have never heard or learned of Chairman ASPINALL bringing a bill before this body which was unworthy of consideration. Despite some of the complaints that one might hear in the cloakroom, and here and there, about this bill, I do want to say this—if it is good enough for WAYNE ASPINALL, it is good enough for Ed WILLIS.

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

I do believe this is a remarkable piece of legislative work that has been brought to the floor of the House, and a great share of the credit must go to the chairman of the full committee.

Yesterday the chairman of the full committee, in his presentation, made reference to the purpose of title II, "to assemble all of the relevant facts with respect to water availability and future water needs for all river basins draining into the Pacific Ocean, whether they are water-short areas or water-surplus areas."

The purpose of my taking this time is to receive an assurance, if I can, from the chairman of the full committee, that this language makes it quite clear that the Secretary of the Interior would not go beyond the area of the reclamation States in connection with the survey authorized by title II.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. First, may I accept the accolades that were thrown my way? But may I also state that the work on this bill was a committee operation? Even

those who are in opposition to some of the provisions of the bill deserve credit for bringing the bill out and making the record which was made yesterday.

Now, if I may answer my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. He is correct in his interpretation. When we refer to "westwide," we mean the western part of the United States, or the reclamation area. Of course, this particular provision, or the particular area covered by the studies authorized here, would be those basins which flow into the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RHODES OF ARIZONA

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 59, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "may, pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary," and insert in lieu thereof the words: "shall have a right, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary, to".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Are we considering amendments to the bill by title or to a particular title?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is considering the bill on the basis of its being open to amendment at any point.

Mr. ASPINALL. All the way through the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. All the way through the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, under section 302(a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire either fee title to, or easements over, lands within the Fort McDowell and Salt River Reservations for the Orme Dam and Reservoir. The purpose of my amendment is to make clear, as I understand the committee intended, that the two Indian communities involved may not be prevented from developing and operating recreation facilities within their reservations—particularly on lands to which the United States has acquired only flowage easements—by arbitrary action of some future Secretary of the Interior.

Even with my proposed change, the first sentence of section 302(d) still provides that recreation development by the two Indian communities shall be "subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary governing the recreation development of the reservoir," and the second sentence further provides that recreation development of the entire reservoir, including Indian lands, "shall be in accordance with a master recreation plan approved by the Secretary."

Moreover section 302(b) provides that any use or lease of land by the Indians must be consistent "with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the

project, as determined by, and under terms and conditions prescribed by, the Secretary," and, of course, any lease also must be approved by the Secretary under existing law—25 United States Code 415.

In short, my amendment frees the two Indian communities from the threat of arbitrary administrative action, but still leaves them subject to all reasonable controls to protect the interests of the United States in the project and to insure that recreation development will be in accordance with the Interior Department's master recreation plan for the reservoir.

Mr. Chairman, I might say parenthetically that, contrary to popular belief, I have only a few Indians in my district. This amendment is offered as a benefit for two Indian groups who live in the First District of Arizona.

One of them is the Salt River Indians, a rather populous tribe with a reservation which is in a very strategically located part of my district. The other is the Fort McDowell group. This group, on the other hand, is not affluent. In fact, this is the band about which the Secretary of the Interior remarked not too many weeks ago that it could not hire an attorney, so he had to be its attorney.

I am joining my illustrious friend, the Secretary of the Interior, as the attorney for the Fort McDowell Tribe and the Salt River Tribe today.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] that I do not have one Indian in my congressional district. Nevertheless, may I say that I believe this really accomplishes what the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs wanted to accomplish. The original amendment to this bill was the amendment that I offered and was adopted, and I think certainly this clarifies the intention and gives the right; instead of saying "may" do something, it says "shall" do something. I think the gentleman's amendment would do just exactly what the subcommittee sought and hoped it was doing in the language we put in the bill. I wish to thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, which I believe really clarifies what we intended to do.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the gentleman for advising the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of his intention to offer this amendment in the committee, thus giving us the opportunity to examine the amendment.

I believe that the language of the bill as reported by the committee is more than generous in its treatment of the Indians. Section 302 provides for Federal acquisition of the Indian lands needed for the Orme Dam and Reservoir. The United States will pay the full fair market value of the land. While the plans are not complete, it may be necessary to

acquire as many as 15,000 acres at a possible cost of \$2,000 per acre, which is a possible total of \$30,000,000 for the land. Only 400 Indians are members of the Fort McDowell community, where most of the land will be acquired, which means that the payment for the land may amount to as much as \$75,000 for each Indian man, woman, and child if applied on a per capita basis.

In addition, the section authorizes the payment of not to exceed \$500,000 for relocating the 53 homes and tribal facilities that must be moved. This is a gratuity, because the full value of the improvements will be paid as a part of the land acquisition.

In addition, the section authorizes the Secretary to give the Fort McDowell community 2,500 acres of Federal land. This also is a gratuity.

In addition, subsection (d) provides that each Indian community may, pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary, develop and operate recreational facilities on the federally acquired lands along the reservoir shoreline adjoining their reservations. The facilities must be in accordance with a master recreation plan approved by the Secretary.

The Indians are dissatisfied with this language in two respects:

First. They want a "right," rather than "permission" from the Secretary, to develop the recreation facilities on the Federal land; and

Second. They do not want their right to be made contingent upon an agreement with the Secretary. They say that it is enough if their developments conform to the master plan, and that they should be able to proceed with developments on the Federal land without any agreement with the Secretary regarding specifics.

It is the purpose of subsection (d) to give the Indians every opportunity and encouragement to undertake the recreational development of Federal lands on their side of the reservoir. There is no difference of opinion about this objective. It is unreasonable, however, to permit them to proceed with development, without an agreement with the Secretary, in the hope that the development when completed will be in accordance with the master plan. If the development should turn out to be incompatible with the master plan it would be difficult for the Secretary to do anything about it. If the development were undertaken pursuant to an agreement, however, as the bill provides, the chance of conflict would disappear.

I agree that the Indians should be permitted to undertake any recreation development on the Federal lands along their part of the shoreline that they want to undertake, if the development is in accord with the master plan. I also believe, however, that each particular development should be based on an advance agreement with the Secretary in order to assure compliance.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona changes the requirement for an advance agreement between the Indians and the Secretary to a requirement that the Indian development must be in accordance with plans ap-

proved by the Secretary. This is a clarification of the language in the bill, and I have no objection to it.

The amendment also changes the word "may" to "shall have a right." I regard this change as unobjectionable because under either form of the language the Indian development must be based on plans approved by the Secretary.

I therefore am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 53, line 13, change the period to a colon, and insert the following: "Provided, That the satisfaction of the requirements of the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994, 59 Stat. 1219), shall be from the waters of the Colorado River pursuant to the treaties, laws, and compacts presently relating thereto, until such time as a feasibility plan showing the most economical means of augmenting the water supply available in the Colorado River below Lee Ferry by two and one-half million acre-feet shall be authorized by the Congress."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the general debate on this bill, those of us who spoke against it said that one of the real defects in the present bill is that it has in a sense an open-ended authorization. The amendment which I have offered closes one of those open ends.

This proviso will tell the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with his plans, authorized in title II of the bill. He is directed to find the most economical means of augmenting the water supply available in the Colorado River, which is short by at least 2.5 million acre-feet. When he finds the most economical means, he is to report back to the Congress, and, when the Congress authorizes that project, it can then proceed.

No one knows what the total cost might be. One of the principal reasons that some of us have objected to the bill as it was drafted by the committee is that it left this tremendous question of future cost, ranging from low estimates of \$2.5 billion to high estimates of \$23.5 billion. The total amount that our committee has been advised the feasibility research will take is approximately \$12 million.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has again been very cooperative with his chairman. He has shown his chairman and others of the staff and of the committee this amendment.

What this amendment attempts to do, if I understand correctly, is to state a policy which is in keeping with other policies that have to do with other river basins. We also state that this basin must continue to furnish the water of the Mexican water burden until there is a satisfactory feasible report together with

an authorization, and, when the authorization takes place, it must take place for at least the minimum of the 2.5 million that is provided in this bill, and it cannot be understated. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. It does not attempt to take any position on the position of the upper basin, that under the compact they are not burdened with any debris at all from the river.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. This does not attempt to solve the problem of the upper basin against the lower basin.

This is only an attempt to solve the problem of the burden on the river with respect to the Mexican Water Treaty.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Once again I say to my colleague, he has been very cooperative. I believe this will remove a great deal of the fear which was expressed in the debate yesterday. As chairman of the committee, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, he is here asking a feasibility study be made. This would authorize a feasibility study, although nothing could be done under this section of the bill until that feasibility study was authorized; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. Nothing shall be done until the feasibility report is made by the Secretary showing the most economical means of augmenting the supply of the river, and then the Congress must approve and act upon that report.

Mrs. MAY. But, in any event, we would still be authorizing a feasibility study without a previous reconnaissance study. We do not know what the cost of this is going to be, as is true in the usual procedure of having a reconnaissance study before we go into the feasibility study. I am correct in that?

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentlewoman is correct in that this authorizes a feasibility study. It does also authorize a reconnaissance study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAYLOR was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAYLOR. However, it will be up to some succeeding Congress to take a look at the report which the Secretary will present. The Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, in testimony before our committee, stated that in their opinions a feasibility study of this nature would cost in the neighborhood of \$12 million.

Mrs. MAY. I should like to point out one thing to the gentleman, in all fairness. I want to be sure I am correct. Upon the adoption of the amendment—for which I should like to thank the gentleman, because I believe in some ways it partially corrects a situation about which we are all concerned—I should like to point out that we still

would not be giving this body an opportunity to again review a reconnaissance study before we OK'd expenditure on a feasibility study, as we ordinarily do for most projects of this sort.

Mr. SAYLOR. I must concede to my colleague that this is correct.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. This section has to be read in conformity with the previous section. The previous section calls for a reconnaissance study first. The reconnaissance study must precede any feasibility study and report.

The only thing involved here is whether or not a reconnaissance study sufficient within itself can cause the Secretary then to go ahead with the feasibility report.

In my opinion, and in the way our committee has worked throughout the years, there will be no feasibility report until we get to see that reconnaissance report and to see whether or not it shows feasibility. Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. SAYLOR. I say to the Members of the House that this has been the policy of the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ASPINALL, which he has followed. I have concurred in that policy ever since he has been the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. What is involved here is that we go ahead and make this a one-package operation. If the reconnaissance report does show feasibility possibility, then the report would be prepared.

The reason for this is that 3 or 4 years ago we changed the procedures in the Congress, establishing the procedure that they have to come to Congress for authorization of feasibility reports. Up to that time it could have been done anyhow; is that not correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. Until the action of the committee in bringing that bill to the floor to change the procedure, the Department would go ahead on its own and make feasibility reports.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. To clarify the gentleman's amendment, at such time as the committee and the Congress received a feasibility report, if it is authorized by this legislation, nothing would take place under the amendment until that feasibility report was acted upon, if there were a feasible plan being approved; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Now, if the Congress should approve a feasibility plan for the augmentation of the river by 2.5 million acre-feet, what then would occur with respect to the burden of the Mexican Water Treaty?

Mr. SAYLOR. Then it would be a national obligation under the terms of this section as amended.

Mr. FOLEY. You are proposing, then, that this section, section 202, shall be suspended unless the Congress shall

later authorize a feasibility plan with respect to the 2.5 million acre-feet? Is that the sense of your amendment?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is the effect of this amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. And in no way would the legislation operate presently to assume the Mexican Water Treaty as a national burden? Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. That whole question would be left to a later time?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. If I understand it correctly by the statements made by the chairman of the full committee and by your statement, this amendment which you are now offering does not go to the question of reconnaissance surveys versus feasibility studies, but this is carried in a different section of the bill. If I understood the remarks of the chairman correctly, he stated that this or a future Congress would have the opportunity of looking at that reconnaissance survey between the time it was made and the time a feasibility study was carried forward by the Secretary.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is exactly what I said. The reconnaissance study is in a previous section of this bill. That is the reason why it was doubled up as I explained to my colleagues yesterday and today. This is so that we can speed up a study without having to come back to another Congress which will later on have an opportunity to act on it, anyway.

Mr. McCLURE. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make sure I understand the chairman's former remarks that this Congress or a future one would have the opportunity at least to look at the reconnaissance survey between the time it was made and the Secretary went forward with a feasibility study, although that is not required by this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is correct. This is a procedural matter. There has never been a feasibility survey made that I know of in reclamation projects since I have been in Congress which did not come first to the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if we can refer to section 401, title IV, as I read that language, on page 72, it will really—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As I read this section, I am concerned because it seems to me what we are doing is to have a blank check on the U.S. Treasury for other projects that may cost billions of dollars. I would like to have the gentleman's view on this, and then I would like also to say that it seems very strange to me that this Congress at this time expresses deep concern about the national economy and about the national budget and that many in this House are insisting that we cut \$6 billion out of the appropriations. I talked to the people in the education field, and a \$6 billion cut in appropriations this year actually means a 30- or 33-percent cut on such things as Federal impact on elementary and secondary education and higher education. I cannot for the life of me understand why today we would take action that would in effect give this blank check to the U.S. Treasury for projects that will run into billions of dollars if we mean what we say that we are for economy and we intend to cut the budget. But I would like to have the gentleman's view on this. This is in section 401 of title IV. It seems it is in essence a blank check.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will say to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], that this is not a blank check. I have a tremendous respect for the gentleman's ability, but the procedure which we have established in title IV is to establish a lower basin fund, the same as we have established a fund for the upper basin of the Colorado River and specify where the money should come to go into that fund.

Now, this is the same provision as Congress after Congress has used in establishing water basin acts.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further for one clarifying question—

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, I yield further to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The language which appears on page 72 of section 401 as it is now written, if the gentleman's amendment is not adopted and if this language stays the same as it is now written, is it not conceivable that we really will authorize projects that are going up into billions of dollars? I happen to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but if it is not adopted, it seems to me that this is language which would allow this to happen.

Mr. SAYLOR. The reason this is being done is because the Congress authorized the upper basin projects in the Colorado River with a similar provision and we specified the projects that had to be built. This provided that the people of the upper basin would have to come before the Congress under certain circumstances to seek the deletion of some projects and ask for authorization for certain other projects. The same situation will exist in the lower basin.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not the same

identical procedure which we used with reference to the Columbia River Basin?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is the identical procedure.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to underline the fact that this bill only authorizes certain projects and if there were augmentation that the gentlewoman from Oregon seems to be worried about it certainly requires before any study could come out of this project for this work some subsequent Congress would have to authorize it. It is fully protected and there is no back door approach about which I am sure the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] refers and about which she is worried.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman explain to the members of the committee what the effect of this amendment will be on section 401, if any?

Mr. SAYLOR. The effect on section 401? It will have no effect on section 401.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if you cannot proceed under section 402 with reference to the feasibility report, then that portion dealing with nonreimbursables will not come up?

Mr. SAYLOR. Will not come into existence; yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield further to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. It will not come into existence until authorized by the Congress. If the amendment which has been offered is accepted, the provisions of section 401 referred to will not become effective until the feasibility report has been prepared and Congress takes a look at it and has the opportunity to approve or disapprove it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I commend the gentleman for offering his amendment and say to the gentleman that it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, today, as we continue the discussion of H.R. 3300, I want to associate my remarks with the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman ULLMAN, and the distinguished gentlemen of my own State of Washington [Mr. MEEDS and Mr.

FOLEY], who are members of the Committee on Interior and serve under the very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

My intention today is to talk about the problems of water.

I have the privilege of serving as the Subcommittee Chairman of Interior Appropriations where a great amount of water research is underway, and where even more should be underway. If it were not for the problem of guns or butter, but guns and water, more would be undertaken. I can understand and do understand the needs of Arizona and the needs of California. I appreciate their desires to settle this problem and I support the major portions of this bill but like the gentlemen from Oregon and Washington, I would like to see portions of the bill deleted or changed. However, I have no illusions. The bill will undoubtedly pass this morning since the Northwest is that portion of the Nation which has clear cold water and everyone in the Nation is looking at it with desire.

But it is because of this very fact that I am taking this time to develop legislative history and to point out that every river basin in the entire United States is confronted by serious problems. I was in Philadelphia 3 years ago when the Delaware was short; I have been in other parts of the United States when their rivers were almost dry; 3 weeks ago, I flew the length of the Columbia River where our river was at such a low ebb that one look was sufficient to show what diversion might mean, which brings me to the focal point of my remarks.

Diversion of a river is the easy way out. It is the Bureau of Reclamation's traditional way out. They have never hunted for other solutions and never will if they are given the money for diversion. But what does water diversion from one river basin to another area mean at this particular moment in our history.

It means that before we have made any national survey of the total water needs or total water problems and have met these problems with answering programs diversion could well be considered; 1973 is only 5 years away. From the testimony I have heard in my committee and with the present status of funding and expenditure limitations, the water problem is not going to be solved in 5 years in either the Columbia River Basin or any other river basin.

What are the long-term problems of river basins? Not only are they those of having adequate water now or in 5 years but what will the total needs of those basins be in 5 years? The Columbia River uses its water for power, irrigation, domestic consumption, industrial supply, and navigation. It is a combination of all these factors that must be considered and measured against the population not only 5 years from now but 20 and 50 years from now. What profit is there to divert water to an area and dry up another area? It is very true, as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] noted. Washington wants markets but I am

sure that not even California wants Washington without water. Last Monday morning as I boarded a plane in Portland, Oreg., I noted the headlines of the Oregonian "Oregon Faces Worst Drouth in Years." Drouth is not a new subject in the Northwest. The last three summers have been dry and the past is full of them. I want to bring to your attention some of the figures when the supplemental appropriations bill is before you. Items in this bill resulting from fire damage were caused by lack of rain in the Northwest.

Now what are the answers?

May I say, diversion of any river at this time is not an answer. There is no way of predicting weather, total population, total commerce, and total growth, the total accuracy that is needed. The people in the Interior Department are aware of this—all except the Bureau of Reclamation. They are aware that we need to do several things:

First. Continue at an accelerated pace the saline water development program and I would call to the attention of the House and the gentlemen from California that Interior is working with areas of southern California on a saline experimental project. I would remind this House that there is a sizable sum of money in this year's budget for saline water development. It must be continued. The price is coming down, and there have been some exciting breakthroughs, and there have been some exciting agricultural byproducts.

Second. We must continue to work to find new sources of underground water. The Geological Survey is continuing in this field as are the research people. May I say, that these are all in the exploratory state today. Again, however, there have been some exciting results.

Third. We need to develop a program of weather modification for water sources. Again, this is in the field of research and discussion.

Fourth. We should be able to know more about the recouplement of water.

Fifth. We should know more about the waste of water.

Sixth. Care, development, and protection of our watersheds.

All the areas of the United States are going to share this vast treasure house of water development knowledge, and it is mandatory that this be completed before diversion becomes the order of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I want to call the attention of the Committee to one further thing about the Columbia River. Unlike many river basins and unlike many rivers, one of its major uses is navigation. After viewing the river scale models year after year one realizes the impact of relative small changes of water flow with resulting sandbars, changes in currents, and other impediments to navigation. This is a subject of deep concern. Commerce is the lifeblood of a district such as mine, which exports into the markets of the world, if you please, the products that are grown and raised there. Therefore, I mention this one further problem that is inherent in navigable rivers. One scale model on the upper part of the river has taken over a year to come up with a solution that is

not yet satisfactory. Five years is a very short time to develop the total results of all segments of the Columbia River involved in diversion.

So, ladies and gentlemen of this House, I repeat that diversion is the easy way out and it is not, I am sure, the cheapest way or best way out as a permanent water solution.

I do trust that great thought and judgment will be given here today not against areas that need water but to develop the resource programs that the whole Nation needs and which will be of far more total assistance to the Southwest than the diversion of any single river at the expense of another segment of the country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRISON

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON: On page 52, lines 14 and 15, strike out "below Lee Ferry by two and one-half million acre-feet annually," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "initially by not less than two and one-half million acre-feet annually, increasing thereafter to not less than four million acre-feet annually by January 1, 1990. Whenever the water supply available in the Colorado River is augmented by four million acre-feet or more, such water supply shall be allocated so that the States of the Upper division receive seven and one-half million acre-feet and the States of the Lower Division receive seven and one-half million acre-feet and Mexico receives one and one-half million acre-feet, with any additional water above this allocation divided equally between the States of the Upper and Lower Divisions."

On page 52, line 16, strike out "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall".

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I offer an amendment to H.R. 3300. It is an amendment which I sincerely hope my Arizona colleagues—motivated as they are by the good faith desire to benefit their region without causing hardship to Wyoming or other States—will gladly accept.

My amendment to title II is a logical extension of the sentiments of that title with respect to the availability of sufficient water in the Colorado River system to meet future needs.

My amendment would add new language to section 201(c) to provide that by a specific date, January 1, 1990, and in a specific amount, 4 million acre-feet, water will be supplied to augment the dwindling supply of the Colorado River system.

I consider this amendment both fair to Wyoming and all other States of the Colorado, and consistent with the temper of the bill we are debating today. It is consonant with the basic law of the Colorado River: The compact of 1922, the upper basin compact of 1948, and the water treaty of 1944 with Mexico.

The figure of 4 million acre-feet is not an arbitrary one. It would satisfy the Mexican treaty obligation with imported water, which was stipulated in the 1922 compact, and it would as nearly as can be determined, meet the needs of upper and lower basin States by the early part of the 10th decade of our century.

H.R. 3300 as now written, provides for studies to investigate means of supplying water to meet the current and antic-

ipated water requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and reconnaissance reports are to be submitted no later than June 30, 1973.

The bill is silent on the future of these studies, other than to assert that no recommendation for importing water into the Colorado River Basin from other river basins shall be made without the approval of States affected by such importation.

Seldom has legislation risen to the surface atop such voluminous records and history. I will not burden this presentation with more of that history than is absolutely necessary in presenting my amendment. My arguments and premises draw their sustenance from the position of my State on this legislation and I support that position fully. I will ask that at the conclusion of my remarks a speech by Mr. Thomas E. Cahill, assistant to Wyoming State engineer, Floyd Bishop, be printed to establish for the record what has long been the posture of Wyoming regarding central Arizona legislation.

The history and the record leave no doubt that the Colorado River will be short of water to a disastrous extent by the latter half of the 1980's or early 1990's.

At that time, some action will have to be taken to make the divisible supply of water adequate to the per capita demand.

At some point in the near future augmentation of Colorado River water will be an absolute requirement. What better forum is there than for spelling out the clear intent to provide that water, than the legislation which will create the most expensive and expensive reclamation project in history, with Colorado River water which is rightly the property of other States.

It has been the position of Wyoming throughout the proceedings associated with this and similar bills, that a minimal precondition to acceptance of CAP would be the concurrent authorization of water importation. This position has been eloquently set forth by State engineer Floyd Bishop in these words:

The proposed authorization of the central Arizona project poses an undeniable threat to Wyoming, our concern is not so much over the legal right to the use of the water granted to us by the compacts as it is over the practical problems which Wyoming will face in the future.

There is little argument concerning the legality of the compacts, and without some unforeseeable upheaval, it would appear that these documents will continue to be the "law of the river". From political viewpoint, however, Wyoming could in the future, find it impossible to utilize this water which everyone agrees is legally ours. It is an accepted fact that the central Arizona project will be depending on the use of water which is legally upper basin water but is surplus to present day needs in the upper basin.

Concurrently with authorization of the central Arizona project, there should be an authorization of a project to import water into the Colorado River system.

This history of this legislation over three stormy decades and my own statements in public and to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee make clear that Wyoming does not oppose the central Arizona project for the sake of opposition. We have no desire to

contribute to the shortage of the most precious of all liquids in the great State of Arizona.

I offer my amendment to extend the study and feasibility report provisions of H.R. 3300 as an effort to put teeth into the proposition that sufficient water will flow into the Colorado River to insure that all user States will have their rightful entitlements, and that water will be available to fulfill the national obligation of the Mexican Water Treaty without jeopardizing the allotments of any State.

I ask each member now to search his knowledge of this legislation and to search as well, his own good conscience and brush the clouds from this bill so the States of the Colorado River will know that water definitely will be provided from some outside source when the need exists.

This bill needs clear language setting forth the date for delivery of water into the Colorado, and it needs language specifying a minimum amount of water. This must not be left to some future interpretation of ambiguity in laws or the munificence of some future Congress unattuned to the realities of the Colorado River and its history.

The crucial questions of how much water and when, must not be left in doubt, perhaps someday to be decided by courts of law which listen to the pleadings of parched upper basin States and wonder why H.R. 3300 was so strangely silent on so vital a matter.

The speech referred to follows:

INTERDEPARTMENTAL WATER CONFERENCE

(Address by Thomas E. Cahill, Special Assistant Attorney General, September 16, 1966)

Wyoming, under present compacts, is entitled to the beneficial consumptive use of approximately 800,000 acre-feet of water from the Green River. This is some 500,000 acre-feet more than is presently being used. This surplus is presently flowing from the State into the Colorado. The Central Arizona Project, which is part of House Bill 4671 in the present Congress, needs that water, and more, to be a feasible project. Wyoming does not wish to impede the development of Central Arizona but it would not be wise for Wyoming to acquiesce to the construction of a billion dollar project in Arizona which is dependent upon Wyoming water.

If it were practical for Wyoming to finance projects on the Green River with other than federal money, a legal right to the use of the water would be sufficient to safeguard Wyoming's future. However, the projects necessary for the full utilization of Wyoming's potential are so expensive and complex that the most probable method of development is through the construction of federal projects.

Wyoming is concerned that when the time comes to get such federal projects authorized, she will be effectively opposed in the Congress by representatives of those downstream states who have their projects constructed and operating on Wyoming water. Practical politics show that Wyoming's two Senators and single Representative will not be able to successfully overcome predictable opposition to such projects from California, Arizona and Colorado. To assist in a better understanding of Wyoming's Colorado River problems, the following background is offered.

THE RIVER

High in the Wind River mountains of Wyoming, about 900 air miles from the Gulf of California, the Green River, which later joins the Colorado River, begins. From here, the Colorado and its tributaries meander through the seven western states of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico and California on a 1,600 land mile journey to the sea.

The mainstream of the Colorado and its largest branch, the Gunnison, flow westward from the Continental Divide in Colorado and join the Green River in southwestern Utah. Farther south the San Juan River comes in from the mountains of southern Colorado and northern New Mexico. For hundreds of miles through Arizona and Nevada, the Colorado River is deeply entrenched between high plateaus and forms the Grand Canyon. It then flows through a wide desert valley, forming the boundary between Arizona and California. Almost at the Mexican border, the Gila River, which begins in southwest New Mexico and flows through southern Arizona, joins the Colorado. A short distance below the Mexican border the Colorado flows through its Delta and into the Pacific Ocean.

The Colorado River System drains an area of 242,000 square miles, 1/6th of the contiguous continental United States. In half of this area the average rainfall is less than ten inches annually; in another third, it averages from ten to fifteen inches.

THE 1922 COMPACT

The struggle over the use of water in the Colorado River drainage has been long and turbulent. In the early 1920's, rapidly growing populations and water uses in the Coastal areas, and the desire of Lower Basin interests to construct a major reservoir which would regulate the river brought the first notable crisis. California wanted to enlist the Congressional support of the Upper Basin states for a bill authorizing main-stream developments which included a major reservoir. The Upper Basin states, fearful that the construction of such a reservoir would establish priorities which would preclude the later use of water in the Upper Basin, desired a guaranteed right to future use of water. It became obvious that some form of agreement between the states was necessary before further development of the Colorado River could proceed. This precipitated negotiations which, in 1922, culminated in the Colorado River Compact.

Originally, the negotiators attempted to apportion specific quantities of water to each of the seven states. When this failed, Herbert Hoover, who represented the federal government, urged that the approach be changed, and consequently an apportionment of water was made between two divisions. All of the drainage area above Lee's Ferry in southern Utah was called the Upper Division and all that below Lee's Ferry was included in the Lower Division. This put Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and New Mexico in the Upper Division and Arizona, California and Nevada in the Lower Division.

When the 1922 Compact was formulated, it was estimated that the average annual flow of the Colorado River was about 20,000,000 acre-feet. This estimate was based on stream flow records covering the period immediately prior to 1922 which was a period of excessively high stream flows. Hoping for some leeway for error, the negotiators of the 1922 Compact allocated only 16,000,000 acre-feet, leaving, they thought, an additional 4,000,000 acre-feet to be apportioned at a later date (unfortunately, the long-term average annual flow has only been 13,951,000 acre-feet).

Immediately after the ratification of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act was introduced in Congress. Finally, after introduction in four succes-

sive sessions, the act was passed. The project included Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal, and the Parker-Gila Valley reclamation project. Subsequently, Parker Dam (diversion point for municipal and industrial water for Los Angeles and San Diego) and the Coachella Canal (which supplies irrigation water to part of the Sallon Basin) were built by the United States.

Besides authorizing projects, the Boulder Canyon Project Act divided the waters of the mainstream of the Colorado River. It gave California the use of 4,400,000 acre-feet, Arizona the use of 2,800,000 acre-feet and Nevada the use of 800,000 acre-feet. The Act, however, did not mention the tributaries in the Lower Basin which have an annual flow of approximately 1.75 MAF annually, which includes 1 MAF from the Gila, all of which is almost totally consumed in Arizona.

UPPER BASIN COMPACT

Soon after World War II was over, the Upper Basin states renewed their efforts to gain congressional support for the construction of Upper Basin projects. To establish stable water supplies for reclamation projects and to prevent future lawsuits concerning the equitable apportionment of the Upper Basin share of the Colorado River, the Upper Basin states intensified negotiations to divide the water. These negotiations resulted in the Upper Colorado River Compact of 1948, which was ratified by the legislatures of the four states, and by the Congress of the United States in 1949. This Compact apportioned to the states the annual beneficial, consumptive use of the following quantities of water:

Arizona: 50,000 acre-feet.

Colorado: 51.75 per cent of the Upper Basin entitlement.

New Mexico: 11.25 per cent.

Utah: 23.00 per cent.

Wyoming: 14.00 per cent.

Ratification of the Upper Colorado River Compact cleared the way for development of projects within the Upper Basin, and after a hard fight, the Colorado River Storage Project Act was passed in 1956. This legislation authorized the construction of Glen Canyon, Navajo, Curecanti and Flaming Gorge dams and designated certain projects which could benefit from the power revenues of these major regulating reservoirs. Wyoming projects which were included were Seedskadee, Lyman, LaBarge, Sublette and Savery-Pothook.

WYOMING DEVELOPMENT

In the Green River Basin of Wyoming approximately 225,000 acres, less than 4 per cent of the total land area, is now under irrigation. This land lies mostly along the Green River and its tributaries near the base of the mountains. Most of the irrigation development has been by individuals and organized local groups. There are also four federal reclamation projects which are in various stages of development in the Green River Basin.

The Eden project, which includes the 39,700 acre-foot-capacity Big Sandy Reservoir on Big Sandy Creek and some distribution facilities, was largely completed in 1960. It was initially intended to serve 20,200 acres in the vicinity of Farson, including 9,540 acres that had been previously irrigated and 10,660 acres of new land. Because of water shortages and because anticipated efficiencies in water use have not been attained, land development has been limited to a smaller acreage. A program of modification of the distribution system is now underway.

The Seedskadee project was authorized in 1956. It includes the Fontenelle Dam and Reservoir on the Green River, which has been constructed. The project is planned to ultimately irrigate 53,775 acres of presently undeveloped land, and to provide 60,000 acre-feet of stored water for the potential Seed-

skadee National Wildlife Refuge. Construction of the irrigation canals and laterals has been deferred pending the results of an experimental development farm on project lands. The discovery of trona deposits under 15,500 acres of potential project land on the west side of the Green River has prompted the deferral of agricultural development on that land until possible surface subsidence is further investigated.

The Lyman project, also authorized in 1956, will include the Meeks Cabin and China Meadows Reservoirs on Black's Fork and the East Fork of Smith Fork, respectively. The water will be distributed through existing works and used as a supplemental irrigation supply on 26,000 acres in the vicinity of Lyman. Bids for construction of Meeks Cabin Reservoir were received in 1965 but were rejected as being too high. New bids were called for and let in the spring of 1966.

The Savery-Pothook project, authorized September 2, 1964, will irrigate lands in both Wyoming and Colorado. It will develop unused flows of the Little Snake River and its tributaries, Savery Creek in Wyoming and Slater Creek in Colorado, for the irrigation of 35,265 acres, including 21,920 acres of new land. The Wyoming portion consists of 16,155 acres, including 6,180 acres of new lands and 9,975 acres of supplemental service land. Storage will be provided by the 18,600 acre-foot Savery Reservoir on Savery Creek and the 65,000 acre-foot Pothook Reservoir on Slater Creek. The water will be conveyed to the land by both existing facilities and new project canals and laterals. Funds have not yet been appropriated for the start of construction.

COMPACT AMBIGUITIES

The 1922 Compact is a brief, but sometimes ambiguous, document. These ambiguities have been the basis for a forty year fight between California and Arizona, and are at the heart of the negotiations between the two basins that have been going on for over a year.

Most of these ambiguities stem from article III which divides the water.

III (a) gives the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet to the Upper and Lower Basins, respectively.

III (b) gives the Lower Basin the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use by an additional million acre-feet annually, but does not specify the source of the water. (Some claim that this refers to the Gila and Salt Rivers.)

III (c) recognizes the possibility of a future treaty with Mexico and states that any guaranteed deliveries to Mexico should come from unapportioned waters. If there is no surplus, both basins are to share equally in any shortage. In 1944 a treaty was negotiated between Mexico and the United States which guaranteed annual delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to Mexico via the Colorado River. Under normal river operations to date, more than this amount of water has automatically reached Mexico through return flows, uncontrolled releases and precipitation in the area adjacent to the border. However, as water becomes more valuable, and since the expected flow has been 14 million acre-feet rather than 20 million acre-feet, it is obvious that the Mexican Treaty burden will at some time in the future become more important.

Arizona is now using at least a million acre-feet annually from the tributaries, and claims this should not be included in the 7,500,000 acre-feet given the Lower Basin by III (a). This interpretation is based on the holding in *Arizona v. California*, discussed later. Accountability of the tributaries is important in determining any Mexican Treaty burden. If we assume that required deliveries of water from the Upper Basin to the Lower Basin at Lee's Ferry are limited to 75,000,000 acre-feet in a ten year period, as specified in III (d), then the consumptive

beneficial use of water from the main stem in the Lower Basin will be limited to something less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year, due mainly to the channel losses and reservoir evaporation, and the Upper Basin will be required to furnish part of any shortage to Mexico. However, if Arizona's tributary uses are also included in the Lower Basin's 7,500,000 acre-feet annual consumptive use, then the total beneficial consumptive use in the Lower Basin would surpass the 7,500,000 acre-feet per year and the burden of the Upper Basin to deliver water to Mexico would be reduced accordingly.

III(d) placed a delivery requirement upon the Upper Basin of 75,000,000 acre-feet in any ten year period, or an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually. This provision put a burden on the Upper Basin states to make a minimum delivery of water to the Lower Basin, and any shortage of water is automatically deducted from the Upper Basin apportionment, rather than from the Lower Basin.

III(e) provided that the Upper Basin states could not withhold water that could be reasonably applied to domestic and agricultural uses in the Lower Basin. It also provided that the Lower Basin could not call for water to be delivered unless it could be applied to those same uses. This provision raises the question of whether the Upper Basin can store water in its reservoirs for the purpose of long-term carryover to even out fluctuations in flow from year to year, when users in the Lower Basin are in need of more water which could be directly used for "domestic and agricultural purposes."

ARIZONA VERSUS CALIFORNIA

In the early 1950's Central Arizona was consumptively using 4,500,000 acre-feet of water annually. Of this, 1,000,000 acre-feet was from surface runoff of the Salt and Gila Rivers. The other 3,500,000 was being mined from a water table that had a recharge rate of 1,000,000 acre-feet annually. Consequently, the underground aquifers were losing approximately 2,500,000 acre-feet annually.

The Central Arizona Project was designed to supply Colorado River water to Central Arizona to supplement the existing supplies and protect a dropping water table. Arizona contended that the Boulder Canyon Project granted Arizona the use of 2,800,000 acre-feet annually from the mainstream of the Colorado River, and that since they were then using only 1,200,000 acre-feet annually, they were entitled to an additional 1,600,000 acre-feet, which could be utilized by the Central Arizona Project.

However, California contended that the Salt and Gila Rivers should be included in determining Arizona's 2,800,000 acre-feet. If this were true, Arizona's share of Colorado River water would have been exceeded, and there would be none available for a Central Arizona Project.

Arizona's congressional delegation introduced legislation authorizing the Central Arizona Project three times. Each time, it passed the Senate, but was blocked by California's strength in the House of Representatives. Finally on the fourth try, the House Committee on Insular Affairs stated that before the bill would be considered again by that committee, the Arizona rights to the use of Colorado River water would have to be determined.

This resolution instigated a law suit between Arizona and California which lasted from the early 1950's until 1963. In 1963, the United States Supreme Court held that the Boulder Canyon Project Act gave Arizona the use, when available, of 2,800,000 acre-feet from the mainstream of the Colorado River (which automatically excluded accounting for the Gila and Salt Rivers). Almost immediately, the Arizona congressional delegation introduced a revised version of the Central Arizona Project Bill. The bill was again rejected by Congress.

CALIFORNIA-ARIZONA COMPROMISE

Arizona, realizing that the 38 California members of the House of Representatives could probably effectively block any legislation which would authorize a Central Arizona Project, decided that they must negotiate with the State of California.

As a result of these negotiations, on February 8, 1965, Congressmen and Senators from Arizona and California introduced identical bills in the House of Representatives and the Senate which would authorize the Central Arizona Project. As was then suspected, and later confirmed in hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House of Representatives, for this project to be feasible it had to use Colorado River water apportioned to, but not presently used by, the Upper Basin states by the two Colorado River Compacts.

In order to gain the California support, Arizona had agreed that whenever there was insufficient water to supply 7,500,000 acre-feet for consumptive use in the Lower Basin, the following priorities would apply:

1. Present perfected rights in Arizona and California;
2. 4,400,000 acre-feet to California;
3. Remainder to Arizona for the Central Arizona Project. These priorities would cease upon the importation of 2,500,000 acre-feet into the Colorado River System below Lee's Ferry.

In an attempt to gain Upper Basin support, the Secretary of Interior was directed to study the water needs in the Upper and Lower Basins and to establish whether or not the present sources in these basins could supply sufficient water for their own needs. Then, with the help of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary was to project these estimates of water need up to at least 2030. Concurrently, a study was to be made of water supplies and water needs (also projected far into the future) in the Columbia River Basin. At the same time, a study of the feasibility of transporting water from the Columbia River to the Colorado was to be made.

In an attempt to placate Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington, these Northwest states were designated as "areas of origin" and were given the future right to "call back" any water then being transported to the Colorado River states if a need for it developed in the Northwest. The Secretary of Interior was to submit a feasibility report of a project which would facilitate the importation of 2½ million acre-feet into the Colorado River System within three years of enactment of the Bill.

A Lower Basin Fund was established which would receive congressional appropriations for construction of Lower Basin projects. The Fund would also receive: (1) Revenues from the Central Arizona Project (which would include sale of power from Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams); (2) Revenues from Hoover and Parker-Davis Dams after their projected pay-out in 1987; and (3) Payments made from users on other Lower Basin projects. After paying the overhead, maintenance, capital costs and interests, expense of the operating units of the Central Arizona Project, any surplus in the Fund was to be applied to the unit allocation to irrigation, commercial power and municipal and industrial water, for a period of fifty years. Bureau of Reclamation studies showed that with both Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, by 2024, there would be a billion dollar surplus which would be available to subsidize the importation of water to be used in the Lower Basin.

The present compacts on the river were to remain sacred, and jurisdiction was given to the states to bring suit against the Secretary of Interior in the Supreme Court of the United States in the event that these are violated.

UPPER BASIN RESOLUTIONS

In an attempt to formulate a common position, the Upper Colorado River Commis-

sion retained the Denver engineering firm of Tipton & Kalmbach to study the water supply of the Colorado River. Using the period of 1921 through 1964, the Tipton Report showed an average runoff of 13,951,000 acre-feet and assessed Lower Basin requirements as follows:

| | Acre-feet |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Beneficial consumptive use (as provided by III(a)) | 7,500,000 |
| 2. Mexican Treaty deliveries | 1,500,000 |
| 3. Reservoir evaporation | 730,000 |
| 4. Losses below Hoover Dam | 810,000 |
| Total requirements | 10,540,000 |

Assuming that Upper Basin would be required to deliver 8,250,000 acre-feet annually (which is the III(d) requirement, plus one half of any Mexican Treaty burden), the Tipton Report showed the supply to be:

| | Acre-feet |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Delivery at Lee's Ferry | 8,250,000 |
| 2. Net inflow Lee's Ferry to Lake Mead | 675,000 |
| 3. Net inflow from Bill William River | 55,000 |
| 4. Release from Lake Mead (draw-down to rated power head) | 365,000 |
| Total available | 9,345,000 |

Thus, if the Lower Basin was to be allowed to consumptively use 7,500,000 acre-feet annually, as provided by III(a), without accounting for tributary uses, and an annual delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico was to be made, the Upper Basin would have to deliver an average of 9,445,000 acre-feet annually.

The obvious conclusion was that a firm water supply was not available in the Colorado River to satisfy a basic beneficial consumptive-use requirement of 7,500,000 acre-feet from the mainstream by the Lower Basin, plus delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico.

The states of the Upper Basin estimated their present uses and future needs to be:

| | Present | 1975 | 1985 | 2000 | 2030 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Colorado | 1,782 | 2,468 | 3,098 | 3,714 | 3,746 |
| New Mexico | 140 | 514 | 749 | 764 | 764 |
| Utah | 579 | 936 | 1,171 | 1,630 | 2,138 |
| Wyoming | 265 | 545 | 769 | 1,193 | 1,193 |
| Total | 2,766 | 4,463 | 5,787 | 7,301 | 7,841 |

Thus, even though the study showed that there was a present surplus available for the Central Arizona Project, future development projections clearly showed that if Upper Basin development was to continue, projects which would import major amounts of water into the Colorado River System would have to be authorized and constructed.

Using these figures as guidelines, and realizing that future Upper Basin development would be contingent upon the authorization of future projects by Congress, the Upper Basin, acting through the Upper Colorado River Commission, proposed amendments to H.R. 4671 which they felt would protect future development in the Upper Basin. On August 16, 1965, the Upper Basin states of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, agreed that before they could support the Central Arizona Project, the following principles would have to be included:

1. That all federal projects within the Lower Colorado River Basin be limited so as not to prejudice, impair, or preclude the future federal authorization of projects which will be required for the annual consumptive use by Upper Basin states of water that may be physically available after delivery of 75 million acre-feet at Lee's Ferry in any period of ten consecutive years;
2. That concurrently with any congressional authorization of the Lower Colorado

River Basin project there also be authorized a project to import water into the Colorado River System in such quantities as will (a) relieve the states of the Colorado River Basin from any obligation to deliver water to the Republic of Mexico pursuant to the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944. (b) Supply the Lower Basin states with enough water to allow for the consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet per year, and (c) supply the Upper Basin states with enough water to allow an annual consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet.

3. That Glen Canyon Dam shall be operated so that it will not be drawn below its rated power head, except as may be necessary to comply with article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact, and except as may be authorized otherwise by the Upper Colorado River Commission.

4. That the diversion of funds from the Upper Colorado River Basin funds to the Colorado River Dam fund as payment for the so-called Hoover Dam deficiencies, pursuant to the Glen Canyon filling criteria, be terminated immediately.

5. That all expenditures made from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund to meet deficiencies in generation at Hoover Dam, pursuant to the Glen Canyon filling criteria be reimbursed to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund in full.

These principles were included in a draft dated August 16, 1965, which was presented to Congress in hearings held before the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Insular and Interior Affairs Committee from August 23 through September 1, 1965.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Just prior to these hearings, the seven Colorado River states met and agreed upon the following principles:

1. The Upper Basin's right to the use of water of the Colorado River, pursuant to the Colorado River Compact, shall not be jeopardized by the temporary use of unused Upper Basin water by any Lower Basin projects.

2. The pending legislation should authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct importation works which will deliver not less than 2,500,000 acre-feet annually, upon the President's approval of the Secretary's finding of feasibility.

3. Such importation works should be planned and built so as to make the imported water available, if possible, not later than 1980.

4. Satisfaction of the Mexican Treaty burden should be the first priority to be served by the imported water. The costs of importation allocable to the satisfaction of the burden, which is a natural obligation, should be nonreimbursable.

At the August Subcommittee hearings, several other areas of opposition to the bill emerged. The conservation interests were determined to delete both Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams from the bill, and the Pacific-Northwest was determined that the Bureau of Reclamation should not make a feasibility study of importation.

SEPTEMBER 20 DRAFT

The states were not able to agree on specific language of the bill, and in September, representatives of the governors of the seven Colorado River states met to attempt to draft language that all seven states could agree upon. They could not reach agreement but agreed that Felix Sparks of Colorado and Northcutt Ely of California should try to draft a bill acceptable to all seven states. The result of their work has been called the September 20 draft.

(1) It authorized the Secretary of Interior to make a feasibility study of a staged importation plan. The first stage would include at least 2,500,000 acre-feet to satisfy the Mexican Treaty burden and could also include 2,000,000 acre-feet for Lower Basin use, 2,000,000 acre-feet for Upper Basin use, and 2,000,000

acre-feet for use along the route of the importation system. The importation plan was to be completed by December 31, 1970, and a report was to be made to the President sometime after December 31, 1970.

(2) Areas of origin were to be protected and a perpetual prior right to water was to be given to any state which contributed to the Columbia River System. This priority would be senior to any rights to imported water by Colorado River System users.

(3) Upper Basin rights were protected, but no implementation was given for this protection.

(4) The Secretary of Interior was to promulgate equitable criteria for the reservoir operations on the Colorado River after consultation with the seven Colorado River Basin states.

(5) The Mexican Treaty burden was to be a national obligation, and the Colorado River states were to be relieved of it upon importation of at least 2,500,000 acre-feet into the Colorado River System.

(6) The Central Arizona Project was to be limited to carry an average of 1,200,000 acre-feet from the mainstream, none of which was to be available for use on new lands.

(7) The Dixie and Southern Nevada projects were integrated into the Lower Basin Fund, and the recreation and fish and wildlife uses on the Dixie project were made nonreimbursable.

(8) The Upper Basin Fund would be reimbursed for expenditures made from it to purchase power for the Lower Basin during the filling of the Upper Basin reservoirs.

(9) It authorized the Dolores and Dallas Creek projects in Colorado and the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado and New Mexico, and reauthorized study of other Upper Basin projects, including the Sublette project in Wyoming.

This draft was unacceptable to Wyoming and Utah, but became the basis of negotiation for future drafts of H.R. 4671.

POWER REVENUES

As was previously mentioned, the Upper Colorado River Commission, on August 16, 1965, withheld support of H.R. 4671 pending inclusion of five principles. These principles have served as a basis for negotiations over the past year and the Committee Draft at least pays lip service to the problem areas. Two of these conditions concerned power and power revenues and the language in the Committee Draft is relatively acceptable.

The problem arose during the filling of Lake Powell and Flaming Gorge. By storing water in these reservoirs, there was less water available at Hoover Dam to supply firm power to power contractors. To make up the difference, the Secretary of Interior purchased power from private power companies, and charged the cost to the Upper Basin Fund. As of September 30, 1965, the Secretary of Interior had charged the Upper Basin Fund \$7,299,350.04 for the purchase of deficiency energy, generation impairment and capacity deficiency. In addition, 688,734,112 KWH of power had been delivered from Upper Basin dams to Lower Basin power contractors. Assuming a worth of 3 mills, \$2,066,202.34 worth of power produced by the Upper Basin generators was furnished to Lower Basin contractors. The Upper Basin Fund received no credit for these deliveries.

The September 20 Draft provided that \$7,299,350.04 would be returned to the Upper Basin Fund at the rate of \$500,000 annually. No provision was made for payment of interest, which by June 30, 1966, will amount to \$13,722,576.38, nor was provision made for payment of Upper Basin power furnished to Lower Basin power contractors. Both basins have generally accepted this compromise.

According to the Upper Colorado River Commission, approximately 10% of the power now generated by Upper Basin dams is being delivered to the Lower Basin, sold, with credit

going to the Lower Basin. The Upper Basin Fund is receiving no credit for these deliveries.

MEXICAN TREATY BURDEN

The Commission resolution of August 16, 1965, directed that the Upper Basin should only be required to deliver 75,000,000 acre-feet in any ten year period, and that the Lower Basin tributary uses be included in computing the Lower Basin entitlement to the consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually. This would lessen the burden of the Mexican Treaty on the Upper Basin.

The Lower Basin has steadfastly refused to even consider any negotiations on this point.

In the draft now in the Rules Committee, the problem is deferred until sometime in the future by Sec. 601 (b) which states:

"* * * the following listed order of priorities shall govern the storage of water in storage units of the Colorado River Storage Project and releases of water from Lake Powell:

"(1) Releases to supply one-half the deficiency described in article III (c) of the Colorado River Compact, if any such deficiency exists and is chargeable to the states of the Upper division, but in any event such releases, if any, shall terminate when the President issues the proclamation specified in Sec. 305 (b) of this Act."

FILLING CRITERIA

In *Arizona v. California*, the Supreme Court gave the Secretary of Interior the authority to apportion future water shortages on the Colorado among the Lower Basin states. It also affirmed his authority to control the filling and refilling of dams on the Colorado. Based on this authority, Secretary Udall promulgated a filling criteria which provided that during the filling period of the Upper Basin reservoirs, water would not be stored in them unless Lake Mead was at its rated power head. This criteria was to be in effect until both reservoirs reached their full capacity.

As introduced, S. 1019 and H.R. 4671 provided that:

"... the Secretary... shall continue to develop... a regional water plan... for the filling and refilling of Lake Mead and the reservoirs of the Colorado River Storage Project to optimum operating levels."

This meant that Udall's filling criteria would remain in force. The only protection that the Upper Basin had was found in Section 502 (a) which provided that:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, (or) the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact... and 502 (b) directed the Secretary of Interior "to comply with the applicable provision of this Act, and of the laws, treaty, compacts and decrees referred to in paragraph (a) in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin."

The Upper Basin states were critical of the filling criteria, and the August 16 Draft had the following which would supercede it:

"In making the reports and recommendations authorized by this section, the Secretary shall make the following assumptions—

"(1) That the ultimate required delivery of water by the states of the Upper division at Lee's Ferry or by exchange delivery at alternate points will not exceed an aggregate of 75 MAF for any period of ten consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series."

"(2) That Lake Powell Reservoir will not be drawn below its rated head, except as may be necessary to comply with article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact, and except as may be authorized otherwise by the Upper Colorado River Commission."

This would provide the Upper Basin reservoirs with enough water to meet their Com-

pact requirements, and protect Upper Basin existing and future uses.

In the September 20 Draft was contained the unimplemented statement that:

"Rights of the Upper Basin to the consumptive use of water of the Colorado River System pursuant to the Colorado River Compact shall not be reduced or prejudiced by any temporary use thereof in the Lower Basin."

And that:

"The Secretary shall promulgate equitable criteria for the coordinated long-range operation of the reservoirs constructed under the authority of this Act, the Colorado River Storage Project Act and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, consistent with the provisions of those statutes, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact and the Mexican Water Treaty. Such criteria shall be prepared after consultation with representatives of the seven Colorado River Basin states and parties to contracts with the United States affected by such criteria."

It further provided that:

"The Congress declares that the satisfaction of the requirements of the Mexican Water Treaty constitutes a national obligation. Accordingly, the states of the Upper Division... and states of the Lower Division... shall be relieved from all obligations which may have been imposed upon them by article III (c) of the Colorado River Compact when the President issues (a) proclamation" (that 2½ million acre-feet is available from sources outside the drainage of the Colorado River.)

These provisions were the subject of much controversy and bargaining and many meetings between the various states. These eventually culminated in the language as it is now which is found in Title VI of the Committee approved draft.

"601(b). In the preparation and subsequent execution of the criteria, the following listed order of priorities shall govern the storage of water in storage units of the Colorado River storage project and releases of water from Lake Powell:

"(1) Releases to supply one-half the deficiency described in article III (c) of the Colorado River compact, if any such deficiency exists and is chargeable to the States of the upper division, but in any event such releases, if any shall terminate when the President issues the proclamation specified in section 305(b) of this Act.

"(2) Releases to comply with article III (d) of the Colorado River compact, less such quantities of water delivered into the Colorado River below Lee Ferry to the Credit of the States of the upper division from sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River system.

"(3) Storage of water not required for the releases specified in subparagraphs (1) and (2) to the extent that the Secretary, after consultation with the Upper Colorado River Commission and representatives of the three lower division States and taking into consideration all relevant factors (including, but not limited to, historic streamflows, the most critical period of record, and probabilities of water supply), shall find to be reasonably necessary to assure deliveries under subparagraphs (1) and (2) without impairment of consumptive uses in the upper basin pursuant to the Colorado River compact: Provided, That water not so required to be stored shall be released from Lake Powell: (i) to the extent it can be reasonably applied in the States of the lower division to the uses specified in article III (e) of the Colorado River Compact, but no such releases shall be made when the active storage in Lake Powell is less than the active storage in Lake Mead, (ii) to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell,

and (iii) to avoid anticipated spills from Lake Powell."

IMPORTATION

S. 1019 directed the Secretary to prepare estimates of the long-range water supply available in the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and to project these requirements to the year 2030. It also directed him to investigate alternative sources of supply to meet the needs in these basins. If an import was necessary, he was to make provision for adequate and equitable protection of the interests of the States in areas of origin. He was to prepare a feasibility study of a plan to import 2½ million acre-feet into the Colorado within three years of passage of the act.

The Upper Colorado River Commission draft provided that if such an importation plan was feasible, the same legislation would also authorize construction. The September 20 Draft directed the Secretary to make a similar feasibility study, but provided the first stage must include 2,000,000 acre-feet for satisfaction of the Mexican Treaty burden, and could also include 2,000,000 acre-feet for use in the Lower Basin, 2,000,000 acre-feet for use in the Upper Basin, and 2,000,000 acre-feet to be used along the proposed diversion route. It also gave to any area or state of origin the perpetual right of recall of any water used for importation.

Senator Jackson of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee opposed this and has consistently opposed the inclusion of any provision which would effectuate a meaningful study of an importation from the Columbia River. He has done this in several ways. In the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 he included provisos that no studies would be made of interbasin transfers of water without express Congressional authorization, and that a River Basin Commission in the Northwest could not be established unless it was requested by governors of three of the four states of Montana, Idaho, Washington and Oregon. He also amended the Water Recreation Act by adding a similar bar to interbasin studies.

He has consistently demanded that any study of importation be made under the auspices of a National Water Commission. This Commission would be composed of seven members appointed by the President, who could not be connected with the federal government. They would work in conjunction with the Water Resource Council in deciding broad policy questions.

The Committee draft of H.R. 4671 provides that the Water Resources Council, in consultation with the National Water Commission, would establish principles, standards, and procedures to be followed in any importation study. The Secretary of Interior, under the direction of the National Water Commission, would use these guidelines in making a reconnaissance study of an import plan by December 31, 1969. Unless the plan proved obviously infeasible, the Secretary would then proceed with a feasibility study to be completed by December 31, 1971.

CONCLUSION

With this as a background, it is no wonder that Governor Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming, on August 2, 1966, in a letter to President Johnson, found it necessary to withdraw previously given support of H.R. 4671, saying:

"The gradual erosion of... basic principles through the process of ensuing negotiation and compromise has been a source of increasing concern to me. The cornerstone of our original position was 'that concurrently with any congressional authorization of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, or any of its component parts, there also be authorized a project or projects to import water into the Colorado River Basin from sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River system'. This re-

quirement has now eroded to the point where all that is required is a study of the importation question and even the procedures which are set forth in the bill for making this study would appear to be so cumbersome and difficult to implement that there is a serious question as to whether the study could be adequately executed within the time limits provided in the bill.

"Wyoming is vitally concerned that passage of this bill should not interfere with our right to the use of water allocated to use under the terms of the Colorado River Compacts. Water supply studies on the Colorado River indicate that there will not be sufficient water in the natural drainage area of the Colorado River to permit fulfillment of all of the commitments under the various compacts now in effect. Consequently, it seems obvious that there must be an importation of water into the basin if all states are to be permitted the use of waters to which they are rightfully entitled.

"All of the assurances in the world concerning the validity of compact allocations to Wyoming will be rendered ineffective if there is not sufficient water to meet these commitments.

"(Therefore) I cannot in good conscience lend my continued support to the passage of this bill in its present form."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I cannot support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] because I am in agreement with what the gentleman is trying to do; that is, to provide assurance that in the future the upper basin States will have available 7.5 million acre-feet of water as anticipated by the Colorado River compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact.

The amendment provides for a feasibility study and report on a plan for augmenting the river by 4 million acre-feet instead of 2.5 million acre-feet. As the gentleman knows, the cost of additional water made available by augmentation must be repaid. Until the upper basin States, and particularly Wyoming, are further along with development of the water already apportioned to them, I do not believe we are ready to ask for a feasibility study covering an additional 1.5 million acre-feet. I would point out that subsection (a) of section 201 provides authority for reconnaissance investigations and report covering the matter involved in this amendment. I would also point out, in the event that it has been overlooked by my friend from Wyoming, that if 2.5 million acre-feet annually, or even 1.7 or 1.8 million acre-feet—the amount to take care of the Mexican Water Treaty—is made available in the lower basin, that this will have the effect of making available to the upper basin States an additional 750,000 acre-feet annually.

In addition, there are flaws in the language of the amendment. As written, the study would provide for the entire 4 million acre-feet being available below Lee Ferry. Also, even with 4 million acre-feet of new water available, we cannot assure the deliveries of water provided for in the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that Wyoming has not been able to give its support to this legislation because I be-

lieve its rights are fully protected and that it will receive extensive benefits from the enactment of H.R. 3300.

I shall have more to say on this subject in a few minutes when another amendment is proposed. The only difficulty at the present time that we have in the upper basin—and this is true in Colorado, it is true in Wyoming, and it is true in Utah—that we do not have planning reports ready that have gone through the reconnaissance survey, and feasibility survey procedures, and available here for the consideration of this committee at this time. That is our difficulty.

Wyoming does not have any. I understand their position. No one in Congress during the last 20 years has worked harder for the welfare of the State of Wyoming than I have. I am just sorry that I cannot go along with the amendment.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly I go along with the gentleman from Colorado in his reluctant opposition to the amendment for the reasons he has stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On Page 55, line 12: After "(4)", strike out "Hooker Dam", and insert "Conner Dam".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, one of the matters of controversy in this legislation involves the site of a dam to store the waters given to the State of New Mexico in this bill. If there is augmentation in the first instance, the State of New Mexico is entitled to 18,000 acre-feet. If there is further augmentation in the river, then they are entitled to an additional 30,000 acre-feet.

Mr. Chairman, construction at the Hooker site of a dam high enough to store the amount of water allocated in this bill to New Mexico would result in the backing of slack reservoir water across land within the Gila primitive area, which is subject to review for future inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system, and through the Gila Gorge some 9 miles within the Gila wilderness area.

The Gila wilderness area is one of 54 units of the national wilderness preservation system established by the Congress just 4 years ago, by means of the Wilderness Act—Public Law 88-577—"to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness." Through the leadership of the late Aldo Leopold, it also was the first wilderness established by the Forest Service in the United States in 1924. It should not be degraded by a man-made, unnatural intrusion as a result of this legislation.

If the Forest Service is going to be able to fully protect the Gila wilderness from nonconforming uses and developments, the bill should be amended to eliminate all references to the Hooker site. An alternative damsite downstream, the Conner site, should be substituted for the Hooker site in the bill to avoid this direct threat to the wilderness area. The phrase, "Conner Dam or suitable alternative," would be preferable to the present language. Many members of the full committee favored this language over the present language of H.R. 300, which, as a minimum, must be interpreted by the Secretary of the Interior as a clear mandate to find an alternative to the Hooker site.

During the committee's consideration of this portion of the bill, it became obvious that adequate, up-to-date technical studies of the Hooker project, and the most feasible alternatives based on the provisions of the current legislation, were lacking. Because the Wilderness Act requires a determination that a water-development project within a wilderness will better serve the interests of the United States than will its denial, and because the necessary study had not been made that would have furnished the facts on which the committee could have made a decision, the committee amended the bill to require such a study—the "Hooker Dam or suitable alternative" language. This amendment—while it does not go as far toward eliminating Hooker Dam as is needed—intends that the Secretary of the Interior shall study the project, taking into account at least the following.

First. The uses to which the water would be put and the benefits that would accrue to the people of the United States; second, comparative advantages of different methods of providing the water, such as, but not restricted to, reservoir storage at various sites, purification of brackish water, and pumping from underground sources; third, means for protecting existing water rights; fourth, damage to the natural environment, wildlife, and scenic resources, particularly those public lands within the wilderness area and primitive area; and fifth, the construction, maintenance, and other costs of dams at the Hooker site, Conner site, and other suitable sites, or other alternative water supply methods.

I would also like to point out that other wilderness areas will be in great jeopardy if a reservoir and associated developments are permitted in this unit of the national wilderness preservation system. I understand that, in Montana, the Bureau of Reclamation has plans to flood out part of the Bob Marshall wilderness area by a dam on the Sun River. Also in Montana, the proposed Glacier View Dam would flood irreplaceable wilderness lands in Glacier National Park. Plans exist to construct water-development projects that would invade the Flat Tops wilderness in Colorado, the High Uintas in Utah, and primitive areas in Idaho. The Hooker Dam proposal is a test case. I believe it marks a crisis in the history of wilderness preservation in the United States. An alternative to Hooker Dam can and must be found.

An excellent summary of the potential impact of Hooker Dam on the Gila wilderness, and of the advantages of the alternative Conner site, was published recently by the Wilderness Society, a respected national conservation organization, which with other national conservation groups strongly opposes the authorization of this dam. I quote part of its report:

The Hooker project would destroy extraordinarily scenic wilderness lands and miles of wilderness river, eliminate significant fisheries and wildlife habitat, and obstruct access to the wilderness by foot and horseback.

The Gila River Canyon in the Hooker Reservoir area is steep and narrow, strictly limiting use of the reservoir for recreational purposes. Precipitous, rocky terrain would make a recreation access road to the reservoir very expensive to build. Few locations on the steep slopes around the reservoir would allow adequate campground, parking, or boat-launching facilities. An alternate dam site downstream—the Conner site—would provide additional recreational facilities without destroying wilderness values.

In summary, I believe the Congress should accept the judgment it made in 1964 when it placed the Gila wilderness in the wilderness system, and should not now authorize a reservoir project which will invade the Nation's first wilderness and set a pattern for other invasions of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the future.

This amendment provides the alternative damsite, which is Conner Dam and Reservoir, which, in turn, will both provide New Mexico with its water and preserve the integrity of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Mr. Chairman, I urge and move the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I understand what is at stake here, because there has been some public discussion, and the Members have had some communication on this subject. The bill, as passed by the Senate, a similar bill, contained a flat unqualified authorization for construction of Hooker Dam which would have caused some invasion of the wilderness area.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. In the House committee, I offered an amendment which changed that flat authorization—and the amendment was adopted—to an authorization for Hooker Dam “or a suitable alternative.” The committee report directs the Secretary to study this again, to take the outdated studies and bring them up to date, and find out whether or not there is an alternative for Hooker Dam. Is this correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not the gentleman's understanding that the good people who represent New Mexico in this Congress are willing that such a study be made, and they do not want to invade the wilderness area unless it is absolutely necessary?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. Both the distinguished gentlemen from New Mexico who serve in the House have so assured me, and I understand the same

assurance has been given the people of New Mexico by the senior Senator from that State.

Mr. UDALL. So the pending bill as now written will make sure there is a further study and leaves final resolution further down the line?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. The only difference in the gentleman's amendment, as I understand it—and he also wants a study and wants a decision at a later time and he wants the Secretary to look at all the alternatives and bring the estimates in—is the gentleman suggests that the language read “Connor Dam” or suitable alternative so the the emphasis is pointed there rather than at Hooker Dam as these studies begin. Is this exactly?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is exactly just what this amendment does.

Mr. UDALL. It seems to me we are not really arguing about anything of any great substance, that either the language the committee put in the bill or the language of the amendment will do essentially the same thing.

Mr. SAYLOR. It may come out to the same end. I just hope this amendment will be adopted, so the Secretaries will not think they are directed to look at Hooker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAYLOR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman in his statement and feeling, and also the assurance of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] that this committee, from which the bill came, and this House itself is serious in every sense of the word, absolutely and completely that the investigation will be made so that, when whatever is built in New Mexico, it is built wherever it can be built with the very least detriment to any of the scenic opportunities of that State.

I commend the gentleman for pointing this out. I would like to get it on the Record in triple clarity that the Department of the Interior, when it makes this study, is to make a most serious evaluation and a most serious attempt to get this installation away from that portion of the Hooker site to which the conservationists object.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to raise one more point of clarification and make legislative history in the event the amendment of the gentleman is adopted.

The committee took the view—and it was the intention of the committee and it is so indicated in the report—that if the studies are carried out, under the language now in the bill, Connor Dam might well be the alternative for Hooker Dam. Does the gentleman intend in his

amendment that if no other site can be found, if there is no other feasible way to do it, under language of his amendment conceivably Hooker Dam could be an alternative for Connor Dam?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would hope this would not occur, but it is perfectly within the realm of possibility.

Mr. UDALL. Then, if the members of the Committee please, I suggest again we are not really arguing over any matter of great substance. In either event there will be a study. There will be a final look at this. There will be an opportunity, when appropriations are sought, to review this matter once again, regardless of the decision which is made.

So I would prefer and I would suggest that in this situation we stay with the committee and we stay with the people of New Mexico.

I want to commend their leaders in this House and in the other body for the attitude they have taken on this matter. There has been a lot of national publicity about this. But New Mexico has said, “We do not want to invade the wilderness. We hope there is an alternative. We hope that another way can be found to do this job.”

In this situation, where there is no real distinction between the effect of the amendment and the language of the bill, I hope this committee will stay with New Mexico. We do not have to have this argument now. We can settle it later, down the line.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I did not want to bring this matter up, but the gentleman called our attention to the question of sticking with the committee. If the Members will look at the committee report, they will find a majority of the members of the committee objected, and signed views asking that this be changed. So if the Members want to stick with the committee they will adopt my amendment.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has correctly stated the number who signed the separate views. Let me say one more thing for the benefit of the Members who have been concerned about communications from conservation groups on this amendment.

Most of the Members received the other day a brochure from a Sierra Club and a letter. In that letter the Sierra Club does not ask for this amendment. I am sure they would be happy with it, but they do not ask for it. What they ask is:

I hope you will seek assurance from the sponsors of H.R. 3300 that there will be a diligent search for a suitable alternative—one that will take full account of the values of the Gila River and the Wilderness.

The New Mexico members have given that assurance in letters to the Members of the House. The committee has given that assurance. I give that assurance. The gentleman from California gives that assurance.

I would hope, under the circumstances, the members of this Committee would stay with the Committee on Interior and

Insular Affairs in the way we wrote the bill as it finally came to the floor, regardless of the matter pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

Mr. REINECKE. I, too, want to make it clear that it was our intention there would be a full and fair and clear study of the situation.

Whether the wording results in either Hooker or Conner at this point I do not believe is too material, other than the fact that there should be a full and fair and thorough study.

I might also comment, it is refreshing to find that here is one question on which we can agree, that there should be studies, without opposition.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. This whole matter will go to conference, anyhow. It may come out without either name, is that true?

Mr. UDALL. That is entirely possible. I suspect one of the Senators from New Mexico will have something to say in that conference.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there was some colloquy here about sticking with the committee. I do not know which side is which; all I hope is that the Members of this great body will stick with JOHNNY WALKER. It is important to the people of New Mexico.

Above all, it is important that we get at the truth of this matter.

I know that if my dear friend from Pennsylvania could actually see the site where we propose to build this dam he would agree with me, as far as the wilderness is concerned.

I have seen it. As a matter of fact, I have lived in that very county.

Some people say this is a wonderful habitat we are getting ready to spoil. I have seen pictures in the past few days of beautiful greenery. I can assure the Members that I can take a color camera and go almost any place, and and bring back beautiful pictures.

We are proud of our beautiful New Mexico scenery. But this area which would be inundated is on the edge of 400,000 acres of beautiful scenery, which would be even more beautiful if there were enough water to allow some greenery to grow. There used to be some wild game in the area, but even the wild creatures need water to survive.

What we want, Mr. Chairman, is to see to it that we can make a game habitat out of this beautiful place these people are talking about. Unfortunately, I do not have the time today to discuss this fully. I do have some pictures here that I would like to show you to illustrate how desolate this country is. As I stated yesterday and as other conservationists have stated publicly, water is New Mexico's lifeblood. It might not mean too much to the people in San Francisco or New

York who have never seen this spot and who talk so much and so long about desecrating this wonderful place and what a terrible thing it is to do that. I say to them that if they would only come and look at it, they would understand what we are trying to do. We are talking about 450 acres, or approximately that, versus 400,000 acres. It is not the heart of the wilderness and it is not going to ruin the wilderness, but it will have a very beneficial effect on the people who live down there. They have been dreaming of this, as I said yesterday, since 1916.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are just talking about changing a name here. I want to assure everyone in this body and those people from the New York Times and the people from the Sierra Club and Mr. David Brower that we want it studied, also. That is the reason why we agreed to it. That is the reason why we have compromised. We have tried to be realistic about it. We have gone along with every suggestion that has been made to us, because we want this so badly. Now all of a sudden—and I cannot understand why, but all of a sudden—we are doing a terrible thing here and we have to change it from Hooker to Conner. Why should we do that if we are going to study it? I give you my word, if there is a better place to put this dam, whether it be called Hooker or Sierra or whatever it may be called, I want to assure you that we want it put in the best place. We do not want to go into the wilderness unless we have to.

For many years before I came to Congress, I have been a strong advocate of the wilderness bill and still am. So I am not a Johnny-come-lately as far as this wilderness matter is concerned. I am just as sincere, and perhaps more so, than a lot of these people who are writing about it, but who have never seen it.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to make a couple of remarks as far as the Forest Service is concerned in the report. The Forest Service is not opposing the Hooker site. In a letter dated October 13, 1967, to Col. Henry Zeller of the Sierra Club, Mr. William Hurst, the regional forester of the Southwest region, wrote:

Based upon the study and findings thus far made, it is our opinion that the administrative problems created by the reservoir (Hooker) can be worked out and that the dam can be constructed and the reservoir created with only a minimum adverse impact on the wilderness and the primitive area.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, in New Mexico we have conservation groups. I shall quote Jon Little, president of the New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association, the largest and oldest conservation organization in the State of New Mexico with a membership in excess of 2,000.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Little states as follows:

It is poor conservation to advocate a downstream dam site. This site would waste 6,000 acre-feet of water, even more with evaporation. Conservation is the wise use of natural resources as opposed to the wasteful use. Our association has tried to be realistic. We

weighed the loss of the wilderness against the benefit to the public the dam would bring. Our association is for the dam—our association is for the Hooker Dam.

Mr. Chairman, I would undertake to talk a little louder, but it is almost impossible for me to talk much louder. As the members of the Committee know, I do not come down in the well of the House very often. When I do I think I am speaking words of wisdom, at least I would hope they are, especially since they are not coming from me but are coming from a great conservationist who believes in this project.

Mr. Chairman, to continue to quote Mr. Little, I read as follows:

The dam would flood only 450 acres of the 400,000-plus acre wilderness. The portion of the wilderness flooded would be on the periphery, not in the wilderness heart. Water in New Mexico is our life's blood.

Said Little:

If we can get 18,000 acre-feet this means jobs, water to drink, water for industry, and recreational benefits would be most significant.

Mr. Little went on to say that other conservationists feel this dam would set a precedent. He said:

If we believed it would endanger the wilderness system, we would have to oppose it. We do regret the small invasion of the Gila wilderness. However, the benefits provided by the Hooker Project far outweigh this invasion. We believe that advocating the downstream Connor site as an alternative to advocating flooding one-tenth of 1 percent of the Gila wilderness is poor conservation. We believe that conservation is the wisest possible use of our natural resources. Therefore, we have tried to exercise responsible conservation by recognizing the benefits of the Hooker Project over the unfortunate, but minute, inundation of wilderness.

So, Mr. Chairman, one can see that we in New Mexico also have our conservationists.

I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and my other dear friends on the floor of the House today that we too are willing to study and compromise. We are trying to be realistic. We are for this study to be undertaken whenever and wherever the Secretary of the Interior—whomever he may be—chooses to do so. Whatever decision he makes we shall follow. If it is his determination Hooker is the best place, that is what we want. But I ask you to defeat this amendment because it is not only undesirable, but unnecessary. The committee language, as written, assures that all potential sites will be considered. The amendment would delete from consideration the Hooker site. If it is found that some other site would be better, then I will be for it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, with no wisdom that anyone says we can violate a rule without creating a precedent.

Of course, the invasion of the wilderness area will create a precedent—there cannot be any argument about that.

The discussion we have had seems to circumvent the point which is really at issue. It is obvious that most people believe the Hooker site is the site where the dam should be built, and where it un-

doubtedly will be built, but we are here arguing about some verbiage, or about the name of a dam. And I am somewhat amazed by all of this argument in view of the fact that there is another great conservationist from that great State of New Mexico, who only a few years ago argued and pleaded with the Members of both Houses of the Congress to create a 65-million-acre wilderness system which would be inviolate to any kind of activity of any sort which might alter its character. The same conservationist who waged that fight at that time is now the first one to come in and create a precedent in undoing the Wilderness Act.

Mr. Chairman, if this matter is of no great significance we might as well go along with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and at least give some emphasis to trying to protect the wilderness system. If those studies then show, after proper emphasis, that the Hooker site is the proper site where a dam should be built, the fight will have been fought and the battle will have been lost by those who wanted to preserve the wilderness, but nothing will be lost for the project which we are debating today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. UDALL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to direct some questions to the very able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

First, I would like to say the gentleman has acted with his usual fairness and impartiality in dealing with the amendments that have been proposed today. I very much commend him for the position he took with respect to the amendment that was proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which carried, and further by his strong stand in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, referring now to sections (b) and (c) of section 201, title II, this question with respect to the expenditures of moneys authorized in this bill.

In section (c) it says:

The Secretary shall prepare a feasibility report on a plan which shows the most economical means of augmenting the water supply available in the Colorado River below Lee Ferry by two and one-half million acre-feet annually.

It is my understanding that no moneys shall be expended for any study beyond the 2½ million acre-feet. Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ASPINALL. The position taken by the gentleman is correct; 2½ million acre-feet is the maximum.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is the maximum that they can study. Does that limitation also refer to the reconnaissance study that is being authorized in section (b)?

Mr. ASPINALL. With this particular project, that does.

But I would advise my colleague that this does not prohibit the Secretary in his general authority to make reconnaissance surveys as he is making in my colleague's State and as he is making in my State at the present time after he has received authorization for appropriation and the moneys through the general appropriations process.

Mr. ULLMAN. What I am specifically referring to is this: He will come back before the committee of the Congress and make the report as he is directed to do and the first report will be a reconnaissance reports?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ULLMAN. When he makes that report, is it within his scope to come back and say, "It is not feasible in our judgment to import water from the Columbia River in the amount of 2½ million acre-feet, but in our studies we have determined that it would be feasible to make such importation at the figure of, say 6 million acre-feet."

Mr. ASPINALL. Not under this feasibility report. He would have to get another authority from the Congress and from the executive department.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. Then the language of this bill is quite clear in that it authorizes the expenditure of funds only for studies limited to 2½ million acre-feet?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 78, line 10: Strike all of section 501, and insert in lieu thereof a new section 501 to read as follows:

"Sec. 501. (a) In order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project, Colorado-New Mexico and the Dolores Federal reclamation project, Colorado, as participating projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C. 620), and to provide for the completion of planning reports on other participating projects, subsection (2) of section 1 of said Act is hereby further amended by deleting the words "Pine River extension", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Animas-La Plata, Dolores". Section 2 of said Act is hereby further amended by deleting the words "Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata" and inserting after the words "Yellow Jacket" the words "Basalt, Middle Park (including the Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, and Azure units), Upper Gunnison (including the East River, Ohio Creek, and Tomichi Creek units), Lower Yampa (including the Juniper and Great Northern units), Upper Yampa (including the Hayden Mesa, Wessels, and Toponas units)", and by inserting after the word "Sublette" the words "(including the Kendall Reservoir on Green River and a diversion of water from the

Green River to the North Platte River Basin in Wyoming), Uintah unit and Ute Indian unit of the Central Utah, San Juan County (Utah), Price River, Grand County (Utah), Ute Indian unit extension of the Central Utah, Gray Canyon, and Juniper (Utah)". The amount which section 12 of said Act authorizes to be appropriated is hereby further increased by the sum of \$170,000,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required, by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved. This additional sum shall be available solely for the construction of the projects herein authorized.

"(b) The Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall be constructed and operated in substantial accordance with the engineering plans set out in the report of the Secretary transmitted to the Congress on May 4, 1966, and printed as House Document 436, Eighty-ninth Congress: *Provided*, That the project construction of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall not be undertaken until and unless the States of Colorado and New Mexico shall have ratified the following compact to which the consent of Congress is hereby given:

"ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT COMPACT

"The State of Colorado and the State of New Mexico, in order to implement the operation of the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project, Colorado-New Mexico, a proposed participating project under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105), and being moved by considerations of interstate comity, have resolved to conclude a compact for these purposes and have agreed upon the following articles:

"Article I

"A. The right to store and divert water in Colorado and New Mexico from the La Plata and Animas River systems, including return flow to the La Plata River from Animas River diversions, for uses in New Mexico under the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project shall be valid and of equal priority with those rights granted by decree of the Colorado state courts for the uses of water in Colorado for that project, providing such uses in New Mexico are within the allocation of water made to that state by articles III and XIV of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31).

"B. The restrictions of the last sentence of Section (a) of Article IX of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact shall not be construed to vitiate paragraph A of this article.

"Article II

"This Compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States."

"(c) The Secretary shall, for the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, and Seedskadee participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, establish the nonexcess irrigable acreage for which any single ownership may receive project water at one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof, as determined by the Secretary, in other land classes.

"(d) The words 'any western slope appropriations' contained in paragraph (f) of that section of Senate Document Numbered 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, entitled "Manner of Operation of Project Facilities and Auxiliary Features", shall mean and refer to the appropriation heretofore made for the storage of water in Green Mountain Reservoir, a unit of the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project, Colorado; and the Secretary is directed to act in accordance with such meaning and reference. It is the sense of Congress that this directive defines and observes the purpose of said paragraph (f), and does not in any way affect or

alter any rights or obligations arising under Senate Document Numbered 80 or under the laws of the State of Colorado."

Mr. SAYLOR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment and that the amendment be printed in the Record, and that I be permitted to explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is one which I am sure will not be adopted, but I have offered it for the purpose of establishing a record.

The amendment would authorize only two projects in Colorado. They are the two projects which have been approved and on which favorable reports have been received. It would delete from the bill the three projects in Colorado on which final reports have not been submitted to our committee.

This is the first time, I believe, in the history of the Congress that we have ever authorized legislation for projects before favorable reports had been received from the Department. I would hope that the amendment would be adopted. It would have some startling effects. It might save, in times like these, at least the authorization of about \$150 million, and it would be, I believe, at this time a good amendment to adopt.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my chairman of the committee, if he cares to comment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, first, if I started to reply completely to the gentleman, I could talk for a long time on this particular matter, but I do not intend to do so. The gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed the Colorado River project, which was authorized in the 84th Congress. But, as soon as the measure was passed, and ever since then, he has been doing everything he can in order to make it a good project. I wish to congratulate him because he has been very cooperative and very constructive.

However, on this particular matter the gentleman is not entirely correct. I know he does not wish to mislead us. The letter from the Bureau of the Budget reads as follows:

In summary, for the reasons expressed above, the Bureau of the Budget would favor deferral of at least the West Divide, San Miguel, and Dallas Creek projects at this time, pending the establishment of the National Water Commission and completion of its review of related water problems.

Of course, I take exception to that because these projects have already been considered. They already have planning reports. The gentleman was mistaken in the statement that we do not have planning reports. We do have them. We have a favorable position so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, and we have favorable benefit-to-cost ratios in accordance with the formula currently used.

The letter from the Bureau of the Budget proceeds further to state:

We believe that this course of action will permit water developments needed at this

time in the Colorado Basin to proceed, but at the same time provide a basis for thorough consideration of the fundamental issues involved and a recommended program that will be in the best interest of the people of the Upper and Lower Colorado Basin, as well as the Nation as a whole.

Let me suggest to my colleague very briefly—and I shall get the gentleman more time if he needs it—Colorado furnishes over 70 percent of all the water in the Colorado River Basin. Under the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the first 1½ million acre-feet, or thereabouts, goes to Old Mexico. The next 7½ million acre-feet goes to the lower basin.

The next 7½ million acre-feet is supposed to go to the upper basin. There has never been this much water on an annual average in the basin since 1922. So what the upper basin stands to get at the present time, without augmentation, is probably 6 million acre-feet.

Let me give some other facts. The upper basin compact, of course, provides that 51.75 percent of the entitlement of the upper basin should go to Colorado, and 11.25 percent should go to New Mexico, and 23 percent should go to Utah, and 14 percent should go to Wyoming, and Arizona will have a guarantee of 50,000 acre-feet out of that entitlement of 7½ million acre-feet.

In accordance with the provisions of the Colorado River Storage Act, Colorado is entitled to 46 percent, New Mexico to 17 percent, Utah to 21.5 percent, and Wyoming to 15.5 percent.

Colorado's share of the present flowage of the river since 1922, based on an annual figure, is approximately 3.1 million acre-feet of water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) Mr. SAYLOR was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, Colorado was using approximately 1.8 million acre-feet of water in 1956. That leaves approximately these 1.3 million acre-feet of water for Colorado's future use. Colorado's authorization in the Colorado storage project for water use was only 38,000 acre-feet of water. We stood on the provisions of the act and did not complain. But we went to work immediately after that and we have spent Colorado State money and also conservancy district's money of about \$6 million since 1956 in order to get our project studies and investigations underway. Most of this money has gone into Bureau of Reclamation's control. So what we have left at the present time for future projects is approximately 818,000 acre-feet. This project, the Colorado projects in this bill, will take approximately 378,000 acre-feet, which will then leave Colorado about 440,000 acre-feet for future development.

As I tried to explain, when my good friend from Wyoming was in the well, we just do not authorize projects—we do not study them in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is responsible for this procedure as well as the

rest of us—until we do have planning reports before us. We do have planning reports for these five projects. We do have the OK from the Department of the Interior.

It is true that the Bureau of the Budget endeavored to kick out the three projects, but this was their way of, I suppose, trying to say we are going too fast. We are not going too fast. With these projects we will not be using one-half of the water which is left for Colorado to develop.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I direct this question to the chairman of the full committee: Can the gentleman give us any schedule or program as to when these three projects might be built?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall give the general program, as I said yesterday. Construction will not start, in accordance with what I said and what I hope is the prevailing feeling in the Congress, until after this war emergency is over. Then it would mean that two or three of the projects would immediately receive some kind of study and some kind of investigation, leading to the final designs, as my colleague understands. Two of these projects will depend upon future determinations.

May I say to my colleagues, we had five projects authorized in Colorado in Public Law 485. One of those projects was later on found to be infeasible with the final study. This might happen to some of these projects, but this makes the record that the State of Colorado is entitled to proceed with its entitlement, just like any other State in the basin, and they are prepared to do it.

Certain of these projects depend on sale of municipal water. No other projects can start, in the way we are now operating in the Bureau of Reclamation programs, until the execution of contracts calling for repayment. My colleague understands that as well as I do.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is what the chairman of the full committee is telling us then is that even though there are five projects authorized for Colorado, there is a likelihood that at least two of these projects may never proceed?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would not put it like that. I would say that this then would leave it up to Colorado to make a later determination whether other projects are more feasible and more desirable. These projects are all good, but they have to be paid out in accordance with reclamation project procedures. If the users are not there to pay them out, they will have to be delayed accordingly.

Of course, I oppose the amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes, and I appreciate the committee's indulgence.

First I should like to commend the chairman of this great committee for bringing this legislation to the floor and to the Committee of the Whole.

I know of no work in the Congress

which inures more strongly to the benefit of generations of Americans yet to be born and to live under this Government than the work being done by this committee, and this important matter of water.

I certainly look forward to this Congress acting affirmatively on the suggestions of the committee.

I would be remiss if I did not bring to the consideration of this committee an augmentation of the problem of water with regard to another facet of this very important field and its place in the life of the total people of America.

In the past we know, and in the present we live, the fact that people do not go to the place where the water is. Rather, the economic and social forces determine where people will be collected, and there we must bring the water. We have learned this.

In the West more than any other place we have had this history, and we have been able to meet the challenge of bringing the water to the people. The wise policies of this Nation generated in no small respect by this great committee has been, to husband the waters we have available, to distribute them and to use them, where they will best serve the interests of our Nation and of its people.

But to conserve well and to use wisely the water now available on the continent is not enough. We have to develop new waters. Therefore, desalinization of sea water is most important. It should not be in place of but should go along with the husbanding of and the distribution of and the use of fresh waters, to add to these the waters we can reclaim from the oceans.

So long as 75 to 80 percent of our people are within 50 miles of the ocean fronts, good sense dictates we ought to move with the momentum which is now available to us in utilizing atomic energy to recapture fresh waters from the oceans.

I hope that this Congress will not be derelict in moving along in this parallel path of developing new sources of water.

This Congress has favorably acted on a proposal for a desalinization plant at Bolsa Island, off the coast of Orange County. That project at the present time does have some problems financially. I hope the Congress will pick up this matter, and not allow it to be slipped into the past or to become dormant, or to lose the momentum in this particular part of our program. I hope Congress will support it and encourage it. I certainly hope that the committee will keep it in mind as a part of the total water future of America.

I commend the committee for what has been done, and I certainly hope they will also go forward with a great program in desalinization.

I thank the committee.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, in studying the committee report on H.R. 3300, I am impressed by the high percentage of the central Arizona project's costs that will be repaid to the Federal Government by its beneficiaries.

Over the 50-year repayment period, \$671 million of the \$779 million cost will be returned to the public treasury. The nonreturnable costs, only 14 percent of

the total, are credited to general public values such as recreation, flood control, fish and wildlife, water salvage, and wild-life refuges.

We spend billions of dollars every year for which we expect no direct or measurable return at all, so I am glad to support this bill as basically an investment proposal.

I am informed that the annual benefits of the central Arizona project alone will be \$82,537,000.

The central part of Arizona enjoys a year-round growing season where melons, lettuce, and other garden vegetables are produced in the wintertime. Let me call your attention to the fact that last year the United States imported \$65 million worth of such produce. So this Arizona project can be a factor in improving our Nation's presently unfavorable balance of payments in world trade. Whatever we can grow here at home we would not have to buy from foreign nations.

While our business today is H.R. 3300, I would like to take just a moment to mention the value of the reclamation program in general and to praise the work of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In 1966 irrigated reclamation lands produced an estimated \$1.7 billion worth of crops; reclamation projects provided 40.5 billion kilowatts of electricity which returned almost \$124 million to the Federal Treasury; and reclamation reservoirs supplied 589 billion gallons of water for municipal and industrial use by 13.2 million people.

It seems to me that reclamation projects are among the rather few things on which we spend money that actually produce wealth—rather than consume wealth with no direct returns.

And if we could measure the amount of taxes collected and traceable to the resources made available by such projects, the story would be even more impressively favorable.

I am glad to lend my support to H.R. 3300 as an essential and sound investment in American resource development.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, although I do not question the ultimate desirability of this Colorado River project, I do very strongly question the wisdom of our being asked to consider it at this time of fiscal crisis. At the very moment of clamor for billions of dollars of cuts in Federal spending, we are now presented with a package bearing a price tag of more than a billion dollars.

It is true that this is merely an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. However, history should teach us that authorized spending has a way of becoming actual spending before long.

We need a sensible concept of priorities, and I think that we have more urgent and pressing needs confronting us. For this reason, I must conclude that I cannot support the pending legislation at this time.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with the other members of the California delegation in support of H.R. 3300, the Colorado River Basin Act.

The bill represents a finely balanced regional compromise over the division of

existing but grossly inadequate water resources.

It is my hope, however, that every possible step will be taken to assure that a suitable alternative to the Hooker Dam, mentioned in the committee's bill, can be found.

Just 4 years ago, the Congress established the national wilderness preservation system "to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness."

The Gila Wilderness Area, which was the first wilderness established by the Forest Service in the United States in 1924, is already a part of the national wilderness preservation system established by that act. The Gila Primitive Area is subject to review for future inclusion in the system.

The Gila's gentle wilderness is extraordinarily beautiful. Significant parts of it would be destroyed if the Hooker Dam were built.

A majority of the committee recognized the need to find a suitable alternative to the Hooker Dam, and I note the strong separate views they filed on this matter in the committee's report on the bill.

I think our decision 4 years ago to establish a wilderness system was sound. I think every effort should be made to continue the preservation of these wilderness areas.

I support the bill today on the basis that a diligent effort will be made to save the Gila wilderness.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 3300.

Although I realize that this bill is now to some degree a pious declaration of intent, nevertheless, I believe that I should express my reservations.

I describe this legislation as I have because its complicated provisions radically limit possible expenditures in the next few years, especially when one contemplates the political and physical changes that may take place in that time.

It is my judgment, therefore, that even though we are not appropriating funds or even authorizing immediately expendable appropriations, we should not in this time when expenditures on programs of defense and social welfare are threatened give a go-ahead signal to projects of the magnitude and vagueness of those proposed in this bill which involve the ultimate expenditure of \$1.28 billion.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues are aware, I consider myself a conservationist in the truest sense of the word. I believe that our Nation can and should conserve our natural resources by the elimination of losses to the fullest practicable extent. I refer to all of our natural resources, but at this time I am addressing myself to the water resources. I note with satisfaction that H.R. 3300 provides for immediate and meaningful steps to conserve these water resources and further provides for investigation and implementation of further water conservation measures.

More specially the central Arizona

project is in itself a conservation measure because as the hydrologic figures of the Department of the Interior clearly indicate, in the absence of a central Arizona project, there will be periodic spills to the Gulf of California for many years in the future. Water flowing to the gulf is an irrecoverable loss. The existence of a ditch diverting from Lake Havasu would permit the capture and utilization of such spills to the extent of the capacity of the aqueduct.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to point out that section 3300 gives the Secretary authority to undertake programs for water salvage along and adjacent to the mainstream of the Colorado River and for ground-water recovery. Such programs must be consistent with the maintenance of a reasonable degree of undisturbed habitat for fish and wildlife, as determined by the Secretary. The water salvage program consists of ground-water recovery in the Yuma Arizona area and eradication and control of phreatophytes presently covering 42,000 acres of land near the Colorado River which consume thousands of acre-feet of water each year. It is estimated that the total salvage program, when combined with the channelization of the river which is now in progress will salvage approximately 680,000 acre-feet of water each year. Not all of these measures are dependent upon passage of H.R. 3300, but it is estimated that the water salvage measures expressly provided in H.R. 3300 will conserve 320,000 acre-feet annually in the Lower Colorado River Basin along the main stem of the river. As indicated on page 64 of the committee report on this bill, \$42,450,000 for water salvage and recovery has been included in the cost estimates for the central Arizona project.

In addition to the direct salvage provisions of section 306, the bill requires in section 304(c) that each contract under which water is provided under the central Arizona project shall require that the canals and distribution systems through which water is conveyed after its delivery by the United States to the contractors shall be provided and maintained with linings adequate, in his judgment, to prevent excessive conveyance losses.

As indicated on page 64 of the committee report, a total of \$30 million has been included in the cost of the central Arizona project for the construction of distribution and drainage systems. Section 309(b) authorizes appropriations of an additional \$100,000 for construction of distribution and drainage facilities.

Within the central Arizona project area itself provision is made for the construction of four dams: Orme Dam, Buttes Dam, Charleston Dam, and Hooker Dam. In the case of Orme Dam and Buttes Dam, the flood runoff from the drainage area tributary to the Salt and Gila Rivers respectively below the last point of control on each stream will be impounded. Under present conditions, this flood runoff spills over the diversion dams and is largely wasted in the sands of the riverbeds below. In the case of Hooker and Charleston Dams, each will impound water near the headwaters of

their respective streams and will thereby reduce the channel losses between the point of impoundment and the next downstream reservoir.

Perhaps the biggest potential for salvage contained within H.R. 3300 is the potential offered by the investigations and planning which would be carried forward pursuant to title II. As therein indicated, the Secretary of the Interior will, within the framework of the principles and standards established by the Water Resource Council, investigate and recommend sources and means of supplying water to meet the current and anticipated water requirements of the Colorado River Basin. The bill suggests that the Secretary consider desalination, weather modification, and other means. The current and anticipated water requirements cannot be supplied by any one means.

I rather think that the end result of the investigation by the Secretary will develop that there should be a combination of things done to provide the requisite water resource. While the act does not specifically mention watershed management, I feel that this holds a tremendous potential which becomes more apparent when it is recognized that in the State of Arizona alone approximately 80 million acre-feet of water falls as rain or snow but of this amount, only 2 million acre-feet is available for use. Here is a potential for conservation in its truest sense.

If we can develop methods to decrease the waters lost by transpiration and evaporation from nonbeneficial plants and land areas by 1 percent of the total precipitation on the State, we will have saved 800,000 acre-feet of water. Desalination is, of course, water conservation in its truest sense as is weather modification, both of which are clearly set forth in the bill.

Recharging of ground-water reservoirs through the control of localized surface runoffs and injection of such water into the ground water is a conservation measure which is being extensively investigated in Arizona and will no doubt be another of the many potentials which the Secretary will look into in pursuance of the instructions set forth in H.R. 3300.

This is not to say that these are the only potentials, for we know there are others. I think that we must recognize that the water problems of the Colorado River Basin must and will be solved and that we must take a giant step in that direction by the passage of H.R. 3300. These are powerful arguments for this bill and justify its favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, while I feel the foregoing arguments justify support on my part, there are several other matters that need consideration as I seek to represent the people of the First District of Iowa. First, I would like to point out that I recognize there are water problems in the Southwest which do need our sympathetic consideration and fortunately this bill seeks to solve this critical water problem. Another important point, until now two important States were fighting over water rights and now they have come to some agreements that will sat-

isfy them before they solve the other problems.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 3300, interests me for a number of reasons and it does several things that promote the interests of conservation. There are water problems in the Southwest which do need attention and this bill seeks to solve them.

But before giving my support to the legislation I want to be sure of several important aspects of the problem.

First of all I want to know if approved, what will be the effect of H.R. 3300 on the budget in the immediate future? And will the central Arizona project put more farmland into crop production with the farmers of Iowa.

The bill as we all know does not appropriate any funds for construction. It merely authorizes various projects of the entire program at this time. This means that when budgetary conditions normalize and when it will become necessary to adjust from a wartime to peacetime economy, construction on these projects can get underway and then funds for construction will be spread out over 10 years when it will become possible to begin building.

One other reassuring feature of H.R. 3300 is that the Secretary of the Interior is directed to require that lands be irrigated must have a recent history of irrigation. The legislation will not expand farm acreage. This no-farm expansion provision makes good sense to me and to the farmers of Iowa.

Some day we may need more farm crops, but at the present time we have plenty and the central Arizona project is not going to increase present day surplus problems when it is built.

Some may say why action now? This is simple. Agreement has finally been reached by the parties most directly concerned. The road leading to this agreement has been long and hard. State and local officials, residents of the area and conservationists have reached an accord. As one who is vitally interested in conservation, I was particularly concerned about the implications of this bill for this area. I am pleased that most of the objections conservationists voiced in regard to this legislation have been substantially overcome.

With this assurance and other assurances we have from others, I feel this legislation is in good shape and I propose to vote for it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during general debate I announced that I would offer a substitute amendment. In view of the fact that the chairman of the full committee and the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union adopted the first amendment which I offered, which would delay to a future time and a future Congress the provisions of section 202 of the bill on the Mexican Water Treaty, until a report has been made by the Secretary of the Interior that an augmentation plan to import 2½ million acre-feet of water is feasible, and is then authorized by the Congress. I will not offer my substitute amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr.

Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for the way in which he has handled this particular matter ever since I have been in the Congress, especially during the present session of the 90th Congress. I also want to commend the ranking minority members both of the full committee and the subcommittee for their work in connection with bringing this matter to the floor of the House and the courteous way in which we have all been treated while this matter has been under debate and now during the reading of the bill.

I think this is a very important piece of legislation to all of the basin States. I hope the Congress, when we get back into the House, will adopt this, because we can then say that the Colorado River Basin bill has been adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to explain what I intend to do when we return to the House in the way of a motion to recommit. This motion will contain three items directed to two specific points within the bill. One is the question which has been discussed repeatedly during the debate; that is, the difference between a feasibility study and a reconnaissance report. It is our strong feeling that the reconnaissance report is all that should be directed at this time in conformance with the established procedures that have been followed by the committee in recent years and by this House in recent years and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget in the last 2 or 3 years.

The second point goes to the assumption of the Mexican Water Treaty as a national obligation and the implementation of this treaty by providing in section 401 of the bill that the repayment of the construction of works to replace that water would be a nonreimbursable expense.

These two items would fully transfer to the shoulders of the taxpayers of this country the entire burden of replacing in the Colorado River Basin the 1.5 million acre-feet and, under the language of the bill, perhaps as much as 2.5 million acre-feet of water, at the expense of the taxpayers rather than the people who are being benefited by it; that is, the people in the States affected by the Colorado River Basin.

These two amendments are contained in my motion to recommit. I think these are vital to the perfection of this bill, and I think they are sound for the national interest and certainly fair to both basins—of the Colorado River and also the areas represented by my colleagues and myself in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the motion to recommit in the framework of the announcement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who stated that his amendment which has been accepted and which puts up to a future

Congress at such time as augmentation works may be authorized, or considered for authorization, the decision of where this treaty burden should go; certainly the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman is not timely and is not applicable.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that the House vote it down.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say I will support the recommittal motion as suggested by my distinguished colleague from Idaho.

As I pointed out yesterday during the general debate on H.R. 3300, title II is completely unnecessary to the authorization or construction, or success of the central Arizona project.

There is no justifiable reason why the Congress should, in this bill, agree to give up the sound practice of taking a look at the reconnaissance survey before authorizing a feasibility study on any project, especially one which would lead to construction of facilities to import to the Southwest millions of acre-feet of water from the major river basins of other regions of the Nation. At this point, no one knows where the water would come from, what the cost would be, or whether such facilities would be necessary. There is no demonstrated urgency, or any justifiable reason why we should direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake immediate reconnaissance and feasibility studies, contrary to established procedures and law. We should first have an opportunity to know what we are being asked to buy.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay or extend this debate. I take this time for the purpose of asking some questions of the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the purpose of making legislative history. However, before I do that, I wish to very briefly state my continuing concern and opposition to that section of this bill which provides for the assumption of the Mexican Water Treaty burden as a national obligation. I also object vigorously to section 401 which would make any future expenditures for construction to satisfy this obligation of 1.5 million acre-feet of water nonreimbursable.

And, Mr. Chairman, I also wish to repeat my opposition to section 201(c). I associate myself fully with the comments of the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has assured the House that, although the bill authorizes a feasibility study, he will bring the results of a preliminary reconnaissance study to the House before the feasibility study is undertaken. That is a generous offer on his part; however, it does not remove my serious reservation concerning the policy of authorizing a feasibility study where we have not had an opportunity to judge or examine the reconnaissance report ahead of time.

The amendment of the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may be of great importance, but I must confess that I am uncertain as to its meaning.

I would now like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one or two questions for the purpose of making legislative history with reference to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment to section 202, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and adopted by the Committee of the Whole, would have the effect of delaying the operation of any declaration of the Mexican Water Treaty as a national obligation unless and until Congress subsequently authorizes a plan to augment the Colorado River by 2.5 million acre-feet; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it also true that the adoption of this amendment would preclude the operation of section 401, which provides that any costs of construction or other costs associated with the assumption of the Mexican Water Treaty shall be nonreimbursable—would this section be inoperative unless Congress subsequently authorizes an augmentation plan of 2.5 million acre-feet?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I answer my colleague from Washington in this manner, by saying that I do not see wherein he arrives at his statement.

Section 401 has nothing particularly to do with section 202, or any provision of section 202. Section 401 simply states that if, later on, there is an authorization to augment the flow of the river, then the augmentation will take place.

In addition, the provisions of section 401 indicate that part which is chargeable to the Mexican Water Treaty will be nonreimbursable, and that part which is chargeable to the users, be they irrigation, municipal or other users, will be chargeable to those users, and this must be taken into consideration in figuring the feasibility of what is proposed, as far as the augmentation of the river is concerned.

Mr. FOLEY. And that consideration of feasibility will be a judgment which will have to be made by a later Congress in its wisdom?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct. All these weeks and months, that is what we have been trying to arrive at, so that we would stay with the procedures that we have followed for years as far as reclamation projects are concerned, and there will be no jumping from one to the other of the studies in any order out of the right constructive approach now provided.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise my colleagues once again that this piece of legislation has been studied carefully. It is an intricate piece of legislation. One provision, one section depends upon the other. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I will have to resist—and I ask my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit because without these sec-

tions there is no guarantee for peace along the river, and that is what we are trying to get more than anything else, as far as this legislation is concerned. And we have so tailored this legislation now, even to a greater extent by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], we have so tailored it, that there can be no logical attempt in my opinion to frustrate or to hurt or to endanger the rights of the great Northwest.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not prolong the debate very long, but I want to express on behalf of the people of my State of Oregon our deep concern. We touched on this in general debate yesterday. We understand that the feasibility study called for by this bill will embrace much more than just the possibility of obtaining water for the Southwest through diversion. We are also well aware of the fact that, prior to the time that there has been any determination whether there is really any excess of water in our section of the Nation, there will be a skewing by the way this bill deals with the Mexican Water Treaty, in the direction of feasibility for diversion versus any other possible method of obtaining water. We object as strongly as possible to the setting up of the feasibility study in this bill before the reconnaissance study has been completed, and at the same time we object to the features of this bill determining to a significant degree in advance the conclusions the feasibility study is apt to reach.

There is an unfortunate impression that seems to be present in debate on this bill today, as was true yesterday, that this is merely a quarrel between the Southwest and the Northwest sections of the Nation. In truth, this matter goes far beyond this. This is a matter of concern to the Middle West, it is a matter of concern to the Northeast, and it is a matter of concern to the Southeast, because the ultimate burden of the dollars to be paid out from the Federal Treasury, if they be determined to be nonreimbursable, will not fall upon the Pacific Northwest in disproportionate share. The burden of financing this whole project will fall upon the Northeast, it will fall upon the Middle West, and it will fall upon the other sections of this Nation in direct proportion to the amount of Federal taxes paid by the citizens in those sections of the Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, in truth this is not just a quarrel between the river basins of the Northwest and the river basins of the Southwest; this goes far beyond that. We object very strongly to this matter of the entire predetermination relative to the nonreimbursable national obligation, so far as the Mexican Water Treaty is concerned.

We urge our colleagues to support this motion to recommit, and after having made the particular changes that the motion to recommit calls for, then to go ahead and approve the central Arizona project.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] in opposition to the motion to recommit, and in support of the legislation before us.

Our subcommittee and the full committee has labored long and arduously for a number of years in the development of this legislation. This legislation represents a delicate balancing of the interests of the various basin States and the proposed motion to recommit would do serious damage to that balance.

This legislation represents not only an investment in the West but an investment in the entire Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote down the motion to recommit and pass the bill as it now stands.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Members of the Committee for the consideration they have given to this bill which is the fruition of 15 years of work in the Congress so far as I am concerned.

I want to say to my good friend from the Pacific Northwest that there is no intent on the part of anyone to take anything that belongs to you. The bill does not do that. There is ample safeguard in the bill to meet the needs of everybody concerned.

I hope the motion to recommit will not be adopted and that the bill will be passed in the form in which it now is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3300) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1162, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] rise?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

Baring
Bell
Broomfield
Cabell
Carter
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Dawson
Derwinski
Downing
Esch
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gettys
Griffin
Gross

[Roll No. 142]

Gurney
Hagan
Hall
Halleck
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kuykendall
Long, La.
McMillan
Malliard
Martin
Matsunaga

Moore
Morse, Mass.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers
Rosenthal
Scheuer
Selden
Stubblefield
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Wilson,
Charles H.
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee substitute amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McCLURE. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCLURE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3300, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with instructions to:

(1) On page 52, line 12, delete the word "feasibility" and insert in lieu thereof the word "reconnaissance"; and

(2) On page 52, line 25, strike out the words "constitutes a national obligation which"; and

(3) On page 72, line 4, after the period, strike out the following sentence: "Costs of construction, operation, and maintenance allocated to the replenishment of the depletion of the Colorado River flows available for use in the United States occasioned by compliance with the Mexican Water Treaty (including losses in transit, evaporation from regulatory reservoirs, and regulatory losses at the Mexican boundary, incurred in the transportation, storage, and delivery of water in discharge of the obligations of that treaty) shall be nonreimbursable."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1162, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1004.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1004 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 3300, as passed, as follows:

"TITLE I—COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT: OBJECTIVES

"Sec. 101. That this Act may be cited as the 'Colorado River Basin Project Act'.

"Sec. 102. (a) It is the object of this Act to provide a program for the further comprehensive development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin and for the provision of additional and adequate water supplies for use in the upper as well as in the lower Colorado River Basin. This program is declared to be for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River; controlling floods; improving navigation; providing for the storage and delivery of the waters of the Colorado River for reclamation of lands, including supplemental water supplies, and for municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; improving water quality; providing for basic public outdoor recreation facilities; improving conditions for fish and wildlife, and the generation and sale of electrical power as an incident of the foregoing purposes.

"(b) It is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall continue to develop, after consultation with affected States and appropriate Federal agencies, a regional water plan, consistent with the provisions of this Act and with future authorizations, to serve as the framework under which projects in the Colorado River Basin may be coordinated and constructed with proper timing to the end that an adequate supply of water may be made available for such projects, whether heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized.

"TITLE II—INVESTIGATIONS AND PLANNING

"Sec. 201. (a) The Water Resources Council, acting in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 103 of the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244), shall within one year following the effective date of this Act establish principles, standards, and procedures for the program of investigations and submittal of plans and reports authorized by this title. The Secretary, in conformity with the principles, standards, and procedures so established, is authorized and directed to—

"(1) prepare estimates of the long-range water supply available for consumptive use in the Colorado River Basin, of current water requirements therein, and of the rate of growth of water requirements therein to at least the year 2030;

"(2) investigate and recommend sources and means of supplying water to meet the current and anticipated water requirements of the Colorado River Basin, either directly or by exchange, including reductions in losses, importations from sources outside the

natural drainage basin of the Colorado River system, desalination, weather modification, and other means: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not, under the authority of this clause or anything in this Act contained, make any recommendation for importing water into the Colorado River system from other river basins without the approval of those States which will be affected by such exportation, said approval to be obtained in a manner consistent with the procedure and criteria established by section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887);

"(3) undertake investigations, in cooperation with other concerned agencies, of means for maintaining an adequate water quality throughout the Colorado River Basin;

"(4) investigate means of providing for prudent water conservation practices to permit maximum beneficial utilization of available water supplies in the Colorado River Basin;

"(5) investigate and prepare estimates of the long-range water supply in States and areas from which water could be imported into the Colorado River system, together with estimates and plans to satisfy the probable ultimate requirements for water within such States and areas of origin for all purposes, including but not limited to consumptive use, navigation, river regulation, power, enhancement of fishery resources, pollution control, and disposal of wastes to the ocean, and estimates of the quantities of water, if any, that will be available in excess of such requirements.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized and directed to prepare reconnaissance reports covering the matters set out in subsection (a) of this section, and such reports shall be submitted to the President and to the Congress not later than June 30, 1973, and, as revised and updated, every five years thereafter. For the purpose of providing for the repayment of the reimbursable costs of any projects covered by such reports, the Secretary shall take into account such assistance as may be available to the States of the Upper Division from the Upper Colorado from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (70 Stat. 107), and to the States of the Lower Division from the development fund established by section 403 of this Act.

"(c) On the basis of the investigations and studies performed pursuant to this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (a) (2) and section 203 hereof, the Secretary shall prepare a feasibility report on a plan which shows the most economical means of augmenting the water supply available in the Colorado River below Lee Ferry by two and one-half million acre-feet annually. The recommended plan may include the construction of works and facilities by such successive stages as are estimated to be necessary to alleviate critical water shortages as they occur. The report prepared pursuant to this subsection, along with comments of the affected States and appropriate Federal agencies thereon, shall be submitted to the Congress on or before January 1, 1975.

"Sec. 202. The Congress declares that the satisfaction of the requirements of the Mexican Water Treaty from the Colorado River constitutes a national obligation which shall be the first obligation of any water augmentation project planned pursuant to section 201 of this Act and authorized by the Congress. Accordingly, the States of the Upper Division (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming) and the States of the Lower Division (Arizona, California, and Nevada) shall be relieved from all obligations which may have been imposed upon them by article III(c) of the Colorado River Compact so long as the Secretary shall determine and proclaim that means are available and in operation which augment the water supply of the Colorado River system in such quantity as to satisfy the requirements of the Mexican Water Treaty together with any losses of water associated with the performance of

that treaty: *Provided*, That the satisfaction of the requirements of the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994, 59 Stat. 1219), shall be from the waters of the Colorado River pursuant to the treaties, laws, and compacts presently relating thereto, until such time as a feasibility plan showing the most economical means of augmenting the water supply available in the Colorado River below Lee Ferry by two and one-half million acre-feet shall be authorized by the Congress.

"Sec. 203. (a) In the event that the Secretary shall, pursuant to section 201(a) (2) and 201(c), plan works to import water into the Colorado River system from sources outside the natural drainage areas of the system, he shall make provision for adequate and equitable protection of the interests of the States and areas of origin, including assistance from funds specified in section 201(b) of this Act, to the end that water supplies may be available for use in such States and areas of origin adequate to satisfy their ultimate requirements at prices to users not adversely affected by the exportation of water to the Colorado River system.

"(b) All requirements, present or future, for water within any State lying wholly or in part within the drainage area of any river basin from which water is exported by works planned pursuant to this Act shall have a priority of right in perpetuity to the use of the waters of that river basin, for all purposes, as against the uses of the water delivered by means of such exportation works, unless otherwise provided by interstate agreement.

"Sec. 204. The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and the Congress reports covering progress on the investigations and reports authorized by this title.

"Sec. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this title.

"TITLE III—AUTHORIZED UNITS: PROTECTION OF EXISTING USES

"Sec. 301. (a) For the purposes of furnishing irrigation water and municipal water supplies to the water-deficient areas of Arizona and western New Mexico through direct diversion or exchange of water, control of floods, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, enhancement of recreation opportunities, and for other purposes, the Secretary shall construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona Project, consisting of the following principal works: (1) a system of main conduits and canals, including a main canal and pumping plants (Granite Reef aqueduct and pumping plants), for diverting and carrying water from Lake Havasu to Orme Dam or suitable alternative, which system shall have a capacity of not to exceed two thousand five hundred cubic feet per second; (2) Orme Dam and Reservoir and power-pumping plant or suitable alternative; (3) Buttes Dam and Reservoir, which shall be so operated as not to prejudice the rights of any user in and to the waters of the Gila River as those rights are set forth in the decree entered by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona on June 29, 1935, in United States against Gila Valley Irrigation District and others (Globe Equity Numbered 59); (4) Hooker Dam and Reservoir or suitable alternative, which shall be constructed in such a manner as to give effect to the provisions of subsection (f) of section 304; (5) Charleston Dam and Reservoir; (6) Tucson aqueducts and pumping plants; (7) Salt-Gila aqueduct; (8) related canals, regulating facilities, hydroelectric powerplants, and electrical transmission facilities required for the operation of said principal works; (9) related water distribution and drainage works; and (10) appurtenant works.

"(b) Article II(B) (3) of the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340) shall be so administered that in any year in which,

as determined by the Secretary, there is insufficient main stream Colorado River water available for release to satisfy annual consumptive use of seven million five hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, California, and Nevada, diversions from the main stream for the Central Arizona Project shall be so limited as to assure the availability of water in quantities sufficient to provide for the aggregate annual consumptive use by holders of present perfected rights, by other users in the State of California served under existing contracts with the United States by diversion works heretofore constructed, and by other existing Federal reservations in that State, of four million four hundred thousand acre-feet of mainstream water, and by users of the same character in Arizona and Nevada. Water users in the State of Nevada shall not be required to bear shortages in any proportion greater than would have been imposed in the absence of this subsection 301(b). This subsection shall not affect the relative priorities, among themselves, of water users in Arizona, Nevada, and California which are senior to diversions for the Central Arizona Project, or amend any provisions of said decree.

"(c) The limitation stated in subsection (b) of this section shall not apply so long as the Secretary shall determine and proclaim that means are available and in operation which augment the water supply of the Colorado River system in such quantity as to make sufficient mainstream water available for release to satisfy annual consumptive use of seven million five hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, California, and Nevada.

"Sec. 302. (a) The Secretary shall designate the lands of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Arizona, and the Fort McDowell-Apache Indian Community, Arizona, or interests therein, and any allotted lands or interests therein within said communities which he determines are necessary for use and occupancy by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Orme Dam and Reservoir, or alternative. The Secretary shall offer to pay the fair market value of the lands and interests designated, inclusive of improvements. In addition, the Secretary shall offer to pay toward the cost of relocating or replacing such improvements not to exceed \$500,000 in the aggregate, and the amount offered for the actual relocation or replacement of a residence shall not exceed the difference between the fair market value of the residence and \$8,000. Each community and each affected allottee shall have six months in which to accept or reject the Secretary's offer. If the Secretary's offer is rejected, the United States may proceed to acquire the property interests involved through eminent domain proceedings in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona under 40 U.S.C., sections 257 and 258a. Upon acceptance in writing of the Secretary's offer, or upon the filing of a declaration of taking in eminent domain proceedings, title to the lands or interests involved, and the right to possession thereof, shall vest in the United States. Upon a determination by the Secretary that all or any part of such lands or interests are no longer necessary for the purpose for which acquired, title to such lands or interests shall be restored to the appropriate community.

"(b) Title to any land or easement acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to the right of the former owner to use or lease the land for purposes not inconsistent with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, as determined by, and under terms and conditions prescribed by, the Secretary. Such right shall include the right to extract and dispose of minerals. The determination of fair market value under subsection (a) shall reflect the right to extract and dispose of minerals but not the other uses permitted by this subsection.

"(c) In view of the fact that a substantial portion of the lands of the Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Indian Community will be required for Orme Dam and Reservoir, or alternative, the Secretary shall, in addition to the compensation provided for in subsection (a) of this section, designate and add to the Fort McDowell Indian Reservation twenty-five hundred acres of suitable lands in the vicinity of the reservation that are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in township 4 north, range 7 east; township 5 north, range 7 east; and township 3 north, range 7 east, Gila and Salt River base meridian, Arizona. Title to lands so added to the reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Indian Community.

"(d) Each community shall have a right, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary, to develop and operate recreational facilities along the part of the shoreline of the Orme Reservoir located on or adjacent to its reservation, including land added to the Fort McDowell Reservation as provided in subsection (b) of this section, subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary governing the recreation development of the reservoir. Recreation development of the entire reservoir and federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary adjacent thereto shall be in accordance with a master recreation plan approved by the Secretary. Each community and the members thereof shall have non-exclusive personal rights to hunt and fish on the reservoir, to the same extent they are now authorized to hunt and fish, without charge, but shall have no right to exclude others from the reservoir except by control of access through their reservations, or any right to require payments by the public except for the use of community lands or facilities.

"(e) All funds paid pursuant to this section, and any per capita distribution thereof, shall be exempt from all forms of State and Federal income taxes.

"Sec. 303. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to a conclusion appropriate engineering and economic studies and to recommend the most feasible plan for the construction and operation of hydroelectric generating and transmission facilities, the purchase of electrical energy, the purchase of entitlement to electrical plant capacity, or any combination thereof including participation, operation, or construction by non-Federal entities, for the purpose of supplying the power requirements of the Central Arizona Project and augmenting the Lower Colorado River Basin Fund: *Provided*, That nothing in this section or in this Act contained shall be construed to authorize the study or construction of any dams on the main stream of the Colorado River between Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon Dam.

"(b) If included as a part of the recommended plan, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with non-Federal interests proposing to construct a thermal generating powerplant whereby the United States shall acquire the right to such portion of the capacity of such plant, including delivery of power and energy over appurtenant transmission facilities to mutually agreed upon delivery points, as he determines is required in connection with the operation of the Central Arizona Project. When not required for the Central Arizona Project, the power and energy acquired by such agreement may be disposed of intermittently by the Secretary for other purposes at such prices as he may determine, including its marketing in conjunction with the sale of power and energy from Federal powerplants in the Colorado River system so as to produce the greatest practical amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates. The agreement shall provide, among other things, that—

"(1) the United States shall pay not more than that portion of the total construction cost, exclusive of interest during construc-

tion, of the powerplant, and of any switchyards and transmission facilities serving the United States, as is represented by the ratios of the respective capacities to be provided for the United States therein to the total capacities of such facilities. The Secretary shall make the Federal portion of such costs available to the non-Federal interests during the construction period, including the period of preparation of designs and specifications, in such installments as will facilitate a timely construction schedule, but no funds other than for preconstruction activities shall be made available by the Secretary until he determines that adequate contracts have been entered into between all the affected parties covering land, water, fuel supplies, power (its availability and use), rights-of-way, transmission facilities and all other necessary matters for the thermal generating powerplant;

"(2) annual operation and maintenance costs, including provisions for depreciation (except as to depreciation on the pro rata share of the construction cost borne by the United States in accordance with the foregoing clause (1)), shall be apportioned between the United States and the non-Federal interests on an equitable basis taking into account the ratios determined in accordance with the foregoing clause (1);

"(3) the United States shall be given appropriate credit for any interests in Federal lands administered by the Department of the Interior that are made available for the powerplant and appurtenances;

"(4) costs to be borne by the United States under clauses (1) and (2) shall not include (a) interest and interest during construction, (b) financing charges, (c) franchise fees, and (d) such other costs as shall be specified in the agreement.

"(c) No later than one year from the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall submit his recommended plan to the Congress. Except as authorized by subsection (b) of this section, such plan shall not become effective until approved by the Congress.

"(d) If the thermal generating plant referred to in subsection (b) of this section is located in Arizona, and if it is served by water diverted from the drainage area of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, other provisions of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding, such consumptive use of water shall be a part of the fifty thousand acre-feet per annum apportioned to the State of Arizona by article III(a) of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31).

"Sec. 304. (a) Unless and until otherwise provided by Congress, water from the Central Arizona Project shall not be made available directly or indirectly for the irrigation of lands not having a recent irrigation history as determined by the Secretary, except in the case of Indian lands, national wildlife refuges and, with the approval of the Secretary, State-administered wildlife management areas.

"(b) (1) Irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply under the Central Arizona Project within the State of Arizona may, in the event the Secretary determines that it is necessary to effect repayment, be pursuant to master contracts with organizations which have power to levy assessments against all taxable real property within their boundaries. The terms and conditions of contracts or other arrangements whereby each such organization makes water from the Central Arizona Project available to users within its boundaries shall be subject to the Secretary's approval, and the United States shall, if the Secretary determines such action is desirable to facilitate carrying out the provisions of this Act, have the right to require that it be a party to such contracts or that contracts subsidiary to the master contracts be entered into between the United States and any user. The provisions of this clause (1) shall not apply to the supplying of water to an Indian tribe for use within the boundaries of an Indian reservation.

"(2) Any obligation assumed pursuant to section 9(d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) with respect to any project contract unit or irrigation block shall be repaid over a basic period of not more than fifty years; any water service provided pursuant to section 9(e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(e)) may be on the basis of delivery of water for a period of fifty years and for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits and from such other points of delivery as the Secretary may designate; and long-term contracts relating to irrigation water supply shall provide that water made available thereunder may be made available by the Secretary for municipal or industrial purposes if and to the extent that such water is not required by the contractor for irrigation purposes.

"(3) Contracts relating to municipal and industrial water supply under the Central Arizona Project may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)); may provide for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits; and may provide for repayment over a period of fifty years if made pursuant to clause (1) of said section and for the delivery of water over a period of fifty years if made pursuant to clause (2) thereof.

"(c) Each contract under which water is provided under the Central Arizona Project shall require that (1) there be in effect measures, adequate in the judgment of the Secretary, to control expansion of irrigation from aquifers affected by irrigation in the contract service area; (2) the canals and distribution systems through which water is conveyed after its delivery by the United States to the contractors shall be provided and maintained with linings adequate in his judgment to prevent excessive conveyance losses; and (3) neither the contractor nor the Secretary shall pump or permit others to pump ground water from within the exterior boundaries of the service area of a contractor receiving water from the Central Arizona Project for any use outside said contractor's service area unless the Secretary and such contractor shall agree, or shall have previously agreed, that a surplus of ground water exists and that drainage is or was required. Such contracts shall be subordinate at all times to the satisfaction of all existing contracts between the Secretary and users in Arizona heretofore made pursuant to the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

"(d) The Secretary may require in any contract under which water is provided from the Central Arizona Project that the Contractor agree to accept mainstream water in exchange for or in replacement of existing supplies from sources other than the main stream. The Secretary shall so require in the case of users in Arizona who also use water from the Gila River system to the extent necessary to make available to users of water from the Gila River system in New Mexico additional quantities of water as provided in and under the conditions specified in subsection (f) of this section: Provided, That such exchanges and replacements shall be accomplished without economic injury or cost to such Arizona contractors.

"(e) In times of shortage or reduction of mainstream Colorado River water for the Central Arizona Project, as determined by the Secretary, users which have yielded water from other sources in exchange for main stream water supplied by that project shall have a first priority to receive mainstream water, as against other users supplied by that project which have not so yielded water from other sources, but only in quantities adequate to replace the water so yielded.

"(f) (1) In the operation of the Central Arizona Project, the Secretary shall offer to contract with water users in New Mexico for water from the Gila River, its tributaries and underground water sources in amounts that will permit consumptive uses of water in New Mexico of not to exceed an annual average in any period of ten consecutive years of eighteen thousand acre-feet, including reservoir evaporation, over and above the consumptive uses provided for by article IV of the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340). Such increased consumptive uses shall not begin until, and shall continue only so long as, delivery of Colorado River water to downstream Gila River users in Arizona is being accomplished in accordance with this Act, in quantities sufficient to replace any diminution of their supply resulting from such diversions from the Gila River, its tributaries and underground water sources. In determining the amount required for this purpose full consideration shall be given to any differences in the quality of the waters involved.

"(2) The Secretary shall further offer to contract with water users in New Mexico for water from the Gila River, its tributaries, and underground water sources in amounts that will permit consumptive uses of water in New Mexico of not to exceed an annual average in any period of ten consecutive years of an additional thirty thousand acre-feet, including reservoir evaporation. Such further increases in consumptive use shall not begin until, and shall continue only so long as, works capable of augmenting the water supply of the Colorado River system have been completed and water sufficiently in excess of two million eight hundred thousand acre-feet per annum is available from the main stream of the Colorado River for consumptive use in Arizona to provide water for the exchanges herein authorized and provided. In determining the amount required for this purpose full consideration shall be given to any differences in the quality of the waters involved.

"(3) All additional consumptive uses provided for in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be subject to all rights in New Mexico and Arizona as established by the decree entered by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona on June 29, 1935, in United States against Gila Valley Irrigation District and others (Globe Equity Numbered 59) and to all other rights existing on the effective date of this Act in New Mexico and Arizona to water from the Gila River, its tributaries, and underground water sources and shall be junior thereto and shall be made only to the extent possible without economic injury or cost to the holders of such rights.

"Sec. 305. To the extent that the flow of the main stream of the Colorado River is augmented in order to make sufficient water available for release, as determined by the Secretary pursuant to article II(b)(1) of the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340), to satisfy annual consumptive use of two million eight hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, four million four hundred thousand acre-feet in California, and three hundred thousand acre-feet in Nevada, respectively, the Secretary shall make such water available to users of main-stream water in these States at the same costs (to the extent that such costs can be made comparable through the nonreimbursable allocation to the replenishment of the deficiencies occasioned by satisfaction of the Mexican Treaty burden as herein provided and financial assistance from the development fund established by section 403 of this Act) and on the same terms as would be applicable if main-stream water were available for release in the quantities required to supply such consumptive use.

"Sec. 306. The Secretary shall undertake

programs for water salvage and ground water recovery along and adjacent to the main stream of the Colorado River. Such programs shall be consistent with maintenance of a reasonable degree of undisturbed habitat for fish and wildlife in the area, as determined by the Secretary.

"Sec. 307. The Dixie Project, heretofore authorized in the State of Utah, is hereby reauthorized for construction at the site determined feasible by the Secretary, and the Secretary shall integrate such project into the repayment arrangement and participation in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund established by title IV of this Act consistent with the provisions of the Act: Provided, That section 8 of Public Law 88-565 (78 Stat. 848) is hereby amended by deleting the figure '\$42,700,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '\$58,000,000'.

"Sec. 308. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the project works authorized pursuant to this title shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213), except as provided in section 302 of this Act.

"Sec. 309. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Central Arizona Project, including prepayment for power generation and transmission facilities but exclusive of distribution and drainage facilities for non-Indian lands, \$779,000,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved here and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project.

"(b) There is also authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for construction of distribution and drainage facilities for non-Indian lands. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 403 of this Act, neither appropriations made pursuant to the authorization contained in this subsection (b) nor revenues collected in connection with the operation of such facilities shall be credited to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and payments shall not be made from that fund to the general fund of the Treasury to return any part of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of such facilities.

"TITLE IV—LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT FUND: ALLOCATION AND REPAYMENT OF COSTS: CONTRACTS

"Sec. 401. Upon completion of each lower basin unit of the project herein or hereafter authorized, or separate feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs of constructing said unit or features to (1) commercial power, (2) irrigation, (3) municipal and industrial water supply, (4) flood control, (5) navigation, (6) water quality control, (7) recreation, (8) fish and wildlife, (9) the replenishment of the depletion of Colorado River flows available for use in the United States occasioned by performance of the Water Treaty of 1944 with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994), and (10) any other purposes authorized under the Federal reclamation laws. Costs of construction, operation, and maintenance allocated to the replenishment of the depletion of Colorado River flows available for use in the United States occasioned by compliance with the Mexican Water Treaty (including losses in transit, evaporation from regulatory reservoirs, and regulatory losses at the Mexican boundary, incurred in the transportation, storage, and delivery of water in discharge of the obligations of that treaty) shall be nonreimbursable. The repayment of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water

Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213): *Provided*, That all of the separable and joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement as a part of the Dixie project, Utah, shall be nonreimbursable. Costs allocated to nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 402. The Secretary shall determine the repayment capability of Indian lands within, under, or served by any unit of the project. Construction costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands (including provision of water for incidental domestic and stock water use) and within the repayment capability of such lands shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 464), and such costs that are beyond repayment capability of such lands shall be nonreimbursable.

"Sec. 403. (a) There is hereby established a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund (hereinafter called the 'development fund'), which shall remain available until expended as herein-after provided.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title III of this Act shall be credited to the development fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury, and shall be available for such purposes.

"(c) There shall also be credited to the development fund—

"(1) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of facilities authorized in title III in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (except entrance, admission, and other recreation fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessionaries), including revenues which, after completion of payout of the Central Arizona Project as required herein are surplus, as determined by the Secretary, to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of said project; and

"(2) any Federal revenues from the Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects which, after completion of repayment requirements of the said Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects, are surplus, as determined by the Secretary, to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of those projects: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue the in-lieu-of-tax payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada provided for in section 2(c) of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act so long as revenues accrue from the operation of the Boulder Canyon project; and

"(3) any Federal revenues from that portion of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie located in the States of Nevada and Arizona which, after completion of repayment requirements of the said part of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie located in the States of Nevada and Arizona, are surplus, as determined by the Secretary, to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of said portion of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie and related facilities.

"(d) All moneys collected and credited to the development fund pursuant to subsection (b) and clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (c) of this section and the portion of revenues derived from the sale of power and energy for use in Arizona pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (c) of this section shall be available, without further appropriation for—

"(1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation Acts; and

"(2) payments to reimburse water users in the State of Arizona for losses sustained as a result of diminution of the production of hydroelectric power at Coolidge Dam,

Arizona, resulting from exchanges of water between users in the States of Arizona and New Mexico as set forth in section 304(f) of this Act.

"(e) Revenues credited to the development fund shall not be available for construction of the works comprised within any unit of the project herein or hereafter authorized except upon appropriation by the Congress.

"(f) Moneys credited to the development fund pursuant to subsection (b) and clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (c) of this section and the portion of revenues derived from the sale of power and energy for use in Arizona pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (c) of this section in excess of the amount necessary to meet the requirements of clauses (1), and (2) of subsection (d) of this section shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit of the projects or separable feature thereof authorized pursuant to title III of this Act, which are allocated to irrigation, commercial power, or municipal and industrial water supply, pursuant to this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of each such unit or separable feature, exclusive of any development period authorized by law: *Provided*, That return of the cost, if any, required by section 307 shall not be made until after the payout period of the Central Arizona Project as authorized herein;

"(2) interest (including interest during construction) on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power and municipal and industrial water supply features of the project at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, and interest due shall be a first charge.

"(g) All revenues credited to the development fund in accordance with clause (c) (2) of this section (excluding only those revenues derived from the sale of power and energy for use in Arizona during the payout period of the Central Arizona Project as authorized herein) and such other revenues as remain in the development fund after making the payments required by subsections (d) and (f) of this section shall be available (1) to make payments, if any, as required by sections 307 and 502 of this Act, and (2), upon appropriation by the Congress, to assist in the repayment of reimbursable costs incurred in connection with units hereafter constructed to provide for the augmentation of the water supplies of the Colorado River for use below Lee Ferry as may be authorized as a result of the investigations and recommendations made pursuant to clause 201(a) (2) and subsection 203 (a) of this Act.

"(h) The interest rate applicable to those portions of the reimbursable costs of each unit of the project which are properly allocated to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the first advance is made for initiating construction of such unit, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from the date of issue.

"(i) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the development fund.

"Sec. 404. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining each lower basin unit of the project for the preceding fiscal year. The report of the Secretary shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment al-

located at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"TITLE V—UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION AND REIMBURSEMENTS

"Sec. 501. (a) In order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project, Colorado-New Mexico; the Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, and San Miguel Federal reclamation projects, Colorado; and the Central Utah project (Uintah unit), Utah, as participating projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C. 620), and to provide for the completion of planning reports on other participating projects, clause (2) of section 1 of said Act is hereby further amended by (i) inserting the words 'and the Uintah unit' after the word 'phase' within the parentheses following 'Central Utah', (ii) deleting the words 'Pine River Extension' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, San Miguel', (iii) adding after the words 'Smith Fork' the proviso '*Provided*, That consideration of the Uintah unit of the Central Utah project shall not be undertaken by the Secretary until he has completed a feasibility report on such unit and submitted such report to the Congress along with his certification that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit or segment will exceed the costs and that such unit is physically and financially feasible'. Section 2 of said Act is hereby further amended by (1) deleting the words 'Farshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, San Miguel, West Divide, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Dallas Creek, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata', and inserting after the words 'Yellow Jacket' the words 'Basalt, Middle Park (including the Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, and Azure units), Upper Gunnison (including the East River, Ohio Creek, and Tomichi Creek units), Lower Yampa (including the Juniper and Great Northern units), Upper Yampa (including the Hayden Mesa, Wessels, and Toponas units)'; (ii) by inserting after the word 'Sublette' the words '(including a diversion of water from the Green River to the North Platte River Basin in Wyoming), Ute Indian unit of the Central Utah Project, San Juan County (Utah), Price River, Grand County (Utah), Gray Canyon, and Juniper (Utah)'; and (iii) changing the period after 'projects' to a colon and adding the following proviso: '*Provided*, That the planning report for the Ute Indian unit of the Central Utah participating project shall be completed on or before December 31, 1974, to enable the United States of America to meet the commitments heretofore made to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation under the agreement dated September 20, 1965 (Contract Numbered 14-06-W-194)'. The amount which section 12 of said Act authorizes to be appropriated is hereby further increased by the sum of \$392,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required, by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved. This additional sum shall be available solely for the construction of the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, and San Miguel projects herein authorized.

"(b) The Secretary is directed to proceed as nearly as practicable with the construction of the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, and San Miguel participating Federal reclamation projects concurrently with the construction of the Central Arizona Project, to the end that such projects shall be completed not later than the date of the first delivery of water from said Central Arizona Project: *Provided*, That an ap-

propriate repayment contract for each of said participating projects shall have been executed as provided in section 4 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 107) before construction shall start on that particular project.

"(c) The Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall be constructed and operated in substantial accordance with the engineering plans set out in the report of the Secretary transmitted to the Congress on May 4, 1966, and printed as House Document 436, Eighty-ninth Congress: *Provided*, That construction of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall not be undertaken until and unless the States of Colorado and New Mexico shall have ratified the following compact to which the consent of Congress is hereby given:

"ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT COMPACT

"The State of Colorado and the State of New Mexico, in order to implement the operation of the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project, Colorado-New Mexico, a proposed participating project under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105), and being moved by considerations of interstate comity, have resolved to conclude a compact for these purposes and have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I

"A. The right to store and divert water in Colorado and New Mexico from the La Plata and Animas River systems, including return flow to the La Plata River from Animas River diversions, for uses in New Mexico under the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project shall be valid and of equal priority with those rights granted by decree of the Colorado state courts for the uses of water in Colorado for that project, providing such uses in New Mexico are within the allocation of water made to that state by articles III and XIV of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31).

"B. The restrictions of the last sentence of Section (a) of Article IX of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact shall not be construed to vitiate paragraph A of this article.

"ARTICLE II

"This Compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States."

"(d) The Secretary shall, for the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, San Miguel, West Divide, and Seedskadee participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, establish the nonexcess irrigable acreage for which any single ownership may receive project water at one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof, as determined by the Secretary, in other land classes.

"(e) In the diversion and storage of water for any project or any parts thereof constructed under the authority of this Act or the Colorado River Storage Project Act within and for the benefit of the State of Colorado only, the Secretary is directed to comply with the constitution and statutes of the State of Colorado relating to priority of appropriation; with State and Federal court decrees entered pursuant thereto; and with operating principles, if any, adopted by the Secretary and approved by the State of Colorado.

"(f) The words 'any western slope appropriations' contained in paragraph (i) of that section of Senate Document Numbered 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, entitled 'Manner of Operation of Project Facilities and Auxiliary Features', shall mean and refer to the appropriation heretofore made for the storage of water in Green Mountain Reservoir, a unit of the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project, Colorado; and the Secretary is directed to act in accordance with such meaning and reference. It is

the sense of Congress that this directive defines and observes the purpose of said paragraph (i), and does not in any way affect or alter any rights or obligations arising under said Senate Document Numbered 80 or under the laws of the State of Colorado.

"Sec. 502. The Upper Colorado River Basin Fund established under section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 107), shall be reimbursed from the Colorado River Development Fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 755) for the money expended heretofore or hereafter from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund to meet deficiencies in generation at Hoover Dam during the filling period of storage units of the Colorado River storage project pursuant to the criteria for the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir (27 Fed. Reg. 6851, July 19, 1962). For this purpose, \$500,000 for each year of operation of Hoover Dam and powerplant, commencing with the enactment of this Act, shall be transferred from the Colorado River Development Fund to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund, in lieu of application of said amounts to the purposes stated in section 2(d) of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, until such reimbursement is accomplished. To the extent that any deficiency in such reimbursement remains as of June 1, 1987, the amount of the remaining deficiency shall then be transferred to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, as provided in subsection (g) of section 403.

"TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS:
DEFINITIONS: CONDITIONS

"Sec. 601. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact (45 Stat. 1057), the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31), the Water Treaty of 1944 with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994), the decree entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California, and others (376 U.S. 340), or, except as otherwise provided herein, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774) or the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 1053).

"(b) The Secretary is directed to—

"(1) make reports as to the annual consumptive uses and losses of water from the Colorado River system after each successive five-year period, beginning with the five-year period starting on October 1, 1970. Such reports shall be prepared in consultation with the States of the lower basin individually and with the Upper Colorado River Commission, and shall be transmitted to the President, the Congress, and the Governors of each State signatory to the Colorado River Compact;

"(2) condition all contracts for the delivery of water originating in the drainage basin of the Colorado River system upon the availability of water under the Colorado River Compact.

"(c) All Federal officers and agencies are directed to comply with the applicable provisions of this Act, and of the laws, treaty, compacts, and decree referred to in subsection (a) of this section, in the storage and release of water from all reservoirs and in the operation and maintenance of all facilities in the Colorado River system under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary, and in the operation and maintenance of all works which may be authorized hereafter for the augmentation of the water supply of the Colorado River system. In the event of failure of any such officer or agency to so comply, any affected State may maintain an action to enforce the provisions of this section in the Supreme Court of the United States and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in

such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

"Sec. 602. (a) In order to fully comply with and carry out the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, and the Mexican Water Treaty, the Secretary shall propose criteria for the coordinated long-range operation of the reservoirs constructed and operated under the authority of the Colorado River Storage Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. To effect in part the purposes expressed in this paragraph, the criteria shall make provision for the storage of water in storage units of the Colorado River Storage Project and releases of water from Lake Powell in the following listed order of priority:

"(1) Releases to supply one-half the deficiency described in article III(c) of the Colorado River Compact, if any such deficiency exists and is chargeable to the States of the Upper Division, but in any event such releases, if any, shall not be required in any year that the Secretary makes the determination and issues the proclamation specified in section 202 of this Act.

"(2) Releases to comply with article III(d) of the Colorado River Compact, less such quantities of water delivered into the Colorado River below Lee Ferry to the credit of the States of the Upper Division from other sources.

"(3) Storage of water not required for the releases specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection to the extent that the Secretary, after consultation with the Upper Colorado River Commission and representatives of the three Lower Division States and taking into consideration all relevant factors (including, but not limited to, historic streamflows, the most critical period of record, and probabilities of water supply), shall find this to be reasonably necessary to assure deliveries under clauses (1) and (2) without impairment of annual consumptive uses in the upper basin pursuant to the Colorado River Compact: *Provided*, That water not so required to be stored shall be released from Lake Powell: (i) to the extent it can be reasonably applied in the States of the Lower Division to the uses specified in article III(e) of the Colorado River Compact, but no such releases shall be made when the active storage in Lake Powell is less than the active storage in Lake Mead, (ii) to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell, and (iii) to avoid anticipated spills from Lake Powell.

"(b) Not later than January 1, 1970, the criteria proposed in accordance with the foregoing subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted to the Governors of the seven Colorado River Basin States and to such other parties and agencies as the Secretary may deem appropriate for their review and comment. After receipt of comments on the proposed criteria, but not later than July 1, 1970, the Secretary shall adopt appropriate criteria in accordance with this section and publish the same in the Federal Register. Beginning January 1, 1972, and yearly thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress and to the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States a report describing the actual operation under the adopted criteria for the preceding compact water year and the projected operation for the current year. As a result of actual operating experience or unforeseen circumstances, the Secretary may thereafter modify the criteria to better achieve the purposes specified in subsection (a) of this section, but only after correspondence with the Governors of the seven Colorado River Basin States and appropriate consultation with such State representatives as each Governor may designate.

"(c) Section 7 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act shall be administered in accordance with the foregoing criteria.

"Sec. 603. (a) Rights of the upper basin to the consumptive use of water available to that basin from the Colorado River system under the Colorado River Compact shall not be reduced or prejudiced by any use of such water in the lower basin.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to impair, conflict with, or otherwise change the duties and powers of the Upper Colorado River Commission.

"Sec. 604. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the projects herein and hereafter authorized, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) to which laws this Act shall be deemed a supplement.

"Sec. 605. Part I of the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1963; 16 U.S.C. 791a-823) shall not be applicable to the reaches of the main stream of the Colorado River between Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon Dam until and unless otherwise provided by Congress.

"Sec. 606. As used in this Act, (a) all terms which are defined in the Colorado River Compact shall have the meanings therein defined;

"(b) 'Main stream' means the main stream of the Colorado River downstream from Lee Ferry, within the United States, including the reservoirs thereon;

"(c) 'User' or 'water user' in relation to main-stream water in the lower basin means the United States or any person or legal entity entitled under the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California, and others (376 U.S. 340) to use main-stream water when available thereunder;

"(d) 'Active storage' means that amount of water in reservoir storage, exclusive of bank storage, which can be released through the existing reservoir outlet works;

"(e) 'Colorado River Basin States' means the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming; and

"(f) 'Augment' or 'augmentation', when used herein with reference to water, means to increase the supply of the Colorado River or its tributaries by the introduction of water into the Colorado River system, which is in addition to the natural supply of the system."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Amend the title of S. 1004 to read: "An Act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3300) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11308, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES OF 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11308) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities of 1965, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none; and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, THOMPSON of New Jersey, CAREY, SCHEUER, BRADEMAS, AYRES, GOODSELL, ASHBROOK, and REID of New York.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF MONDAY, MAY 20, 1968

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader to kindly advise us as to whether or not there is any more program for this week and the program for the following week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, we have completed the legislative program that will be called for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are eight suspensions. They are as follows:

H.R. 16674, Farm Credit Administration amendments;

H.R. 15387, assaults on postal employees;

S. 561, authorizing appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore;

H.R. 14074, entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N.C.;

H.R. 16025, compensation and education assistance for widows of veterans;

H.R. 16902, care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes;

H.R. 7481, nursing home care for certain veterans; and

H.R. 14954, improve vocational rehabilitation training for service-connected veterans.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday is scheduled the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1969.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 2158, Interstate Taxation Act, with 3 hours of debate, and it is subject to an open rule;

House Resolution 1093, investigation of operations of U.S. military credit unions;

H.R. 17324, extension of Renegotiation Act, which is subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 15794, U.S. Grain Standards Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

House Joint Resolution 1227, to authorize the temporary funding of the emergency credit revolving fund, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate and waiving points of order;

H.R. 8578, to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 15198, employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products, which is subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program will be announced later.

I advise Members that it is expected that the truth-in-lending conference report will be brought up sometime next week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 20, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15131

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 15131, the Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby declare that I would have voted for the motion to recommit and against the bill that has just now passed.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, had a rollcall been taken on the Colorado River Basin project, I would have voted in favor of the motion to recommit and against final passage.

THE REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK AND SEASHORE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, over many years, the Congress has developed and passed legislation to help the average American citizen. We have appropriated, and I believe rightly so, literally billions of dollars in welfare and assistance programs, educational programs and other programs designed to help the average man.

Now we are being asked to enact legislation to do just the opposite—to make displaced citizens out of normal, hard-working, self-respecting, self-supporting Americans. These people are in my district.

I am referring, of course, to some of the extreme proposals for a Redwood National Park which would deprive thousands of my people of their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents in the redwood area. All of them ask the same questions: "If the extreme park proposals are to be adopted, what is going to happen to us?" Or, "If we have to go on welfare, and our companies can no longer make their tax contributions, won't the welfare be pretty thin?"

I want to speak for these people.

One of them wrote:

I work in a Men's Wear Store in Eureka, and business is so bad due to this moratorium that I was laid off. Stores are closing all over Eureka, as you must know.

The fact is that we can have a Redwood National Park which will not create economic devastation. I have submitted one such plan, "Redwoods to the Sea," H.R. 7742. My people can live with it. They approve of it. It would give us a Redwood National Park and Seashore that we could all be proud of.

What I am talking about are the grandiose proposals, which have been incorporated in proposed legislation, and which would take tens of thousands of acres of private timber-growing lands, put several companies out of business, and devastate the economy of the area.

Let me make one thing clear. Today I am not speaking for these companies or the people that own the lands. They have their spokesmen and can speak for themselves.

It is the common man who has no spokesman. I propose to speak for him.

The man in the street is the average man. In the redwood area, he is desperately concerned. He has his home in the smaller towns, and he is economically dependent on the redwood industry. He may work for one of the companies. Or he may be a merchant, the operator of a filling station, or a schoolteacher, or a banker, or a municipal or county employee.

He is economically dependent upon the redwood industry, which, in spite of what uninformed people claim, has done a magnificent, unrecognized job of helping preserve the superlative specimens of that majestic tree, and restores to improved growth those trees that are harvested.

He had his home in the area, and he wants to stay there to raise and educate his children.

He knows that if the company which employs him is put out of business, that company will be paid severance damages. But he, as an individual, will not be compensated; and he is worried.

Not only is he worried, but so is his wife and so are his children. I have a letter from one of these wives who reported that in the Trinidad School District where she lives, that already the average daily attendance has dropped from nearly 500 students to a present count of 392.

In other words, people are already leaving because of the uncertainty and insecurity of their futures.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that when this House considers the redwood park proposals, that it consider the plight of the average Americans who have lived in the redwood areas most of their lives. Are we to legislate them into being displaced persons and second-class citizens?

Are we to deprive them of productive economic existence?

Are we to jeopardize their school districts?

Are we to ruin their lives and their businesses merely to permit interested visitors to view the redwoods from the edge of the highway, and never see, those additional commercial-type, nonpark quality redwoods located in remote, wild distant areas that would be included in the most sweeping proposals to take 77,000 acres of private producing lands in addition to existing State parks?

We have 30 beautiful Redwood State

Parks, but they have not been developed as they should be. One constituent wrote me, and I quote:

We don't need more parks, what we need is development of what we already have. There isn't a park or grove between Eureka and the Oregon border that you can find a place to park legally. If you could, you'd be lost in underbrush way over your head if you got 10 feet off the highway. How many tourists are going to crawl around in that wet and decayed mess?

Another constituent wrote to tell how he had talked to visitors in the existing State parks, and they had been smart enough to notice that there were very few people in the park where he talked to them. He added that he could not understand why people from other areas have demonstrated such little concern for the future of our region and its people.

They do not seem to care, he added, if we have hungry children or if we are overloaded relief rolls. He also pointed out that no family in the redwood areas wants handouts; what they want are jobs to go to every day in their own hometown.

Most of these people have never worked in anything but the lumber industry, and it is a little late for them to change. As my constituent said, many of them are too old to retrain for something else, and too young to retire.

Mr. Speaker, these people that I am trying to speak for are very honest, thrifty, and hard-working American citizens. They have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Are we to deprive them of these rights simply to impose an unnecessarily large park plan on them from Washington?

Now, I recognize that the proponents of the larger parks tell us that the recreation income will replace the lost income from employment. Careful studies question that this is the case. The recreation income, during the 3 months that the weather permits visits to the redwoods, could not replace the present income provided by the industry in payrolls in the foreseeable future.

So, we have this issue clearly before us. It is, simply: "Do we want to stagnate the economic life and careful use of the God-given redwoods merely to satisfy the private enthusiasms of a few people, or do human values mean anything to this House?"

The distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Representative ASPINALL, wisely held hearings on the proposed bills in the redwood area. The members of the Interior Committee were able to confirm at firsthand what I am saying about the plight of the common man out there. The committee was able to observe the adverse economic effects that already have been inflicted on local communities because of uncertainty about what will happen.

One of the things many proponents of a national park have overlooked, is the desirability of including sufficient coastline. The largest of the proposed parks is mostly inland, and pretty far inland, at that. It would include 18 miles of coastline.

The second proposal includes 13 miles of coastline.

The national park and seashore plan, which was developed in close consultation with the people who live in the redwoods, and which was submitted in legislative form by me, has 39 miles of coastline.

When we analyze the plans, we find that one of them has only 3 miles of usable beaches; the other 11. Redwoods to the Sea has 25 miles of usable beaches.

This is important. Experience has shown that most visitors prefer the coast. They love the beaches. They may briefly view the redwoods from the highways, or visit the existing State redwood parks. But, they prefer the beaches. They have no desire to leave their automobiles and plunge into the wilderness of the redwoods far from the highway.

So, it is of utmost importance to provide coastline and usable beaches. These, they can enjoy and, at the same time, keep people from destroying the roots of these redwoods by "tromping" them to death.

Many others like to fish. Redwoods to the Sea provides 12 miles of Smith River frontage, some of the most beautiful in the world. The larger plan ignores this great recreational possibility altogether. The other plan includes just 6 miles on the Smith River.

Redwoods to the Sea includes 21 miles of lagoon frontage; one of the other plans has no lagoon frontage; the other, 7 miles.

The importance of all this water frontage is that it offers highly desirable recreational possibilities that cannot be achieved in the deep redwood areas which are ordinarily damp, dark, and sometimes dangerous. The beach frontage is not.

Inclusion of the beaches will not deprive anyone of a job, nor harm the economy of the region. Instead, they will enhance it and make life even more enjoyable.

There is another feature of redwoods deep in the woods, in areas which are proposed to be taken over. This is the real element of personal danger.

Redwoods have a characteristic well known to those who work with them—that of suddenly dropping huge limbs to the ground, particularly during high winds or winter storms. Locally, these falls are known as "widow-makers," and it is a term well chosen. I do not mean to frighten people, but I do feel we "natives" should warn our future visitors of this possible hazard.

Unless areas in the redwoods are cleared for recreation and camping, as in portions of State parks, there are few who should venture far into remote areas. Few want to. They stick to the highways, or go into spaces cleared for camping or viewing the great trees.

As another constituent wrote me:

Those who want to drive through the redwoods can do so by following the old 101 highway along the Eel River. No finer redwoods can be found anywhere, and there are plenty for everyone to see. No man alive today or born tomorrow will ever live long enough to see all the million and three-quarter giant redwoods that have already been set aside in our State parks.

So, if we are to have a Redwood National Park in addition to the redwoods in our existing State parks, why not accept the more reasonable and sensible plan that will provide a National Redwood Park with seashore access that will not disturb the financial condition of the people who live out there?

The communities involved, the people who face possible dislocation, can live with Redwoods to the Sea, and they have said so. The local government bodies have accepted it and endorsed it by resolution and testimony before congressional committees.

The able chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee also heads up the important Public Land Review Commission. That Commission is engaged in a monumental study of Federal land use and administration in this country. It will, I am sure, have recommendations toward achieving a land-use policy that will be fair to all.

In the matter of a Redwood National Park, I think this House must be fair to all. It must be fair to those who want to see the redwoods and the magnificent cathedral-like groves that we have in northern California and fair to those who live among them.

We should not penalize one to patronize the other.

We cannot ignore the human needs of the people who make their livelihood in the redwood country.

We cannot say to them: "Too bad. You'll have to get along as best you can, even if your wife and children do suffer and your personal plans are disrupted, even if your business is shut down and your bank starts to foreclose."

There is a better answer than that. I am certain that when the time comes, this House will provide that better answer.

I ask that you work with us toward adopting the best possible "compromise" Redwood National Park and Seashore plan—a plan that we in redwood country can live with—one that will be an asset and not a liability.

You will note that I place a great deal of emphasis on the seashore. Frankly, I believe history could record the fact that the value of this magnificent seashore will surpass that of the redwoods—particularly, when you consider the recreational value, the "saving of the redwoods" from the potentially destructive affect too many people, trampling the roots, could have.

This is the only place in the world where redwoods grow contiguous to a nearly 40-mile seashore. Let us be very considerate of and kindly to the people living there who are willing to share these "conservation gems" with their fellow Americans—providing they, themselves, are not destroyed in the process.

PARK SERVICE ADMINISTRATION HAVE ACTED UNWISELY IN REGARD TO POOR PEOPLE'S MARCHERS

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, exactly 3 weeks ago today, I spoke here on the House floor to point out that the avowed purpose of the so-called Poor People's March on Washington was to disrupt the city of Washington and the orderly processes of government.

In the light of this, I called upon the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and the President to use the full power of their offices to prevent these marchers from camping on Federal property or elsewhere in the District of Columbia where their use of property would violate existing building and/or sanitation codes or disrupt government.

Many other Members of Congress have expressed a similar opinion. Many bills and resolutions were introduced, and by an overwhelming vote the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, reported to the House for consideration a bill which would have prohibited the use of any Federal property except in the Anacostia-Bolling area and would have authorized a requirement of a bond to insure against property damage.

Our opinions have been disregarded and these so-called marchers virtually all of whom arrived in Washington in air-conditioned buses without any marching at all, have been given free access to public property.

Although their leaders are engaging in semantics with the word "violence," they continue to make it clear that it is their purpose and intention to be a disrupting influence here in the city and in the face of the tense atmosphere already existing, only a blind man would fail to foresee the troubles which will inevitably follow.

The Park Service and the administration have acted most unwisely and I can only hope that they are much better prepared to cope with the trouble these marchers have promised to make than they have given us any basis for believing.

LEGISLATION TO ENABLE WOMEN WITH 30 YEARS COVERAGE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY TO RECEIVE FULL RETIREMENT BENEFITS AT AGE 62

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, currently, there are some 26 million females gainfully employed in our Nation's labor market, representing over 35 percent of the total number of citizens employed in these United States.

These women have had, and are having, a profound effect upon our Nation's economy and way of life as their numbers, buying power, and importance continue to increase.

Our gross national product, rapidly approaching a trillion dollars, is the most fantastic and enviable materialistic

achievement yet known to man. An incredible growth has been realized in our gross national product, rising from \$284.7 billion in 1950 to approximately \$800 billion today, and paralleling—or perhaps “stimulating” would be a better word—this growth has been the expansion of the female role in our labor market and economy.

The greatness of the female contribution to our Nation's economy and well-being cannot be questioned. We only wonder about the degree of this greatness as we acknowledge their valued contribution.

Today I rise for the purpose of acknowledging their contribution by introducing legislation which, if enacted, will enable the women of our Nation's labor force with 30 years coverage under social security to receive full benefits at the age of 62.

Under legislation enacted in 1956, women are able to receive 80 percent of the benefits due to them if they should retire at age 62. Now, I consider it appropriate and wise that we permit them full—not 80 percent—benefits at age 62, and many other Members, whose names also appear on this bill, concur with me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen whose names appear on this bill are not asking for a giveaway. We are urging the Congress to recognize the great contributions made by the women of our land toward the incredible growth of our Nation's economy during the past 30 years and whose labor continues to spark further growth in our economy.

The initial recipients of this legislation are those women who joined the labor force when our Nation was just beginning to overcome a depression, and whose labor may very well have accounted for our Nation's recovery from that economic disaster.

Let me reiterate that this legislation would only apply to those women who have faithfully contributed to this fund for 30 full years—that is, 120 quarters.

Now as we all know, a person can gain full social security coverage if he has contributed to the fund for every quarter after 1950 up to, but not including, the year he or she reaches age 65. In other words, it is possible that a person could gain full benefits at age 65 if he had only contributed to the fund for 18 quarters. In some special instances, even six quarters would enable one to gain full benefits.

The legislation I introduce today speaks not in terms of six quarters or 18 quarters, but in terms of 120 quarters. That is, recipients must have contributed to the fund for at least 30 years or 120 quarters.

We are addressing ourselves to those hardworking, productive Americans whose names do not appear on the welfare rolls during these past 30 years. We are speaking about those strong Americans who are greatly responsible for the growth of assets in the social security trust funds from \$267.2 million 30 years ago to the present \$25.5 billion.

We are asking that Congress now realize the extent of their contribution and permit them to retire with full benefits at age 62. We are not giving them anything that they do not deserve. It is not

a give away. Rather, it is a way for our Nation to say thank you for a job well done to the women of our land who have indeed contributed far more than they could possibly receive from the social security program.

On behalf of all the Members who have cosponsored this bill, I ask that this body act expeditiously and favorably on this legislation.

We have a debt to repay and a commitment to meet. The debt, of course, is to those who have labored so long, and the commitment is to the younger people who are available to replace those who retire. This bill would free many jobs for these younger people and thus enable us to live up to our standing commitment of maintaining the highest possible level of employment.

Let us now live up to this debt and commitment.

CONNECTICUT YOUTHS RESPOND TO SERVICE ACADEMIES' CALL

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, great emphasis has been placed in recent years on dealing with problems of education which confront students and educators, as well as parents and taxpayers who pay the ever-increasing tab. We hear of the frustration of youth, of high school dropouts, of demonstrations by students, and strikes by teachers. We read of so many incidents from the debit side of the ledger because it is human nature to focus attention primarily on news of misfortune, violence, and the extraordinary.

I want to point up a contrary and laudable achievement which I am proud to say has taken place in my own Fifth Congressional District and which I have discovered in the course of seeking qualified candidates for the Nation's service academies. It is not really an extraordinary experience for it has occurred in previous years, although perhaps to a lesser degree. Once more I find to the credit of the students, educators, parents, and taxpayers of my district that there are far more qualified contenders for academy appointments than there are vacancies. And this despite the generosity and wisdom of the academies in allowing my district more appointments than the normal district quota.

Let me explain the situation with a few statistics. Last year, in the normal course of events, I was notified that I would be asked to fill two vacancies at Annapolis in June 1968, three at the Air Force Academy, and one at West Point. I was also invited to nominate candidates for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., to take part in statewide competition for appointment.

As usual, and following a custom which I have adopted in my 10 years of the Congress, I made known to the public through newspaper, radio, and television

announcements, as well as notice to the guidance counselors of schools in my district, that I was accepting applications for academy nominations. The response was good although I feel that some potential contenders did not get the word in time to compete for the appointments. I use the word “compete” because it is and has been my policy to require that all candidates participate in a preliminary civil service examination and a preliminary physical examination at a military establishment.

I have outlined the number of vacancies available to Fifth Congressional District residents in 1968 and my method of selecting nominees. The usual quota of each Congressman is five cadets at Annapolis, West Point, and the Air Force Academy at a given time. When I say the academies have been generous and responsive to the meritorious efforts of Fifth District contenders, I mean that it is common for the academies to accept qualified boys from my district in excess of my quota. This again has been my experience in 1968.

As outlined above, the Fifth District quota for Annapolis for 1968 was two cadets. As of this date, four young men whom I had the privilege of nominating have been notified to report to the Naval Academy as cadets on June 26, 1968. Another young man from my district is fully qualified for appointment, and I hope that the Academy will be able to find a place for him.

The Fifth District quota for 1968 was three at the U.S. Air Force Academy. As of this date, four of the young men I nominated have been notified to report to the Air Force Academy as candidates on June 24, 1968 and four more are fully qualified as alternates for appointment and I am hopeful that one or more of these alternates will be appointed.

The Fifth District quota for the U.S. Military Academy class of 1972 was one. As of this date, one of my nominees has been appointed and has been notified to report to West Point on July 1, 1968. Another of my nominees is fully qualified as an alternate and I am confident that there is a good possibility that he will gain an appointment. In fact, he has been invited to enroll at the West Point Preparatory School.

Three of the young men I nominated for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point have qualified as alternates and let the record show that Kings Point is already heavily populated with young men from Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege each year to recommend young men from my district for the service academies and my staff and I spend considerable time and effort enlisting candidates, checking academic records, arranging civil service and physical examinations, and communicating with the academies and with constituents. But the statistics I have outlined above clearly demonstrate that the effort is certainly worthwhile. It pays dividends not only in bringing qualified young men to the fore and making available to them 4 years of education leading to a military career or civilian opportunity, but also in clearly demonstrating the potentials among our youth today in

striving and competing for the values in education offered by our service academies.

I could go on at length in extending compliments and expressing appreciation to those who have participated and to those who have assisted. I am proud of my district and of the young men who have in such large numbers qualified for academy appointments. I am privileged that the normal congressional quotas for academy appointments have been no shackle to the enthusiastic and qualified competitors from my district, and I am confident that this gratifying record will be sustained in the future.

I cite these statistics and make known my feeling of pleasure in them at this time because now that the 1968 appointments have been completed, I am announcing the acceptance of applications for the academy vacancies that may be available and for which I may be invited to make recommendations for 1969. Without reservation, I accept applications from any Fifth Congressional District resident between the ages of 17 and 22. He must be at least 17 and not have passed his 22d birthday on the date of entrance to an academy. I point out, however, that the competition is tough and that only those who can make a proper showing in academic and physical standings in preliminary examinations conducted at my request will be given the opportunity to meet the final tests of the several academies.

On the basis of my experience with academy appointments, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have no reason to fear for the future of our Nation. I have full confidence in the ability and willingness of our youth, in the vast majority, to rise to the challenge, as demonstrated by the response and the success of my young constituents in service academy competition.

OUR REA PROGRAM

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this week represents the 33d anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This remarkable agency has an outstanding record of continuous leadership in the challenging task of bringing to light the vital importance of farm efficiency and rural development.

During the history of the REA program, since it was established May 11, 1935, our Nation has changed from an essentially agronomy-oriented society to an economy based upon industrialization and mechanization. Clearly, this transition would have been far more difficult than it was, had it not been for the availability of electric power in rural America, sparked largely by the REA. Indeed, in the economic vacuum of the 1930's local people with the help of REA stepped in to provide rural power when other electric suppliers were reluctant to do so.

Today, REA-financed rural electric systems are rural America. REA is one of the great achievements of our present-day government.

A new industrial load on the lines of an electric cooperative is a well-recognized revenue producer, as it is for any electric utility. But there is another important consideration. Rural industrial and commercial electric loads encourage diversity of economic development and opportunity in rural areas. This diversity and these new opportunities are important to opening the way for overcoming our current—and critical—rural-urban imbalance.

Rural people formed their own cooperatives and assumed the responsibility of providing essential electric service for themselves and their neighbors. In so doing, and with the help of their Federal Government, these rural people have in fact stimulated new opportunities to live, work, and thrive in the areas where they were born and reared.

The remarkable progress made so far in the past 33 years in this field stands as a tribute to our rural Americans. They have demonstrated—with the aid of REA—singular energy and imagination in helping themselves to fashion their own communities of tomorrow. We trust they will enjoy another 33 years of future growth, in advancing steadily toward a brighter tomorrow.

FREEDOM REPLACED BY FEDERAL FORCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, recently two field representatives of the Office for Civil Rights—HEW—descended on LaGrange and Troup County, Ga., like a two-man plague of locusts.

They spent about 29 hours in the county before declaring themselves experts on the school systems there. While in Troup County and LaGrange, they attempted to generate complaints and dissatisfactions where none previously existed and where none exist now.

These two 29-hour experts issued an ultimatum that will require extensive busing of students who will pass each other twice a day and that will probably require the closing of new modern school buildings. It is very clear that these bureaucrats are not interested in education or the quality of education.

For the last 4 years, the Troup County school system and the LaGrange school system have operated under the freedom of choice plan. During this period of time, no student or teacher has complained of being denied the opportunity to attend or teach in the school of his or her choice.

The policy of the Department of HEW with regard to "freedom of choice" is that if this does not accomplish the results which HEW desires, school officials are required to force the transfer of students

instead of permitting them to attend the school of their choice.

The citizens of Troup County are disturbed, and rightly so, about this exercise of raw bureaucratic power, as is evidenced by an editorial in the May 8, 1968, edition of the LaGrange Daily News, which follows:

OUR FREEDOM IS REPLACED BY FEDERAL FORCE

In the past, the school systems in this area have operated under the "freedom of choice" plan with regard to integration of public schools.

Under this plan, all students, both Negro and white, decided which schools they preferred to attend. If a Negro student elected to attend a formerly all-white school, he could do so.

Tuesday, William Meredith of the Atlanta office of Civil Rights, told Troup County School Board: "The freedom of choice plan has failed." He went on to explain that it has failed because not enough Negroes are attending previously all white schools and no white children are enrolled in Negro schools.

If Mr. Meredith is correct in his statement, then the basic fundamentals of democracy has suffered what may well prove to be a fatal blow.

To say that the American citizen, whether he be Negro or white, cannot exercise his own freedom of choice is to take away one of the basic rights on which America was founded.

Indeed, this basic belief in a freedom of choice was the motivating force which led to the founding of this country.

The next logical question to raise is: If there can be no freedom of choice, what is it being replaced with?

Perhaps Mr. Meredith and the HEW will not agree with us, but we believe that it is "force."

We have moved from freedom to force, and this is a strange and startling direction for democracy to take.

Whose rights are being violated in this absurd approach by the Federal government?

The white man? Yes, he is being forced to lose his identity in a social upheaval which appears to be motivated for political purposes.

But the Negro's rights are being violated as well.

In the Troup County School system, some 100 Negro students have elected to attend previously all-white schools. The other 1,520 elected to remain in all-Negro schools, schools of which they were proud, surrounded by a race of which they were proud to be a part.

Now, the Federal government decides that the Negro can no longer take pride in the traditions of his school. He must lose these traditions to a social change which he already has demonstrated that he did not want through his own "freedom of choice."

Mr. Meredith and his HEW associate, Phillip Lyde, spent only 29 hours in the Troup County School system before giving their report Tuesday. And yet, in this brief time, they had come up with a plan designed to solve all of the educational-social problems for Troup County.

To say that this adds insult to the ridiculous would be a gross understatement.

The only explanation is that the Federal government, acting through its agents, Mr. Meredith and Mr. Lyde, has no real interest in education as such. The resulting chaos of the plan which they presented will be left as a problem to be faced by both white and Negro educators of Troup County.

But the really pathetic note that comes out of such an HEW report meeting is the sudden realization that your freedom is being taken from you by the government that was created by the individual states of America.

Whether you are Negro or white, you are losing your right to choose. Your freedom is

being replaced by force, and you ask yourself what is to come after democracy has been taken away.

THE CASE FOR USING EXISTING HOUSING TO FOSTER LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOMEOWNERSHIP: SURVEY OF AVAILABILITY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the more than 150 Members of both the House and the Senate who introduced the National Home Ownership Foundation Act last year, were encouraged this session by the administration change of heart on the question of homeownership for lower income families. The administration bill does have its weak points, however, and perhaps the most glaring is its lack of attention to the potential for immediate homeownership impact contained in existing older housing now available in most urban centers. The emphasis with limited exceptions in the administration measure is on new or completely rehabilitated housing.

To make a more informed judgment on this potential, my office conducted a telephone survey of 151 realtors, real estate agencies and real estate brokers selected at random from the yellow pages of the Washington, D.C., telephone book. While existing apartment houses could of course be converted for cooperative or condominium ownership operations, in this instance I limited the inquiry to housing suitable for single-family homeownership. Of the 151 contacted, 14 either refused to respond, were no longer actively engaged in real estate, or were unavailable for comment.

Of the remaining 137, 92 firms reported dealing in a significant way with moderately priced homes. These 92 were then asked the following questions:

1. Do you currently have for sale any homes priced at the \$18,000 or below category?
2. Based upon your activities for the last six months, would you say that homes of this type are listed frequently or infrequently with your agency?
3. Do homes of this type require extensive rehabilitation or repairs before they are considered suitable for family living?

The conclusions that I believe may be drawn from the staff survey, which I will include at the end of my remarks, can be summarized as follows:

First, a moderate number of existing single-family dwellings are available in the District of Columbia for under \$18,000 in cost, at any point during the year. Estimates of the number now available ranged among the 50 firms answering affirmatively to the first question ranged from "a few" to a dozen or more. Even taking into account possible multiple listings, the number turned up by the survey could be estimated at 200 or more. It might be added that the cost per unit

in the administration housing bill is \$17,500 for high-cost areas, and \$20,000 for families with five or more children.

Second, most of these houses require minor repairs, if any. Only 20 percent of those replying said houses they now had listed required extensive rehabilitation.

Third, and most important, there was considerable opinion expressed that a significant number of houses would come on the market if the potential buyers could secure mortgage financing. A number of firms, particularly Negro firms, indicated that housing was now being rented because the owner could not find buyers with satisfactory financing arrangements. So prevalent is the renter orientation in some parts of the minority community, and so limited is their present housing choice, that in one instance, when my office asked if the firm dealt with houses for sale to home buyers, the real estate office employee answered, "Oh, no, we do not handle white property, only black property."

I hope Members of this body, particularly those from urban areas, will carefully consider the possibility of similar results if such a survey were conducted in their localities. I am certainly going to press for greater use of existing housing in any bill coming out of the House Special Subcommittee on Housing of which I am ranking minority member.

It would also prove useful to open up FHA-insured mortgages to nonprofit groups like Home Buyers, Inc., a Washington, D.C., organization, who purchase and make available housing to lower income families under a lease with option to buy approach. Under present law, the nonprofit sponsor has to build or thoroughly rehabilitate five or more dwellings before it can qualify under the 211(h) program. Some nonprofit groups simply are unwilling or unable to take on this responsibility when they first enter the homeownership field, but they are quite capable of assisting low-income families in preparing for homeownership responsibilities, or in locating housing and financing, or even in handling minor repair work.

Allowing nonprofit groups FHA assistance in the purchase of existing housing not requiring extensive rehabilitation would also make more housing available for the rent certificate or leased public housing program which I authored in 1965. This would mean lower monthly payments at the outset, easing the tenant into a home-buying position through a lease with option to buy arrangement, with help from the nonprofit sponsor. The lease with option to buy under the rent certificate program has not been tried as yet in the District of Columbia, or, for that matter, in many areas around the country.

This use of existing housing would benefit the potential lower income home buyer by its immediate availability, and would show the concern of Congress for those left out of the mainstream of American abundance at a time when that concern is being questioned. At the same time, nonprofit religious, fraternal, labor, civic, and neighborhood organizations could gain experience and confidence,

enabling them to move later into the more demanding, but no less necessary, field of increasing the available low-income housing supply through new construction or total rehabilitation.

The survey paper follows:

RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF TELEPHONE SURVEY OF SELECTED REALTORS IN THE WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOWNTOWN AREA, APRIL 29 TO MAY 6, 1968

(Prepared by the staff of Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL)

This survey was undertaken to try and assess the availability of low and moderate income housing in the Washington, D.C. downtown area. The method used was random selection of a considerable segment of the realtors and real estate brokers listed in the advertising section of the telephone directory. Small as well as large real estate agencies were included to insure a representative sampling. Any agency whose telephone listing indicated a principal activity other than direct selling of real estate to private individuals was not contacted. All of the respondents were asked three basic questions: a) Do you currently have for sale any homes priced in the \$18,000 or below category? b) Based upon your activities for the last six months, would you say that homes of this type are listed frequently or infrequently with your agency? c) Do homes of this type require rehabilitation or repairs before they are considered suitable for family living? Finally, it might be noted that almost all of those contacted were quite helpful, and only a handful were uncooperative and refused to give the needed information.

In all, 151 real estate agents or agencies were solicited. Of these, 92 replied that they engage in the sale of moderately priced homes as one of their principal activities, that is they solicit listings of this type and endeavor to sell homes of this category on a day-to-day basis. Another 45 replied that their principal activities were other than selling either residential housing, or housing in this price range. Most of these people were engaged in either the rental of housing they owned, real estate investments, management, speculation or building.

CHART I—PRINCIPAL ACTIVITY OF REALTORS

| | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| Dealing in significant way with moderately priced homes..... | 92 | 61 |
| Not dealing in significant way with moderately priced homes..... | 45 | 30 |
| Not responding, unavailable, or no longer engaged in real estate business..... | 14 | 9 |
| Total..... | 151 | 100 |

The first question asked only concerned the 92 realtors who indicated significant activity in this area. Of the 92, 50 or 54.3% reported that they currently had homes for sale in the \$18,000 or below price category, while 42, or 45.7% stated that they did not have any homes available. Thirty-three per cent, then, of the total realtors surveyed had moderately-priced homes currently for sale.

CHART II—REALTORS REPORTING MODERATELY PRICED HOMES FOR SALE

| | Number | Percent | Percent of total realtors |
|--|--------|---------|---------------------------|
| Having current listings of moderately priced homes for sale..... | 50 | 54.3 | 33 |
| Not having current listings of moderately priced homes for sale..... | 42 | 45.7 | 28 |
| Total..... | 92 | 100.0 | |

The second question concerned the frequency with which listings of moderately-priced homes were made with those realtors devoting a large part of their time to such sales. Forty-three, or 46.7%, of the 92 realtors indicated frequent availability of these homes, while 49, or 53.3% stated they obtained such listings rarely. The difference between the 50 realtors who showed current listings of moderately-priced homes and the lesser figure of 43 who report almost constant listings is probably due to the random nature of the sample; undoubtedly some respondents were contacted at one of the times when they had a home for sale costing less than \$18,000. These 43 realtors represented 28.4% of the total sample.

CHART III—REALTORS REPORTING FREQUENT LISTINGS OF MODERATELY PRICED HOMES

| | Number | Percent | Percent of total sample |
|--|--------|---------|-------------------------|
| Realtors reporting frequent listings of moderately priced homes..... | 43 | 46.7 | 28.4 |
| Realtors reporting infrequent listings of moderately priced homes..... | 49 | 53.3 | 32.4 |
| Total..... | 92 | 100.0 | |

The last question related to necessary repairs on these homes; repairs that would be basic to providing an attractive, clean and safe family living unit. Of the fifty realtors reporting current listings, (this includes almost every one of the 43 obtaining frequent listings) 10, or 20% stated that massive repairs or almost total rehabilitation would be necessary before most of the homes they were selling could be inhabited. Another 26, or 52%, felt that extensive minor repairs, those costing no more than \$2,000, would be needed on their homes, while 14, or 28% said that the houses they were selling were already in good or adequate condition and would need little or no work. It seemed as though most of these homes already in good condition were owned by persons who had invested in restoration for profitable re-sale later.

CHART IV—NECESSARY REPAIRS TO MODERATELY PRICED HOMES

| | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| Reporting major repairs or rehabilitation needed before occupancy..... | 10 | 20 |
| Reporting extensive minor repairs needed..... | 26 | 52 |
| Reporting no repairs needed..... | 14 | 28 |
| Total..... | 50 | 100 |

What conclusions can be drawn from these figures? First, it seems that there is an available supply of moderately-priced homes in the Washington, D.C., area, although not as great as the supply of higher priced homes. There is, of course, the possibility of multiple listings, but of the 43 realtors who reported frequent listings of moderately-priced homes, only one was shown as a member of the Washington Board of Realtors, and only four as members of the negro Washington Real Estate Broker's Association. In fact, there may be a rather large potential supply of homes also. A number of firms stated that many owners of low or moderately-priced homes that are currently being rented could be persuaded to sell if only suitable buyers could be found. On the whole, then, the presumed housing shortage in Washington may not be as severe as some feel, although other factors are important in providing adequate living quarters for people as the availability of a building.

A second factor influencing the current housing situation is the problem of financing. The families most attracted to homes in the

\$18,000 category are usually the ones in the poorest financial position. Most of them cannot afford a large down payment or obtain a conventional mortgage. Even Federal Housing Administration financing may be difficult for these people, even though down payments are lower and qualifications that have to be met, easier. This inability to finance leads both to an inability to purchase and a reluctance to sell. In several instances realtors reported that owners were only willing to sell for cash, presumably to speculators, or that homes could be obtained only if the buyer could obtain proper financing. Others stated that they didn't attempt to sell low or moderately-priced homes because "... it's more trouble than it's worth," or, "... why go to all the trouble of trying to sell a home when the buyers can't buy." But the most vehement critics of present financing arrangements were non-white real estate agents who apparently suffered both financially and psychologically. They had large numbers of unsold low and moderately-priced homes in their files, but while each stated that people were available in many cases who wanted to buy these homes, they could not present financing agreeable to the seller.

Third, most of these low or medium-priced homes required anywhere from minor repairs to complete rehabilitation before they could be considered suitable living units. Seventy-two per cent of the realtors felt repairs of \$1,000 or more would be needed to almost all of their homes they had for sale. Some realtors, in fact, commented that almost all homes in this price category would be considered substandard, although this view was not common. The dominant feeling was that a thousand dollars or more would have to be spent on the large majority of these homes. An aggravating factor has been the decline in building in the Washington, D.C. area in the last few years.

The decline in home building has had its greatest impact on homes selling for less than \$20,000, the so-called moderately-priced home. In 1964, 284 of the 570 new housing units were priced at \$20,000 or below; in 1967, however, only 81 of the 1173 new units were priced this low, and no new units were sold for less than \$15,000. According to the Washington Post, March 16, 1968 edition, this decline indicates "... that it is no longer attractive or feasible to build single-family houses for less than \$20,000, and that it is almost as hard to build them for under \$30,000." The trend toward higher-priced homes apparently caters to the desire of people to "upgrade" themselves, and reflects the rise in building costs, especially land prices and inflation. In any event, this means the present and future market of moderately-priced homes lies in older homes in the central city, with their extra repair costs. Some realtors did indicate that older homes under \$18,000 could be found in the suburbs, however.

In summary, then, it may be said that there is a supply of moderately-priced homes available in the Washington, D.C. area, although the full potential of this supply will probably not be known until some financing method is provided which allows individuals with limited resources to purchase homes. The supply will probably consist mostly of older homes, and money will have to be expended on rehabilitation of many of these homes. Essentially the problem is to create an opportunity for real estate agents to handle sales of moderately-priced homes, for owners to sell, and for buyers to have the ability to purchase.

THE IMPACT OF SUPERHARD ICBM SILOS ON ABM DEPLOYMENT

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to testimony given last week before the Senate Appropriations Committee by Dr. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force.

In his statement, Dr. Brown revealed for the first time a new development that could have a major bearing on the extent of the proposed ABM, or anti-ballistic-missile-defense system.

In my view, this new information brought out by Dr. Brown raises questions that demand careful scrutiny by the Congress concerning the potentially huge outlays encompassed in any massive deployment of the ABM.

At the very minimum, the Secretary's disclosures certainly call for a comprehensive analysis of what the timetable for the ABM should be.

What Dr. Brown outlined was an Air Force plan to build "highly survivable superhard silos" to house either the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile, the up-coming replacement for the present Minuteman I, or the Advanced ICBM, currently designated as WS-120A. I am sure that there are those who will be inclined to dismiss the mention of "superhard" silos as another cute Madison Avenue euphemism which means very little in real strategic terms. But a look at the numbers associated with this plan is revealing.

What the Air Force expects to achieve in the construction of these new underground facilities for our missiles is an improvement in the ability of those containers to withstand nuclear detonations by a factor of 1,000 percent. The hardness ratings of the missile silos envisioned would be 2,500 pounds per square inch or approximately 10 times the current hardness. The related control areas would have hardness ratings approaching 7,000 pounds per square inch.

Silo strengths of this magnitude would require an attacker to deliver four times the megatonnage he would need today to assure destruction of our missiles. In addition, the accuracy of the incoming missiles would have to be virtually perfect.

The Soviet Union, however, is not believed capable of developing the striking power required to destroy our second-strike missile capability, with the superhard silo improvement, within the foreseeable future.

In his testimony, Dr. Brown made the following statement, which I consider to be significant:

Against present estimates of Soviet missile capabilities it seems as efficient or more efficient for us to counter Soviet missile warheads by deploying the superhard missile silos than by deploying ABM defenses for our missile fields.

In a sense, hardened silos are a form of ABM defense.

Eventually, we also may need active ABM defenses around our missile fields.

In effect, Dr. Brown is saying that there may be a less expensive method of

insuring the survivability of our intercontinental ballistic missiles than that of employing the multibillion-dollar ABM system.

Last year, this issue of the ABM became one of great contention when it was disclosed that the Soviet Union was developing and appeared to be emplacing its own ABM system. Many reacted with demands for greater haste on the part of the United States to move ahead with its own ABM.

The superhard silo concept casts a justifiable shadow over the urgency of arguments advanced by advocates of a rapid and extensive deployment of an ABM system. Before we rush headlong into the creation of a \$40-billion system at a time of serious financial crisis, we must assure ourselves that it is warranted.

We have had expensive projects in the past where billions of dollars have been expended needlessly as we now know with the wisdom of hindsight. An objective, unemotional analysis is what is required so that years hence we can conclude that we acted with foresight and responsibility.

I feel that a thorough analysis of the impact of the superhard silo concept on the deployment plans for the ABM is mandatory at this time. I call upon Air Force Secretary Brown to provide the committee with a comprehensive analysis of this question, including detailed comparative cost estimates.

I intend to seek the support of my committee colleagues on this airing and hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee will lend his full support to determine what the proper course of action should be.

HIGH SCORE HIT BY TRAINEE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note in the May 1 issue of the Corpsman the achievements of a young Texan—a high school dropout at the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex.

Eric Samuelson of Robert Lee, Tex., recently scored 93 percent on the general educational development test—the high school equivalency test—thus, placing him in the top 5 percent of students in 38,000 high schools nationwide which administer the test.

This is not the only achievement of Eric since he joined the Gary Center. With his year and a half experience in the Center's radio and television repair course, he hopes to obtain employment enabling him to continue his education.

I believe Eric typifies the Job Corps program and what it can do for a young person who makes the most of the opportunities the program offers.

I include the article about Eric which appeared in the Corpsman in the RECORD at this point:

HIGH SCORE HIT BY TRAINEE—SAMUELSON PLACES IN UPPER 5 PERCENT

Corpsman Eric Samuelson has nearly hit the top as far as scholastic rating is concerned.

The 17-year-old from Gary (Texas) scored an amazing 93% on his GED tests. This put him in the top five percent of students in 38,000 high schools all over the country that give the test. It was an all-time high for a Gary Corpsman.

Samuelson dropped out of high school in his home town of Robert Lee, Texas. A few months later he signed up in the Job Corps and was sent to Gary.

He's been there for over a year and a half studying radio and television repair. An excellent student in both his vocational and educational courses, Eric has been described as a model Corpsman.

In recent center elections he won a seat in the General Assembly and was elected secretary.

Eric Samuelson believes that "education and learning never stop" and plans to enter Texas Tech in Lubbock, Texas. He hopes to use the skills he learned at Gary to work his way through college and law school.

JOHN W. GARDNER AND THE URBAN COALITION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding public servants of our time is the Honorable John W. Gardner.

During his 2½ years as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner brought to that immensely important post the qualities of intelligence, imagination, and compassion that are the highest marks of leadership in a free society.

Now, as chairman and chief executive officer of the Urban Coalition, Mr. Gardner is seeking to mobilize the resources of national leadership in business and labor, in religion and civil rights, as well as among the mayors of our great cities, in an attack upon the problems of the urban ghetto.

Mr. Speaker, I know of few figures in American life whose words and thoughts on the problems facing our country command such widespread respect, both from Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives. Many of us are already familiar with Mr. Gardner's well known books, "Renewal" and "Excellence."

I believe, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that Members of Congress will read with great interests four recent addresses by Mr. Gardner. One of these, I am pleased to say, was delivered in my congressional district when Mr. Gardner received on March 6, 1968, the Annual Patriotism Award voted by the senior class of the University of Notre Dame.

The addresses to which I refer were delivered on the following occasions:

America's Democratic Legacy Award dinner, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, May 5, 1968.

Washington Day exercises, the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., March 6, 1968.

Silver Quill Award dinner, Washington, D.C., February 8, 1968.

American Statistical Association, Washington, D.C., December 27, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the text of these addresses in the RECORD together with an editorial from the March 2, 1968, South Bend, Ind., Tribune, and articles from Business Week of April 27, 1968, and the Wall Street Journal of April 17, 1968:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, CHAIRMAN, THE URBAN COALITION AT AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY AWARD DINNER, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, NEW YORK, MAY 5, 1968

In the time immediately ahead the attribute that may prove to be most valuable to the American people is stamina.

Our afflictions are many. They will not diminish soon. We shall need cool heads and courage—and above all, staying power—if we are to get through the days ahead.

It does no good to oversimplify our problems. But the simplifiers are ever present. They have an understandable desire to roll all our troubles up into one ball. All the trouble, they say, is traceable to the war, or to the President, or to racism, or to the establishment, or to our economic system, or to people over thirty.

One way of suggesting to you the complexity of our troubles is to talk just a bit about the interlocking clusters of problems of poverty, discrimination and the cities.

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

The effort to combat poverty, rightly conceived, is far broader and more varied than is generally recognized. It begins with sound management of the economy and attention to the requirements of economic growth and full employment. It requires programs of income maintenance—unemployment insurance, Social Security, public assistance. And justified dissatisfaction with present assistance programs has led to lively debate concerning new forms of income guarantee.

But if we are to break the cycle of poverty we must also eliminate the urban and rural slums that foster poverty. Such environmental change requires massive urban efforts such as the Model Cities Program, as well as regional and rural development activities such as the Appalachian Program.

Equally essential if we are to prevent the continuous regeneration of poverty is to reach its victims—present and potential—with programs of prevention and rehabilitation. That requires programs of early childhood education; excellent schools in the low income areas, job training, health care, social and rehabilitation services.

Having had the opportunity to observe all of those varied attacks on poverty, I am not moved by those who say that the effort to combat poverty has failed. It has not failed. The fact is that the number of people living in poverty has decreased steadily. No social critic likes to mention that fact, but there it is.

Of the hundreds of specific measures we have taken to cope with poverty, some have failed, and some are so new and experimental that the verdict is not yet in. If we don't occasionally have resounding failures in specific programs, then we aren't being sufficiently experimental.

DISCRIMINATION AND THE NEGRO REVOLUTION

The issues surrounding the attack on poverty are of course deeply entangled with the issues raised by the Negro revolution. But they are not the same thing.

The Negro revolution is the most significant event of our day. We seek to cope with it in terms of jobs and low cost housing and other measures not dissimilar to the attack on poverty. But it's more than that. Listen to a well-dressed young Negro college student

who has eaten well all his life, and you know that he is talking of something other than poverty.

He's talking about acceptance on equal terms as a human being—and he is not pleading for such acceptance any more, he means to have it. And if you get the feeling as you talk to him that perhaps nothing you can presently do will quite placate him, that his resentment of centuries of subordination is too deep to eradicate quickly, that he is in a sense "raging against history", you are right. We may have to wait for that rage to spend itself.

We do not seek to do him justice because he threatens riots. That would be foolish. We seek to do him justice because it is right.

Unfortunately our task is vastly complicated by the actions of extremists on both sides. Acts of violence on one side bring responsive acts on the other side. Hatred brings responsive hatred. Extremists on each side point with glee to extremism on the other side. And the destructive interaction goes on.

It appears to be building toward a fear-some climax. And I'm sorry to say I believe there are decent people on both sides, white and black, liberal and conservative, who unconsciously want that climax. Don't ask me why. But as I've listened—and I've listened a lot—I have felt it. Being decent people, they of course want someone else to start the trouble. Like the good firefighter in the western movie, they want bloodshed but want the other guy to draw first.

But no one who cares about the future of this country, whether he is white or black, liberal or conservative, will allow anger or resentment or an unconscious taste for violence to lure him into thoughts or acts that will bring that climax nearer. On the contrary, he will do everything possible to reverse the rapidly escalating mutual fears and hostility. Only in that way can we get back to the constructive task of removing the obstacles to a life of dignity and meaning for Negroes.

MUST COME TO GRIPS WITH PROBLEMS OF THE CITIES

Many of the difficulties facing the Negro today are created by the urban environment in which so many of them now live. Until we resolve the worst of our urban problems, it won't be a fit environment for either race.

The problems of the city are numerous and complex. The urgency of our present difficulties tends to mask those complexities. We now tend to concentrate on two or three desperately urgent matters—jobs, housing and the like. But sooner or later we shall have to get back to seeing the problem in all of its complexity. We shall have to face up to the fiscal starvation, the splintered jurisdictions, the absence of comprehensive planning, the problem of population, and so on.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE LOCAL LEADERSHIP

In addition to all the other problems facing metropolitan areas, they face a deep running crisis of leadership. They need and must have far more effective leadership in and out of government.

I hasten to add that when I press the case for local leadership, I am not suggesting that Washington should have a diminished role. The argument over whether we should have a powerful Federal Government is over and done. Every sensible person now recognizes that this big and complex nation is always going to need a big and complex Federal Government. If we're lucky, it will also be wisely led and effectively managed. It will never be anything but powerful.

But the significant lesson of recent years is that the Federal Government, with all its wealth and strength, cannot be fully effective without the help of vital local leadership, in and out of government.

While the liberal and the conservative were arguing over the years about the proper

role of the Federal Government, neither of them was asking how they could strengthen state and local government, neither of them was asking how the private sector, which in its very nature, is highly fragmented, could pull itself together to cope with major problems facing the nation.

THE URBAN COALITION

Now we must ask these questions.

The organization of which I am now the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer—The Urban Coalition—is designed to foster such leadership at the local level. Let me tell you about it.

After the riots last summer, a group of outstanding leaders in American life came together to form the Coalition.

The members of the Steering Committee included Mayors such as John Lindsay of New York and Jerome Cavanagh of Detroit, business leaders such as Henry Ford and David Rockefeller, labor leaders such as George Meany and Walter Reuther, Negro leaders such as Whitney Young and Roy Wilkins. In fact, no other organization in American life can equal the Coalition for the distinction and variety of its leadership.

I would emphasize the importance of the Coalition principle. Some people think of the Coalition as just another organization tackling the tough urban problems of the day. But it isn't "just another organization." It is unique, and its uniqueness lies in the way it goes about tackling the problems. Our distinction is that we bring together leadership elements that do not normally collaborate in the solution of public problems—in fact, we bring together segments of American life that have often been utterly out of touch with one another—and, in many cities, are still out of touch.

NEED FOR COLLABORATION AMONG SIGNIFICANT LEADERSHIP ELEMENTS

Today, no one leadership segment can solve the problem alone. City Hall can't go it alone. The Business Community can't solve the city's problems singlehandedly. There must be collaboration among all significant elements that hold power or veto power within the community.

Because of this need at the local level, our National Organization set out immediately to form local coalitions. We now have 33 and we hope to have 100 by year's end. As in the case of the National, each local organization includes representatives from a variety of leadership segments in the community—the Mayor, business, labor, minority groups, and religion. And we encourage the participation of other relevant elements—the universities, the schools, the press, the professions. Each local coalition raises its own funds, and is free to shape its own program in terms of its particular needs.

Now I still encounter leading citizens who say, "Why try to get all those people into the act?" "Why don't a few of us get together quietly, and try to solve some of these problems?"

It's a reasonable suggestion, but hopelessly old-fashioned. It won't work for long in any modern city. People are no longer willing to have solutions cooked up in the back rooms of the establishment and then served to them on a platter. They want to have their say. We won't re-establish stability in our cities until we bring into the same conversation all significant leadership elements that hold power or veto power in the life of the community.

The Coalition principle requires that minority groups be represented in the effort to solve community problems, and such representation is itself a step toward solving the toughest problem of all: effective dialogue between the black and white communities. When a crisis strikes, it is too late to begin the long process of building effective channels of communication. If there is to be fruitful collaboration between black and

white leaders, it must begin and be tested in a non-crisis atmosphere. Then when trouble strikes, if it does, men who have worked together and trust one another can go into action together.

The creation of open, continuous and understanding communication between white and black communities is difficult. It requires hard work and patience and imagination on the part of every person involved. But there is no alternative, unless we are willing to see our cities torn apart.

The Urban Coalition will be concerned with unemployment, housing, education, entrepreneurship in the ghettos, race relations and many of the other problems that plague the cities today. We will try to make the public aware of those problems. We will try to bring the nation's best talent to bear on them. We will support constructive efforts to solve them.

We will seek to supplement and not supplant other efforts. We consider every organization constructively engaged in these matters to be an ally and we will hope to work with them and strengthen them where possible.

Thus we will work closely and cooperatively with the National Alliance of Businessmen, The Alliance, as you know, is under the Chairmanship of Henry Ford, who is a member of our Steering Committee.

Let me close with a plea that you lend your support and encouragement to the Urban Coalition—nationally and locally.

Our society is in serious trouble. It is a frighteningly complex society. It is undergoing extraordinarily rapid change. It is afflicted with the gravest dissension and internal conflict. If we are to gain command of the problems that threaten to overwhelm us, we are going to need all the talent, all the leadership that the nation can command. You can supply some of that necessary leadership.

A TIME TO THINK AND ACT IMAGINATIVELY

This is not a time for business as usual. This is a time to think and act imaginatively and responsibly to hold this nation together and move it toward a constructive future.

I don't know how many of you are conservatives and how many liberals, how many Republicans and how many Democrats. I will do you the credit of believing that you are all patriots in the best sense of the word, wanting to preserve this as a vital, coherent nation, wanting it to live up to the best in its tradition, wanting it to continue as a dynamic and free society.

Now, in these troubled days, the nation needs your wisdom, your steadiness, your willingness to deal patiently and calmly with difficult issues, working always to knit the nation together and to transmute destructive emotion into constructive action.

This nation can solve its problems. If we have the stamina and steadiness of purpose to keep our heads during times of conflict and controversy, we can make this society what it was always meant to be—a fit place for the individual human being—any and every individual human being—to live a life of dignity and fulfillment.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, WASHINGTON DAY EXERCISES, THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, SOUTH BEND, IND., MARCH 6, 1968

Let me begin with a bit of history.

The time is June, 1776. The scene—a second floor parlor in the brick home of a young German named Graff, at the southwest corner of Market and Seventh Streets in Philadelphia.

There shortly after the eleventh of June, beginning perhaps on the very evening of the eleventh, the lodger who occupied the second floor of Graff's home began to draft one of the great documents in our history. It would not be easy for me to tell you why my mind has for years lingered over that scene.

The lodger was, of course, the tall, lean, thirty-three year old Virginian known as Thomas Jefferson.

The document was, of course, the Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson said that he "turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing" the Declaration. Beyond that, we know very little about how the actual drafting proceeded. If I could talk with the shade of Jefferson I think I would pass up a good many other exciting topics in order to question him about the drafting. I think I would question him in particular about the second and most famous sentence in the Declaration, the sentence that, as it stands in the final version, reads: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

THE DECLARATION A REMINDER OF OUR INFIDELITY

In the Rough Draft, he said: "We hold these truths to be sacred and undeniable . . ."

Jefferson later emphasized that he was giving expression to widely held views. The Declaration, he said, "was intended to be an expression of the American mind . . ." And we know that he had grounds for that assertion. As Julian Boyd put it "The idea that men were born equal, that they were possessed of certain inherent and unalienable rights, that those rights included life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that it was the duty of government to protect and preserve those rights, that the government which did not do so could be abolished—these were ideas familiar not only to . . . every pamphleteer, every lawyer, every minister of the gospel, but also to almost every American subject of George III in the epochal year 1776."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident . . ."

True to our modern temper, we have dissected the sentence, debated it, and impugned it. I myself have questioned it, defended it, argued over it and written about it. But the dignity of the sentence remains. To me nothing can detract from its beauty, nothing can detract from the significance for Americans of the moral strivings reflected in the sentence. It is the most seminal sentence in the history of American values.

But we must not let our admiration blind us to certain facts. After the great words were written, 89 years passed before we abolished slavery in this land of the free. Another half century passed before we enacted effective legislation against child labor. It wasn't until 1920 that women were allowed to vote. It wasn't until 1954 that the Supreme Court ruled against segregation. And even today human potentialities are warped and stunted in our slums.

Recognizing all that, what should be our attitude toward the words of the Declaration? I have heard it argued that in the light of attitudes and practices then prevailing, the words were sheer hypocrisy, the kind of lofty sentiment men express but never live by, and that for the sake of honesty, they might better not have been written.

I take a different view of the matter. I believe the later gains in human dignity would have come even more slowly, if the Declaration had not stood as a reminder of our infidelity.

The story of our failures and partial successes in the 192 years since the Declaration, is more than a story of the slow approach to an early goal. Not only is our practice becoming in some respects more compatible with the Declaration, our moral insight concerning the goal itself is in some respects deepening. We understand more now than we did then about the implications of those truths that were thought to be self-evident.

OBSTACLES TO INDIVIDUAL FULFILLMENT

One of the things we know now is that there are other and perhaps more stubborn obstacles to individual fulfillment than the tyranny and oppression that preoccupied our Founding Fathers. The other obstacles are poverty, ignorance, disease, discrimination, mental or physical illness or incapacity, and so on. And these cannot be removed by mere assertion of inalienable rights, nor even by legally certified freedoms.

The most exciting declaration of our generation is the assertion that we must seek to remove all of these obstacles. Indeed we are now engaged in an unprecedented attack on all the conditions that prevent the full and free development of individual potentialities.

When we get down to the practical realities of that task—improving our schools, eliminating poverty, combatting mental illness, eradicating discrimination and the like, we find ourselves engaged in a hard and unglamorous business. That perhaps is why the unprecedented effort now being carried on is virtually unknown to the general public. Yet a very considerable number of Americans are participating in it, and for them it is the one wholly meaningful thing on the contemporary scene, the one thing that redeems all the idiocy and brutality of modern life.

None of the tasks we have set ourselves are easy. And they are made more difficult by the complexity of the problems that confront us and by the rapidity of the change the society is undergoing. The sheer task of managing the society, to say nothing of improving it, requires exceptional gifts of technical competence and vision and leadership.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERS IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE

But in the matter of leadership, and the emergence of leaders, we face a considerable problem.

With all their extraordinary vision, the Founding Fathers failed to foresee one fairly central difficulty that this Nation would face. They did not see that leadership in a free society would not prove to be the only or even the chief magnet for good men. They did not see that with the rise of the professions a career ideal would emerge that would be far more attractive to our best young people than a career in public life or in any other leadership role.

Ask our brightest and best young men and women what careers they intend to follow. How many plan to run for office? How many plan to enter State or local government? How many into national affairs? Of 3106 National Merit Scholars selected during the first 4 years of the program, less than 2 percent of the boys and about 6 percent of the girls looked forward to careers in government service. A follow-up study of the same Scholars a few years later showed that even fewer retained an interest in government service, 1.7 percent of the boys and 1.5 percent of the girls.

Now in our kind of society, government has no monopoly on leadership, so you might imagine that these able young people have in mind some of the other areas of vital leadership in our society. But they do not.

They aren't particularly interested in being corporation presidents, or labor leaders or university presidents. They want to be professionals—unentangled, unencumbered, unbeleaguered, loyal only to their craft.

Now I am all for professionals. They have created the modern world—but I don't hold that against them. They are a priceless asset to any society.

But we also need a steady flow of extremely capable people into the decision-making roles in and out of government. And we aren't getting them.

I believe that there are few facts in our national life more disturbing than that. Our society and our world have grown so complex, social change occurs at such a bewildering pace, and the sheer technical demands of

leadership have mounted so swiftly that in my judgment we're headed for disaster unless our ablest young people take a hand in running the society.

We need them as leaders, not just as buttoned-up and buttoned-down professionals living secure and tidy lives. We need them as leaders in business and education and in every other area of our national life—but most particularly we need them in public life.

We are producing the most educated, articulate and brilliant sidewalk superintendents the world has ever seen. We have a limitless supply of people with the intelligence and expertise to analyze the society's problems, but very, very few with the motivation and stamina to leap in and help solve them.

If enough of our young people are willing to commit themselves to the hardheaded business of leadership, then I have some hope for the years ahead. As some of you know, I have been keenly interested in what it is that makes nations decay. And as those of you who have read my book *Self-Renewal* know, the evidence convinces me that the decline of nations is not inevitable. As I said in the book if we go into a decline, we shall not be able to blame the inexorable forces of history. It will be an avoidable failure of the mind and heart and spirit of the American people. We now know beyond all doubt that nations die from within, and they are attacked less often by traitors within the gate than by traitors within the heart—complacency, apathy, cynicism, intolerance, self-deception and an unwillingness on the part of the individual to lend himself to any worthy common purpose.

"LET US RAISE A STANDARD"

Before the Constitutional Convention in 1789 George Washington is said to have made the statement: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

When I was a young man that seemed to me, and it still seems to me, a noble proposal. But as a youth, I was also attracted by its seeming simplicity. Life hadn't yet revealed to me how difficult it is to raise any kind of standard, nor for that matter how hard it is to be wise and how very hard to be honest—hard all the days of our lives.

I believe that Jefferson erected such a standard when he inserted into our first great national document a memorable expression of what have proven to be the most enduring values in American life.

We have been faithless and faithful by turns to the ideals Jefferson expressed. We have interpreted and reinterpreted his words. Our understanding of the values underlying them has evolved and deepened. Yet we are still struggling to do justice to the vision, heartened by a few successes, ashamed of many failures, and unable to predict what new moral insights of tomorrow will make present practice appear primitive. Perhaps that is simply a description of the reality surrounding all moral striving.

It may be, of course, that in the years ahead, moral progress will be swifter than we think. It may be that the human race, which for 10,000 years has been so uneven in honoring its ideals, will suddenly change when the generation now under 30 takes over. But it may not. We must face that dreadful possibility.

Perhaps we will have to face the fact that we are imperfect creatures.

But we are imperfect creatures who dream of something better.

The something better that Americans, with all their failings, have dreamed of so insistently down the years is a society in which every person is of value, in which no one is damaged by circumstances that can be prevented, a society in which ignorance and disease and want will tyrannize no longer, a society that does not assault the senses with

ugliness nor the mind with mediocrity nor the spirit with bleakness.

We will not redeem that ideal without great devotion and great effort. But there isn't anything we could be engaged in that will more surely give meaning to our lives.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SILVER QUILL AWARD DINNER, FEBRUARY 8, 1968, 7 P.M., WASHINGTON, D.C.

These are difficult times, and those who care about the well-being of this land are more than ever concerned to serve it well. We want to strengthen the Nation and preserve its vitality. We want to expand its tradition of freedom. We want it to stand for the best. We want it to be true to itself.

But the problems of the Nation are complex, and—at least at the level of leadership—it can only be served well by those who are willing to understand and cope with complexity. I'm going to talk tonight about some aspects of that complexity.

In the course of my career I've been involved in the foundation world, the business world, the universities, the military services and government. And somewhere along the way I developed a strong interest in how the various pieces of this society fit together.

Many people now see that relations between the Federal Government and other elements in the society are in swift transition, and they see that the American people had better understand that transition if we want to shape it to their purposes.

The difficulties facing this society today are of the utmost gravity. They may get much worse before they get better. I do not believe that as a nation we have acknowledged the seriousness of our situation. We must bring to bear on those problems the best minds and energies that this Nation can offer.

We must find better means of appraising our problems as they emerge, better means of devising and testing social solutions, and above all, better ways of mobilizing the abundant talents, resources and institutional strengths of this society. Without such mobilized effort we stand little chance of gaining command of the problems that threaten to overwhelm us.

NEED FOR MUTUALLY RESPECTING PARTNERSHIPS

But as this audience knows so well, we have a system characterized by the dispersion of power and initiative, and we like that attribute of the system. So we must develop means of mobilizing talent and resources that will move us toward our goals and at the same time will disperse power and initiative. Stated in simpler terms this means:

We must find far more effective ways of relating the Federal Government to State and local governments.

We must find new and better ways of involving private enterprise in the pursuit of social goals.

We must ask the universities to become even more deeply involved in carrying out public functions.

We must utilize increasingly a wide variety of nonprofit agencies in getting public work done.

And we must make certain that the relations between the Federal Government and all these other elements—State, local or private sector—are such as to preserve the integrity and vitality of the non-Federal partner.

President Johnson has urged and encouraged the creation of just such mutually respecting partnerships.

When I came to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I initiated a thorough review of relations between the Department and the States. After a year of study I met with the governors and told them there were many specific and concrete

measures that the Department could and would take to provide them with greater initiative and flexibility. This has since resulted in organizational changes in the Department, in legislative innovations, and in a revolutionary improvement in communications between the governors and the Department.

Let me give you one example, from the field of health. We had developed—over the years—fifteen separate grant programs through which the Federal Government made money available to the States for specified purposes, after the State had met prescribed conditions. Last year we merged those fifteen programs into one. Now each governor is asked only to assure us that he has adequate machinery for assessing what his State's needs are and then he is free to use his Federal aid for what he and his senior health officials deem important. There's a lot more to be done in redesigning our relations with States, but we're taking the first steps.

The Department has taken comparable steps to review its relations with the universities. I have set up a committee of college and university presidents to provide a continuous channel of communication. And we're already taking some practical, down-to-earth steps to remove sources of irritation from that relationship.

Finally, let me turn to the relationship between the Federal Government and private business. I know that many of the organizations represented here tonight have shown a deep and constructive interest in improvement of that relationship.

Business serves the nation well and the Federal Government well when it preserves its own vitality and forward movement. It is not only this country's chief source of economic growth and vitality, but the principal source of opportunity for the individual.

From the earliest days of this Republic, businessmen have seen in their government not only a keeper of the peace, an enforcer of contracts, a collector of taxes and a regulator of ways of doing business but also a provider of subsidies (sometimes in cash, sometimes in credit or in tax concession).

More recently, government has been given heavy responsibilities in the effort to promote economic growth, to maintain economic stability and to foster full employment. And in the years since World War II the government contract has come to play an increasingly important role in accomplishing a broad range of national purposes.

Even in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which does not deal primarily with the business world, there are innumerable examples of the relationship. Aerojet General has developed a computerized patient manikin which promises to revolutionize the teaching of anesthesiology. McDonnell-Douglas Corporation is working on a power source for the artificial heart. United Aircraft is working on radar devices to aid the blind.

Less conventional and less well known is the Department's relationship to Blue Cross and to commercial insurance carriers in administering Medicare. In the Medicare program, health care is purchased from private, State or local hospitals, and claims are handled and payments made by Blue Cross or commercial carriers—all without a Federal employee having a hand in it.

The Food and Drug Administration, one of the constituent agencies of HEW, is collaborating with General Foods on an interesting experiment in self regulation of food processing. General Foods and FDA have agreed upon standards, and General Foods is reporting periodically on the evaluation of its own operations, with a view to eventual reduction in government inspection.

These examples—involving the universities and State and local governments as well as business—demonstrate that as a nation we are developing new ways to relate the Fed-

eral Government to each of the nongovernmental elements.

If those relationships are to develop in such a way as to maximize this society's creative abilities while preserving our system of dispersed power and initiative it will be because we planned it that way. And by "we," I mean all who are involved—those in the private sector, and those in government.

STRATEGY FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR

As leaders in the private sector address themselves to the future of the relationship, what should they be thinking about? Let me give you what I think of as a strategy for the private sector—and I refer not just to the business world but to all the nongovernmental sector—the universities, foundations, professions, and so on.

FACE UP TO THE PROBLEMS

First, face up to the largest and toughest problems of the society. No factor has been more conclusive in the emergence of big government than the failure of the private sector to look squarely at the real problems of the community and the nation. Even today there are many in the universities and in the business world who somehow imagine that their special worlds can flourish while the society decays. It cannot be. Our society is wholly interdependent today, and decay in one part endangers all.

Today each of the varied segments of the private sector appraises its own special problems, but none examines the larger issues facing the nation. As a result, those larger problems end up in the lap of government. And that makes little sense when one considers the extraordinary resources of talent and expertise available in the private sector. Individuals and institutions in the private sector are perfectly capable of appraising the major problems facing the society and of developing policy alternatives.

What should our future system of health care look like? How should it be organized and how financed? What should our higher educational system be like 20 years from now, and how do we get from here to there? What steps will have to be taken over the next two decades to control environmental pollution? How can we save our cities? The way in which these questions are answered will deeply affect the private sector.

UNDERSTAND PROCESSES OF GOVERNMENT

Second, understand the processes of government. The day is past when leaders in the private sector, whether they are corporation or university presidents or something else, can delegate to their Washington representatives the problem of understanding the Federal Government. The leaders in the private sector should be deeply and personally concerned about how the society is governed. Many should take their turn at governing. They should know how government functions.

I'm not talking about the shallow arts of influence—what official or what Member of Congress to see to get what results. I'm talking about a real comprehension of how the system works.

EXAMINE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Third, re-examine the relationship between the Federal Government and each non-Federal element. What are the principles that should characterize the Federal Government's relationships with State and local government, with business, with the universities? How can relationships be designed so that the non-Federal partner is not weakened and subordinated? These are questions that should be asked insistently and they can be answered. But they cannot be answered with rhetoric or generalities. It is necessary to get down to the specific principles governing the relationship—and those principles must be embedded in legislation, in regulations, and in tradition.

New forms of collaboration need to be devised even as existing relationships are re-examined. In the case of business, for example, we must seek ways of adopting established tools—the credit subsidy, the tax concession, the contract and the grant—to provide the inducement (in business terms, the market) that will bring the creative force of business to bear on social goals.

And in thinking about the Federal Government's relations with non-Federal elements, I urge that everyone give thought to the future of State and local government. Our system of dispersed power and initiative is anchored in two sets of relationships: the government-private sector relationship and the Federal-State-local relationship. Anyone who cares to preserve the system had better care about the latter as well as the former.

STRENGTHEN EXISTING INSTITUTIONS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Fourth, strengthen existing institutions in the private sector and design new ones where needed. In the intricately organized society of the future, inefficient institutions will be squeezed out. To mention those that I see at close range, some of our private hospitals, private charity institutions and private schools are among the most inefficient institutions in the nation. They should be subjected to continuous re-examination and renewal. They are too important to our future to be neglected. (I don't need to add that government agencies need equally rigorous scrutiny.)

Let me conclude with a word about the way in which leadership is organized in this nation. It is characteristic of our system that a great deal of the significant leadership of our society lies outside of government. But today that non-governmental leadership is rarely an effective voice in the larger issues facing our society. That can and must be remedied. We need, outside of government, an effective body of leaders, local as well as national, who are committed to preserve the vitality and stability of the community despite the ups and downs of partisan conflict.

The need for such a layer is dramatically evident in our major cities where City Hall is virtually helpless without the strong assistance of local leadership by industry, labor and minority groups.

Our society has become so complex, change so swift, and the social forces impinging on us tumultuous that it's pretty close to being more than we can manage. If we are to retain any command at all over our own future, the ablest people we have in every field must give thought to the largest problems of the nation.

The whole point of my remarks tonight is that they don't have to be in government to do so. But they do have to come out of the trenches of their own specialty and look at the whole battlefield.

"ONE NATION INDIVISIBLE . . ."

One final comment. Even the ablest and most willing leadership will not be effective unless we can halt the deep cleavages that are appearing in our society.

Anyone who has listened to the messages from the ghetto, and the words uttered in paneled offices and country clubs knows that there are destructive and divisive sentiments in circulation that could tear this Nation apart.

The place to combat those sentiments is where they start—in our own minds and in the conversations of our friends and colleagues. And leaders in every segment of our national life have further responsibilities: To strive to diminish tensions in their own communities, to act constructively under stress, to bind the Nation together.

Every time we salute the flag we pledge allegiance to "one Nation indivisible." And one Nation indivisible it must remain.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 27, 1967

A couple of years ago, when I was about ten years younger, Fred Mosteller asked me to give this speech. I said "yes" partly because I've known and admired Fred for many years, partly because I once taught statistics and have many friends in this Association, but mostly because I was flattered that someone thought I would last long enough to keep the engagement.

My days and my energies are now totally absorbed in handling some of President Johnson's major domestic programs, and I want to talk about some of the problems in our domestic effort, problems in the governing of this free society, in other words, problems facing the people.

I cannot speak with assurance, only with concern. I constantly marvel at the number of people outside the arena of action who know precisely how to solve our problems, and the number of people in the heat of action who lack that superhuman clarity. I've often wondered why this is so.

I want to talk about resources, expectations, planning, the public mood, institutional change and civil disorder.

HEIGHTENED AWARENESS OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

We have seen in the years since 1961 a growth of domestic social programs unrivaled in our history except for the period 1933-37. I'm not speaking solely of government programs—I'm speaking of activities in and out of government, in every corner of this land. It has been an extraordinary outburst of social conscience, marked first and foremost by a heightened awareness of social problems.

There is no precedent for the scope of goals envisioned by the people in and out of government who concern themselves with the social fields today. We have declared war on ignorance, disease, poverty, discrimination, mental or physical incapacity—in fact, on every condition that stunts human growth or diminishes human dignity.

I am deeply committed to that effort and heartened by the progress we have made. But it is a struggle all the way, and there are grave problems ahead.

Consider, for example, the coming crunch between expectations and resources. The expectations of the American people for social benefits are virtually limitless. In the past six years we have opened up innumerable areas of constructive governmental activity—in early childhood education, work with handicapped children, special education for the disadvantaged, health research, work on artificial organs, programs for the aged, rural development efforts, conservation and beautification activities, manpower training and so on. We have begun most of these programs on a modest scale.

The proponents of every social institution or group aided by these programs believe passionately that support to their field must be vastly enlarged in the near future. The colleges and universities have ideas for future Federal support that would run to billions per year. And they ask little compared to the advocates of aid to elementary and secondary education.

The annual cost of a guaranteed income would run to scores of billions. Estimates of the cost of adequate air and water pollution control and solid waste disposal run even higher. Estimates of the cost of renovating our cities run to hundreds of billions.

Today we attribute budget constraints to the Viet Nam war, but if the war ended tomorrow, in 12 months we'd again be bumping against the ceiling of resource constraints.

PROBLEM OF LIMITED RESOURCES

How do you make rational choices between goals when resources are limited—and will

always be limited relative to expectations? To those of you familiar with program budgeting, the question translates itself into several others: How can we gather the data, accomplish the evaluation, and do the planning that will make rational choices possible?

Forced choices are of course not the only consequence of a limit on resources. We can have our cake and eat at least some of it if we can get a higher yield from the dollars, talent and institutional strength available to us.

But that raises questions of good management and unit cost that are painful to most people active in the social fields. Once in talking with a physician who was ministering to poor people I asked about unit costs of his government-supported clinic, and he said "I'm not an efficiency expert, I just want to heal sick people."

What he was refusing to face is that somewhere up the line hard decisions will necessarily be made, and a limit placed on resources available for delivery of health care. So if he is in fact functioning with high unit costs, the number of sick people he can treat will be correspondingly few. Without knowing it he has made a decision on resource allocation.

RATIONAL USE OF RESOURCES

Now let me mention one more kind of problem that arises when demand is great and resources are limited.

Any effort to plan and rationalize the allocation of resources tends to reduce pluralism, and to introduce new kinds of institutional controls. If we have less than enough to spend in constructing hospitals, then we must be sure that those constructed are properly located and designed to accomplish the greatest good.

In doing so, we move toward a measure of social control. The Federal Government has avoided infringement of local autonomy by asking the States to perform the necessary planning functions.

But whether the controls are at the Federal, regional or State level, rational use of resources tends toward the creation of large-scale, interconnected systems, and to comprehensive planning of those systems.

Traditionally we have had no appetite for such systematic planning. And our non-governmental institutions, whether universities or hospitals or scientific laboratories, are not accustomed to think of themselves as parts of large-scale interconnected systems.

MUST MAINTAIN LOCAL AND INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

I believe it is possible to accomplish a large measure of rational social planning and still retain the most important features of local and institutional autonomy. But it will require a conscious effort and a knowing grasp of the problems involved.

In the light of these requirements one can see the value of President Johnson's assertion that the Federal Government should operate more and more through mutually respecting partnerships with State and local government, with the universities and corporations, and with the other great estates of the private sector. Such partnerships, rightly designed, can maintain the dispersion of power and initiative that we cherish. But it will take a lot of skill and ingenuity to design the partnerships wisely and well.

NEED FOR FORMULATING GOALS

Another inevitable consequence of the effort to husband resources and allocate them wisely is the attempt to predict future needs and expenditures. Our tradition of stumbling into the future is expensive. Intelligent use of limited resources requires orderly formulation of goals, evaluation of means to achieve those goals, and development of strategies and cost-estimates for getting from where we are to where we want to be.

But I have been talking about social goals, plans and priorities as though the only significant considerations were rational and technical. In the development of public policy, that can never be. So let me talk a bit about people.

Once people were fatalistic about their problems because they attributed those problems to the will of God or the forces of Nature or simply to the unchanging order of things.

But for the past 3 centuries man has gained increasing confidence, justified or not, that he can have a hand in determining his own fate, can rid himself of at least some of the ancient afflictions.

Whatever else the consequences, that shift places a very heavy burden on man and his institutions. The individual who used to curse his fate now curses himself or his employer or the party in power.

The pressures and strains on institutions are particularly severe when people who have suffered oppression, as have some of our minority groups, begin to see the chance for a better life.

INSTITUTIONS MUST BE MADE MORE RESPONSIVE

Once the grip of tradition or apathy or oppression has been broken and people can hope for a better life, their aspirations rise very steeply. But the institutions that must satisfy those aspirations change at the same old glacial speed.

As things stand now, modern man believes—at least with half his mind—that his institutions can accomplish just about anything. The fact that they fall very far short of that goal is due, he believes, to the prevalence of people who love power or money more than they love mankind.

To my mind there is an appealing (or appalling) innocence to that view. I have had ample opportunity—perhaps more varied opportunity than anyone you know—to observe the diverse institutions of this society—the colleges and universities, the military services, business corporations, foundations, professions, government agencies and so on. And I must report that even excellent institutions run by excellent human beings are inherently sluggish, not hungry for innovation, not quick to respond to human need, not eager to re-shape themselves to meet the challenge of the times.

I am not suggesting a polarity between men and their institutions—men eager for change, their institutions blocking it. The institutions are run by men. And often those who appear most eager for change, oppose it most stubbornly when their own institutions are involved. I give you the university professor, a great friend of change provided it doesn't affect the patterns of academic life. His motto is "Innovate away from home."

We are going to have to do a far more imaginative and aggressive job of renewing, redesigning, revitalizing our institutions if we are to meet the requirements of today.

Just as the resistant character of institutions blocks constructive change, so does lack of resources. We discussed that subject earlier, but left out one crucial fact. The overall limit on resources available to government programs is determined not just by the economy, not just by the rational and technical processes of budgeting, but by the perception on the part of Congress and the public of what needs doing and how badly it needs doing, by the willingness of the public to let itself be taxed for relevant purposes, by the courage of the Administration in calling for taxes and of the Congress in enacting them.

GRAVE CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

I believe we are now in a situation in which the gravest consequences for this Nation will ensue if we fail to act decisively on the problems of the cities, poverty and discrimination. The human misery in the ghettos is not a figment of the imagination. It can be read in the statistics on infant mor-

tality, in the crime statistics, in the unemployment figures, in the data on educational retardation. We must deal responsively and not punitively with human need. But the resources available to cope with these problems will be determined by public awareness of the need, by the subtleties of public mood, and by Congressional action. At this writing, it does not seem to me that either the Congress or the public is fully aware of the alarming character of our domestic crisis.

We are in deep trouble as a people. And history is not going to deal kindly with a rich nation that will not tax itself to cure its miseries.

The modern belief that man's institutions can accomplish just about anything he wants, when he wants it, leads to certain characteristics contemporary phenomena.

One is the bitterness and anger toward our institutions that occurs when high hopes turn sour. No observer of the modern scene has failed to note the prevalent cynicism concerning all leaders, all officials, all social institutions. That cynicism is continually fed and renewed by the rage of people who expected too much in the first place and got too little in the end.

ASPIRATION AND DISILLUSIONMENT

The aspirations are healthy. But soaring hope followed by rude disappointment is a formula for trouble. Leaders arise whose whole stock in trade is to exploit first the aspirations and then the disappointment. They profit on both the ups and downs of the market.

The roller coaster of aspiration and disillusionment is amusing to the extreme conservative, who thought the aspirations were silly in the first place. It gives satisfaction to the left-wing nihilist who think the whole system should be brought down. It is a gold mine for mountebanks willing to promise anything and exploit any emotion. But it is a devastating whipsaw for serious and responsible leaders.

All of this leaves us with some crucial and puzzling questions of public policy. How can we make sluggish institutions more responsive to human need and the requirements of change? How can we mobilize the resources to meet the grave crises ahead?

How can we preserve our aspirations (without which no social betterment is possible) and at the same time develop the toughness of mind and spirit to face the fact that there are no easy victories? How can we make people understand that if they expect all good things instantly they will destroy everything? How do we tell them that they must keep unrelenting pressure on their social institutions to accomplish beneficial change but must not, in a fit of rage, destroy those institutions? How can we caution them against exploitative leaders, leaders lustful for power or for the spotlight, leaders caught in their own vanity or emotional instability, leaders selling extremist ideologies?

DIMINISH THE RESORT TO VIOLENCE

How can we diminish the resort to violence? Violence cannot build a better society. No society can live in constant and destructive tumult. We will have either a civil order in which discipline is internalized in the breast of each free and responsible citizen, or sooner or later we will have repressive measures designed to re-establish order. The anarchist plays into the hands of the authoritarian. Those of us who find authoritarianism repugnant have a duty to speak out against all who destroy civil order. The time has come when the full weight of community opinion should be felt by those who break the peace or coerce through mob action, or by-pass established democratic procedures in favor of coercive demonstrations.

In closing let me emphasize one or two points. Dissent is an element of dynamism in our system. It is good that men should expect much of their institutions, good that

their aspirations for improvement of this society should be ardent.

But those elements of dynamism must have their stabilizing counterparts. One is a tough-minded recognition that the fight for a better world is a long one, a recognition that retains high hopes but immunizes against childish collapse or destructive rage in the face of disappointment. The other is an unwavering commitment to keep the public peace.

NEED FOR YOUNG LEADERS

But we need something else. An increasing number of very bright and able people—people like yourselves—must become involved in the development of public policy. Ours is a difficult and exhilarating form of government, not for the faint of heart, not for the tidy-minded, and in these days of complexity not for the stupid. We need men and women who can bring to government the highest order of intellect, social motivations sturdy enough to pursue good purposes despite setbacks, and a resilience of spirit equal to the frustrations of public life.

We face the gravest difficulties in the days ahead. But if we could bring to bear on our toughest problems all of the talent and resources of this Nation we could accomplish some things that would leave an indelible mark on the history books.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 2, 1968]

GARDNER WITHOUT HANDICAPS

It was widely agreed that John W. Gardner, who recently stepped down as secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), was among the most able men ever to serve in President Johnson's cabinet. Such judgments are never unanimous, but in Mr. Gardner's case the agreement was surprisingly broad.

It is, therefore, encouraging that Mr. Gardner has accepted the chairmanship of the Urban Coalition—an organization that has aspirations of becoming a kind of non-federal department of health, education and welfare.

Unlike the federal version, with its entrenched bureaucracy, its tradition-laden ways of doing things, and its emphasis on congressional appropriations as the solution to all evils, the Urban Coalition is young enough to be flexible and responsive instrument.

It is not likely to do away with the need for a parallel federal bureau. But it could prove to be an effective supplement to HEW, and perhaps an experimenter and pace-setter.

The Urban Coalition was born of last year's civil strife. It is an alliance of business, labor, local governments, civil rights groups and churches to seek answers to the social problems that give rise to America's urban agonies.

At its best, it could prove to be the healthiest counter-balance yet to the long trend toward federalizing domestic problems and their solutions. At worst, it will help spread awareness of problems among segments of society whose vision has not normally embraced such problems.

Mr. Gardner performed well as HEW secretary in spite of the built-in bureaucratic handicaps. It will be fascinating to see him in action without the handicaps.

The country may have gained rather than lost a skillful servant in John Gardner's job shift.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1968]

RESCUING THE CITIES—RACIAL TURMOIL SPURS NEW URBAN COALITION TO STEP UP ITS EFFORTS—GROUP LED BY GARDNER UNITES BUSINESS, LABOR, RIGHTS LEADERS IN ATTACK ON ILLS—THE "POOLROOM CROWD" IN GARY

(By Monroe W. Karmin)

WASHINGTON.—The day after the death of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. an emergency phone call from the nation's capital to

Puerto Rico furnished sudden impetus to a fledgling effort for social change—the Urban Coalition.

President Johnson wanted help from John Gardner, who just five weeks earlier had left the Cabinet to take charge of this national alliance of business, labor, civil rights, religious and urban leaders formed last August to mount a "broad public-private attack on the problems of American cities."

Mr. Gardner, who was in San Juan to deliver a speech, promptly wired local coalitions in 33 cities that the King murder attached "new urgency" to the need for "positive and constructive action in this time of national crisis." From this alert, and amid the post-assassination racial violence, came this response:

—Coalitions in some major riot cities rushed aid. In the District of Columbia, for example, the local unit set up emergency centers to find jobs, distribute food and arrange housing for residents of riot-torn neighborhoods. Though the Washington coalition was organized only a few weeks ago, Chairman Walter F. McArdle, a businessman, says the burning and looting "matured us in a hurry."

—Coalitions in other cities contributed in different ways. Detroit's coalition swung behind Federal civil rights legislation with messages to Congress from big business names: Ford's Henry Ford, General Motors Chairman, James M. Roche; department store magnate Joseph L. Hudson, as well as the board chairmen of Michigan Bell, Detroit Edison and Michigan Consolidated Gas (the rights bill cleared Congress a week ago). The Minneapolis coalition pledged action on 14 alleged grievances presented by the black community, ranging from job discrimination to the lack of Negro representation on the city council.

Cities without coalitions showed new interest. Last week national headquarters received inquiries from at least 11 communities wanting to form local units. Among these communities were Westchester County, N.Y., St. Petersburg, Fla., Madison, Wis., and Memphis, scene of the killing of Mr. King. "Since the assassination and rioting," says a national coalition staffer, "people have been calling in here with a new sense of urgency."

A SIGNIFICANT CALL

As significant as the cities' emergency response to Mr. Gardner was the fact that Mr. Johnson called him at all. At the Urban Coalition's birth eight months ago, there was no White House involvement whatsoever.

The Urban Coalition was founded at an "emergency convocation" here in August. The co-chairmen of the meeting were Andrew Heiskell of Time Inc. and A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. The organization had an impressive set of founders: General Electric's Gerald Phillippe, Chase Manhattan's David Rockefeller, labor's George Meany and Walter Reuther, Mayors Richard Daley of Chicago and John Lindsay of New York, and Negro leaders Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins and Mr. King—among many others.

Yet the White House greeted the new group with utter silence; the coalition's blueprint for "an attack on the urban crisis" exceeded, in many aspects, the Great Society's own domestic-spending plans.

But Mr. Gardner now is confident of Mr. Johnson's support. Indeed, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare insists it was the President who suggested (when Mr. Gardner first revealed his wish to resign) that he consider becoming chairman of the Urban Coalition to "stay in the battle" to save the cities. Mr. Gardner did, and at the very next crisis the President called.

Fresh crisis, apparently, is what the Urban Coalition needed to generate momentum. Despite its bold purpose and blue-ribbon sponsorship, the alliance, prior to Mr. Gardner's takeover, could point to few solid ac-

complishments. Its national staff was small, and what was being done stemmed more from local initiative than from national direction.

OFFERS OF HELP

Mr. Gardner hopes to change all that. He's now recruiting staff talent to be paid from foundation grants, and, encouraged by last week's activity, he has set a couple of short-term goals:

First, he wants to enlarge local membership. With 33 cities represented now, he hopes for 50 by summer and 100 by the end of the year.

Second, he wants to give local units more forceful, precise leadership. By early June, he hopes to give city coalitions specific suggestions about jobs for the hard-core unemployed, education reforms and homes for low-income families plus open housing for Negroes. Jobs are especially urgent. "What we need in the worst way is a distillation of the experience of private industry with the hard core," Mr. Gardner declares.

Why does Mr. Gardner believe the Urban Coalition can be more effective than other organizations—including his former employer, the Federal Government—especially since the coalition's primary purpose is not the dispensing of funds?

The chairman views the coalition as a catalyst, bringing together community leadership elements that do not normally join hands to solve public problems. And he believes it can perform this task more easily than Government simply because the coalition is not Government. "I've gotten all kinds of offers of help that I would never have gotten as HEW secretary," he says.

This coalescing of community support is intended to have both national and local impact.

On the national level, Mr. Gardner hopes the coalition will generate grass-roots pressure on "an inert and apathetic Congress" to win lawmakers' acceptance of social welfare programs aimed at uplifting the urban poor generally and the urban Negro specifically. In this regard, the coalition has moved well out in front of the Johnson Administration in calling for "a reordering of national priorities." For example, it wants Congress to finance one million public-payroll beginner jobs for Negroes in police and fire departments, schools and hospitals. Mr. Johnson indicated late last week that he was not about to recommend any such dramatic—and costly—new program.

On the local level, Mr. Gardner wants to see member coalitions turn their talents and energies to a range of community problems, following the lead of some of the pioneers.

The New Detroit Committee, spearheaded by Henry Ford II, is the most publicized of these. Though the committee existed before the national Urban Coalition was formed, it is now the Motor City's local coalition. And while its success remains to be measured, the committee counts among its accomplishments the placement of at least 50,000 unskilled workers, more than half of them Negroes, in the past six months and the "adoption" of a city high school by Michigan Bell, which sends employes to teach at the school and provides on-the-job training at its own facilities.

In Gary, Ind., the Urban Coalition unit is a product of U.S. Steel Corp. initiative. Four of the coalition's 30 board members come from the corporation, which has also pledged \$70,000 to help attack the city's problems. There's no question, says George Coker, executive director of the Gary Urban League and secretary of the Gary coalition, that U.S. Steel has been "a major mover."

Over the winter, the corporation hired 130 hard-core unemployed, described by Mr. Coker as "the poolroom crowd recently arrived from the South." Company-sponsored basic-education classes raised their reading proficiency to the sixth-grade level and

taught work discipline. It's too soon to evaluate the newcomers' long-term performance, but only 7 of the 130 have dropped out, and Mr. Coker says the corporation has now revised its hiring standards to begin accepting applicants who aren't high school graduates.

The New York City coalition, as part of a broad attack on local problems, is considering the establishment of an "economic development" unit to provide venture capital and technical assistance for would-be Negro entrepreneurs. The economic unit might seek to obtain Government contracts and private franchises for the ghetto residents.

The Niagara Falls, N.Y., coalition, which came into being only in February, is helping teen-agers, mostly Negro, from a United Youth Corp. United Youth hopes to turn a profit by providing dances, shows and other recreation for local youngsters. Profits would be used to help finance the coalition and to provide scholarships.

The Fresno, Calif., coalition has pledged a modest \$10,000 as the start of a city mortgage-insurance fund to help residents of slum neighborhoods buy homes. The 30-man steering committee includes representatives of the poor, Mexican-Americans, Negroes, youngsters and the aged.

The Minneapolis coalition saw one of its plans come into being in a hurry over the crisis weekend that followed the King assassination. To insure order, a mobilization call went out to a citizens' patrol known as the "Protectors"—organized through a Negro community center under the auspices of the city coalition—that had been under discussion for weeks. The coalition paid for gas for the Protectors' cars and provided them with walkie-talkies to keep in touch with the police.

But if the threat of violence spurred Minneapolis to quick action, the occurrence of violence poses a new problem for some other coalitions.

Despite the success of its relief operation in riot-torn Washington, some members of the city's coalition fear the destruction will erode future support. A coalition member reports "a helluva lot of businessmen are saying, 'I'll be damned if I'm going to help, now that the city has been burned.'" Thus, he believes a primary task for the coalition here will be to "try to get people to understand why the riot happened and the need for action" to alleviate its causes.

[From Business Week, Apr. 27, 1968]

BUSINESS JOINS WAR ON URBAN ILLS

The Urban Coalition, now headed by John W. Gardner, pulls in some powerful business backing. Its plan is for a low-key—but solid—drive to raise up the cities' ghettos.

John W. Gardner, the new head of the Urban Coalition, did the impossible when he was Lyndon Johnson's Secretary of Health, Education, & Welfare.

After 2½ years in a job that bruised and scarred other men, Gardner resigned with his prestige enhanced. He is now committed to a new venture: cementing together—and making effective—a brand-new organization that got off to a flying start last summer, but has been flying low and slow ever since.

His task is to make it possible for the country's hard-headed businessmen to stand up and be counted—alongside hard-headed Negro leaders, labor leaders, religious leaders, and big city mayors—for some of the most controversial and costly proposals for solving the urban crisis.

Says a labor union official who is a member of the coalition: "Without the business leaders, you've got the same lobbying organizations you had before. With the business leaders joining in the question becomes: Will they come in hard enough and strong enough to make it a lobbying organization that really is something more than we had before?" The coalition was officially launched last summer, while the horror of Newark and Detroit

still hung over the country. Gardner became the coalition's first full-time chairman on Mar. 1.

The coalition has already taken hard stands for more money for the war on poverty, more money for summer jobs for ghetto youth, more public housing and rent supplements, and for the new open housing bill.

It opposed last year's freeze on welfare payments, and supported a tax increase. And it asked the government to provide "public service jobs" in cities and towns for those of the unemployed who cannot find jobs in private industry.

Coming tests. The coalition's next big objective is its drive for public service jobs; its proposals carry a price tag of around \$4 billion.

The coalition has discussed the highly controversial welfare system, and the alternative of some kind of guaranteed annual income or negative income tax. But Gardner is going slow on this and other new issues for the rest of this year.

One insider says hopefully that as the coalition takes on weight and momentum, its policy positions "will reverberate throughout the political leadership, and be perceived as important sentiment from around the country." He adds: "But as yet this is not the case. Gardner needs organization and community effort to bring this about. The test for the coalition has to be, 'When will the politicians sit up and take notice?'"

But there is also some doubt whether the coalition can move fast enough and hard enough to satisfy some of its key members. "Whitney Young (executive director of the National Urban League) is going to hold the coalition's feet to the fire," says one man in a position to know. "At Gardner's first news conference a few days after King's assassination, Whitney told the world publicly what he had told the executive committee privately—that he is as mad and as militant as H. Rap Brown. Young has upped the ante. His price for being agreeable has gone up. He would scare hell out of them if he threatened to walk out."

BIG UMBRELLA

The coalition idea began in the fall of 1966, when, as one staffer puts it, "The mayors could begin smelling the joint burning down."

One insider says the coalition was created because "people in leadership positions in business and other fields have been looking for an umbrella to get under, or a bandwagon to get on. The Urban Coalition is both respectable and acceptable—as an umbrella or a bandwagon, depending on how the man wants to use it."

At the moment, the coalition is no bandwagon. But under its umbrella are leaders from five major segments of American society: business, labor, religion, racial minorities, and local government. There are 36 members on the steering committee, with more to be added later to represent Mexicans and Puerto-Ricans, and perhaps educators. Fifteen of the 36 comprise the executive committee, which meets more frequently than the larger group.

Parallel. In its national role, the coalition can be likened to the Committee for Economic Development, which after World War II provided a mechanism through which businessmen attempted to prepare for the switch from wartime production and controls to peacetime competition and growth. The CED promoted the discussion of new ideas, policies, and programs—and particularly proposals for countering the postwar recession that was then expected.

Similarly, the Urban Coalition is providing businessmen with a forum for an exchange of ideas in an era of threatening social change that seems to grow increasingly ominous.

The coalition commits a businessman to a first-hand, do-it-yourself confrontation of

ghetto and racial problems, and gives him an opportunity to hammer out programs with Negro and church leaders.

These leaders are also learning something from the pragmatism of the businessmen, according to coalition insiders. "They're learning they can win the backing of the businessmen, but only when they can satisfy them that the policy is right or that the program will work."

NEW DIRECTION

At the coalition's big convocation last August, the 1,200 community leaders represented, in Whitney Young's words, "enough power to turn this country around." Since then, however, Gardner admits that the prevalent impression of the coalition is of "an organization that meets in Washington, holds press conferences, and issues handouts."

Gardner's job is to change all that, but he is not going to be rushed into a splashy show of activity just to get attention. "Everybody wants the Urban Coalition to march out and do some big symbolic thing," Gardner says, "and I want it to move solidly and effectively." The coalition, he contends, could "dissolve in talk if we aren't careful. I'm going to try to move ahead one step at a time."

Satellites. One of the coalition's immediate goals is to create coalitions in each of the major cities, and about 30 have already been formed. "But only about 12 or 15 of these are really functioning," says one coalition source.

The Washington, D.C., coalition, formed only about a month before the riots, sprang into action almost overnight, working with existing church and other groups to provide housing, food, and an emergency fund for burned-out ghetto residents.

Gardner's goal for the next year is to push the total of local coalitions to about 100, each with the same leadership elements that make up the national coalition and each locally financed. The role of the coalitions at the local level is likewise to mobilize a broad base of community support for jobs, housing, and school programs. Like the National coalition, the local groups have task forces working on these problems. Some local coalitions have already sponsored projects of their own. The New York group, for example, organized a work-study program administered by the city police department, and financed by a grant from Standard Oil Co. of N.J. The Minneapolis coalition has organized and backed a citizens patrol of ghetto neighborhoods. The coalitions' normal role, though, will be to act as a catalyst for new programs, or to expand existing ones, and have them run by specialized agencies.

Gardner's role. The appeal of Gardner—a psychologist, educator, and foundation official—to businessmen puzzles some people. He is described by associates as "high-minded . . . low-key . . . idealistic . . . pragmatic." Gardner operates much the same way that President Lyndon Johnson does: He draws on his wide range of sources in industry, universities, foundations, government, and on his own aides for information and views on a given problem, keeping his options open, and disclosing his own conclusions only when everyone else has had his say.

"Businessmen respect him, especially big businessmen. Maybe it's because the bigger the businessman is, the more idealistic he's apt to be," says one man close to Gardner.

Part of Gardner's role, one source suggests, is to give the coalition's policies "a seal of legitimacy. People feel that if Gardner buys something, it must be legitimate, and people will buy anything if it's legitimized."

Gardner is not getting all his views from old friends. He has been busy building a staff in addition to the half-dozen former top aides at HEW that he took with him.

And as a real believer, according to one coalition man, in the "generation gap," he has on hand a "youth group" which is encouraged to provide him with unconventional wisdom, information, and insights.

Gardner's strong connections with foundations, dating from his tenure at the Carnegie Foundation, is bringing in financial support. The Ford Foundation, among others, is helping with this year's \$3-million budget. Because foundations cannot finance lobbying activities, though, the coalition has created a separate Urban Coalition Action Council with identical membership. Funds for its work will come from business, labor and religious groups. Further, business is kicking in substantially to local coalitions.

LEAP TO ACTION

The coalition's first major effort since Gardner took over was in behalf of the open housing bill, which passed a few days after King's death. At least 14 top businessmen, including such non-coalition members as General Motors Chairman James M. Roche and Kaiser Industries President Edgar F. Kaiser, wired the leadership of the House to adopt the measure as passed by the Senate.

No one knows how much of a difference the coalition's efforts made. But Gardner says his troops worked closely with government lobbyists, labor people, and others so that the coalition's leverage could be used most effectively.

Impact. On some issues there is at least coincidental evidence that the administration has been listening to the coalition.

For instance, the original convocation last August called for "a major expansion of private-sector programs to provide jobs and training for the hard-core poor." A few months later, coalition member (and Business Council member) Henry Ford II became chairman of the new National Alliance of Businessmen. The alliance, backed by some \$350-million in government funds, is trying to persuade business to put 100,000 hard-core slum residents into special education and training programs.

Similarly, the coalition came out in January for repeal of "the repressive welfare program amendments"—the so-called welfare freeze—that would have shifted welfare costs from the federal to city and state governments. From all accounts, a one-year postponement of the freeze has been accepted by Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways & Means Committee.

Meeting of minds. Not all these coalition stands are taken easily or quickly. Last fall, businessmen in the coalition would not be rushed into backing the welfare-freeze repeal; "They just didn't understand it," one source reports. But three months later, after they had time to study the issue in detail, they did support it.

The coalition has come out for a tax increase but in this case, the labor leaders were reluctant. George Meany and Walter Reuther have committed themselves and their memberships against a tax increase that does not include a lot of structural reforms to help low-income taxpayers. They are against the Administration's 10% across-the-board surcharge.

But they went along with a statement urging adoption of a tax increase to give credibility to the coalition's demand for "a specific re-ordering of priorities rather than identified in any way with the coalition's without regard to need or merit."

Common ground. The coalition operates on consensus in taking a stand: If any sizable number cannot be persuaded, the issue is put off until agreement can be reached—or the issue is just dropped. On the other hand, one businessman who will not go along cannot stop the coalition from taking a stand. On that one position, he just will not be identified in any way with the coalition's stand; he is free to go his own way.

A consensus "isn't easy nationally and will not be easy locally," Gardner told a Senate subcommittee recently when he testified in favor of a legislation creating a million public service jobs for the unemployed. But when you find a "common piece of ground to stand on," he said, "it is an immensely powerful and effective thing."

THE INCOME MAINTENANCE ACT,
H.R. 17331

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Income Maintenance Act (H.R. 17331) which would provide a comprehensive national income maintenance system for all Americans.

Present welfare laws seldom provide sufficient income for needy families to live at a minimum standard of decency. In order to receive minimum welfare benefits, citizens are often subjected to the indignity of intrusions into their private lives, which burden welfare social workers with police functions and tend to destroy the relationship of trust which is necessary if social workers are to provide services which are genuinely needed by deprived families.

Welfare standards vary widely from State to State. The few States with relatively progressive welfare standards find themselves bearing the burden of migration from States which fail to provide for their own indigent families. Yet the most needy are often barred from receiving assistance because of impediments, such as residency requirements, based on considerations other than need.

Moreover, because welfare benefits are usually reduced by \$1 for every dollar of outside earnings, there is little financial incentive for the person on welfare to work; and welfare tends to become a way of life.

Last December Congress burdened this already oppressive system with new restrictions in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1967.

Deficiencies in our system of public assistance have been documented by the report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare issued on June 29, 1966, which called for national standards of public assistance based solely on the criterion of need.

More recently, the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders came to a similar conclusion about the failure of the welfare system and the indignities which it imposes. In the short run the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders recommended that benefits be raised and made uniform, that residency requirements be eliminated, and that the compulsory work training and the AFDC freeze enacted last December be repealed.

As a long-range goal the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders

recommended a national system of income supplementation based strictly on need with two broad and basic purposes:

To provide, for those who can work or who do work, any necessary supplements in such a way as to develop incentives for fuller employment; and

To provide, for those who cannot work and for mothers who decide to remain with their children, a minimum standard of decent living, for aid in saving children from the prison of poverty that has held their parents.

Recently the concept of income maintenance, referred to in some instances as a guaranteed annual wage or a negative income tax, has been proposed by economists as diverse as Milton Friedman, Robert Lekachman, Robert Theobald, and James Tobin. It has been endorsed by several nationally known business executives, by major trade unions, and at least one presidential candidate, and also by liberals and conservatives in both parties.

A panel of 12 national business leaders recently recommended to Governor Rockefeller, of New York, an income maintenance program.

This week in a conference with a number of Members of Congress the Reverend Ralph Abernathy endorsed the idea.

Clearly, with this kind of diverse and wide support, income maintenance is an idea whose time has come.

Let me briefly cite some of the advantages which it offers compared with our present system of welfare.

First. It would close the poverty gap in the most direct and efficient way—by providing more money.

Second. By establishing a single national criterion of assistance—need—it would end the indignities and violations of personal liberty which characterize the existing welfare system.

Third. It would end the confusion of diverse and inconsistent State public assistance standards.

Fourth. It would end irrelevant residence requirements for assistance.

Fifth. By providing a minimum standard as a matter of right, payable upon simple application, it would remove the social stigma now attached to public assistance.

Sixth. By establishing national standards, it would slow down the migration of the poor to the overburdened cities.

Seventh. By reducing the monthly benefit by 50 cents for every dollar earned; it would provide an incentive to work which is now absent from present welfare systems.

Eighth. It would force the most menial jobs to pay decent wages.

Ninth. It would limit the need for emergency food programs by giving everyone at least a subsistence standard for living.

Tenth. It would free social workers to provide needed and wanted services, and save money by eliminating the welfare bureaucracy's "police" functions.

Eleventh. It would save the States and cities money by freeing badly needed revenues.

Twelfth. It would stabilize the economy by establishing a minimum floor level of purchasing power for the poor.

I have listed a long and formidable list of advantages for this program. Now let us look at the specific legislation which I have introduced.

Any income maintenance system should serve three separate and somewhat inconsistent requirements.

First, it must provide a minimum benefit for the family with no outside earnings.

Second, it must minimize leakage through benefits to families who are not really in need.

Third, it must not tax outside earnings at 100 percent, or it will create the same disincentives to work that the present welfare system includes.

Therefore, my bill proposes a relatively modest standard which I would expect would gradually be increased as the system is perfected, hopefully to close the poverty gap entirely within 5 years.

The plan would work as follows: Persons with low incomes could apply for income maintenance benefits by submitting monthly income statements at intervals which would be determined. They would simply receive from the Bureau of Income Maintenance in the Treasury Department monthly income maintenance checks similar to social security checks based on a formula.

Under the formula, at zero outside income, a family would receive an income maintenance payment equal on a yearly basis to two-thirds of the dollar amount of its personal income tax exemptions plus the minimum standard deduction. Translated into monthly benefits, this equals \$50 a month for the head of a family plus \$39 for each dependent, as provided for in H.R. 17331. The benefit would be reduced by 50 percent of outside income. In other words, the income maintenance benefit would be reduced by 50 cents for every dollar earned.

For example, a family of four with no outside income would receive \$50 per month for the head of the family plus \$39 per month for each of three dependents or \$2,004 a year. That benefit would decline as income increased. I include at this point in the RECORD a table which shows that progression for a family of four.

| Outside income | Benefit | Total income |
|----------------|---------|--------------|
| 0 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| \$1,000 | 1,500 | 2,500 |
| 2,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
| 3,000 | 500 | 3,500 |
| 4,000 | 0 | 4,000 |

¹ Positive tax.

Under this formula there is an incentive to earn; benefits are not reduced at a rate that discourages beneficiaries from working.

Benefits are included in gross income for the purpose of positive taxation, so that, as total income goes beyond the \$3,000 level for a family of four, income maintenance benefits would be reduced at a rate slightly greater than 50 percent of earnings.

An amount of \$2,000 a year for a family of four is below the poverty line, but it is above the subsistence level and above the present average AFDC payments pertaining in 38 States—States

which have the greatest concentration of poverty. In the case of States which now have more generous standards of public assistance, benefits over and above the minimum Federal income maintenance benefit would be paid by State or local governments. I would expect that, as the Federal standard is gradually increased to meet the poverty line, the already reduced burden on the States would be completely eliminated. The maximum income maintenance benefit, regardless of the size of a family would be \$284 a month or \$3,408 a year. The maximum break-even point for the largest family at which all income maintenance benefits would cease and at which payment of positive income taxes would begin, therefore, would be \$6,816 a year. I believe these are realistic limits.

I should also note that my bill provides for an enforcement system based not on a detailed investigation of every applicant as under the present welfare practice, but, rather, on a sampling or spot-checking basis similar to that of the Internal Revenue Service's enforcement system with regard to income tax returns. It is demeaning to build into a new social program the assumption that most recipients are likely to cheat. If all applications are examined routinely for errors and inconsistencies but full-scale investigations are limited to 1 in 10 or 1 in 20—compared to 1 in 35 under the Internal Revenue Service—then the system will operate with less intrusion and greater personal dignity.

It has been estimated that my bill would cost about \$4 billion a year over and above present welfare costs. Those States which now have the most liberal welfare services would be saved hundreds of millions of dollars. Although the level of subsidy would not totally close the so-called poverty gap, it would be of major benefit to the majority of the estimated 22 million Americans who now live in poverty but who receive no public assistance whatsoever.

It would improve the income of approximately 60 percent of the approximately 8 million Americans who now are receiving some form of public assistance. It would certainly stimulate earnings from work.

Most importantly, I should point out the fact that this is not designed as a Utopian proposal, but one which is sound and reasonable and one which can and should be enacted into law this year.

This represents the first step toward replacing the present ineffective and burdensome welfare system with a comprehensive and uniform income maintenance program which would eliminate abject poverty in America at a cost which America can afford and should willingly assume.

I should also point out that this proposal is not intended to be, nor can it ever be, a substitute for full employment. If one responsibility is to provide decent incomes for those who cannot work or who cannot find work at a living wage, another responsibility is to assure that more and better jobs are available to all who are able to work.

This is a complicated bill, and I include with my remarks a section by section summary of its provisions. I hope

other Members of the House will join in cosponsoring this bill and in the debate which it will arouse.

We must reorient our thinking toward the entire welfare system. And this legislative proposal should help stimulate that reorientation.

A section by section analysis of H.R. 17331 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 17331,
THE RYAN INCOME MAINTENANCE ACT

Section 1: Short title: "The Income Maintenance Act."

Section 2: Amendments to Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 as follows:

SUBCHAPTER A

Section 1601—Definition

An individual eligible to receive income maintenance assistance must be at least 18 years of age or married, a resident of the U.S. and not the spouse of an ineligible individual nor the eligible dependent of any other individual.

Section 1602—Income maintenance benefits

Eligible individuals making application are entitled to income maintenance benefits.

Section 1603—Maximum benefit

The maximum benefit shall be \$50 per month, plus \$39 for each eligible dependent, in no case to exceed \$284 per month. For rural residents, this shall be reduced by 10 percent, unless the applicant certifies that he did not consume home-grown produce equal to that amount.

Section 1604—Reductions on account of income

The maximum benefit for a month shall be reduced by 50% of the income received by an individual and his eligible dependents during such month.

If an individual is receiving public assistance payments, his income maintenance benefits shall not be reduced until outside income is sufficient to reduce his public assistance payments to zero. At this point, his income maintenance benefits are reduced by two-thirds of such outside income until his position is identical to that of a non-public assistance recipient, at which point income maintenance benefits are reduced by 50%.

Income, for the purposes of this act, includes gross income plus death benefits, interest on Government obligations, workman's compensation and certain disability compensation, income from wage continuation plans, combat pay, Armed Forces mustering out pay, dividends, scholarships and grants, gifts, unemployment benefits, Social Security and retirement benefits.

Section 1605—Imposition of tax on excess annual income

In the case of persons who have received income maintenance benefits for some months of the year due to seasonally fluctuating income, if their annual income exceeds 150% of the sum of the minimum standard deduction and personal exemptions, income maintenance benefits are taxed at a 50% rate until they are repaid.

Section 1606—Ineligibility of individuals receiving public assistance on account of blindness or disability

Individuals eligible for public assistance due to blindness or disability may opt for income maintenance benefits or public assistance, but not both.

SUBCHAPTER B

Section 1611—Regulations

The Secretary may prescribe necessary regulations.

Section 1612—Application for benefits

An individual may apply for benefits by stating his income for a given month. The application may be submitted for a period

covering more than one month, but specifying income on a monthly basis, to be determined by regulation. Two or more individuals may apply jointly.

Section 1613—Payment of benefits

The Secretary shall pay benefits not later than 180 days after the close of a month for which application for benefits is made.

Section 1614—Procedure and enforcement

Right to a hearing.

Judicial review.

Overpayments may not be collected except by withholding future payments.

Except for routine examination of applications, detailed investigations shall be conducted on a "spot check" basis on not more than—percent of applicants in any one year.

Income maintenance benefits are considered as taxable income.

This Act shall become effective as of June 30, 1969.

Section 3: Changes in amounts of income to be disregarded under public assistance needs tests.

All Federally aided public assistance programs shall disregard the first thirty dollars a month of earned income and one third of the remaining income in making deductions in public assistance payments. Effective after June 30, 1969.

Section 4: Establishment of a Bureau of Income Maintenance in the Department of the Treasury.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Would the distinguished gentleman from New York answer whether or not his proposal—I would assume that we would call this a guaranteed income proposal—would his guaranteed income proposal that he has presented to the House at this point be in lieu of or in addition to the existing welfare programs that are now in existence in the country?

Mr. RYAN. I call this an income maintenance system. It is along the idea of a guaranteed annual income. We have estimated that in 38 States this proposal would replace their current welfare programs, because their level of AFDC benefits today is lower than would be provided for under this bill. In other States, where there are more liberal benefits provided, the income maintenance system can provide a minimum monthly benefit; and the States would still carry or make up whatever the difference might be. Hopefully, if this became established and it were accepted, then the income benefit levels would eventually be increased to the point where the present welfare system in the various States would be phased out.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, has there been any prediction or estimate made at this time as to how many additional employees would be necessary to administer this proposal?

Mr. RYAN. No; but I would estimate that it would require less personnel to administer this proposal than are presently required by the Federal, State, and local governments under the present welfare programs. This system would be supervised under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department where a mechanism already exists for auditing and checking returns which is well established.

I would think this would reduce the number of employees at the local, State, and Federal level which would be needed to operate the program.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman have any idea at this point—it might be a little too early—to ascertain as to which committee his proposal might be referred?

Mr. RYAN. I presume it would be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his interest, and I hope that other Members of the House will also raise questions because I believe this is an area which should be explored, and which should be debated. All of us, I hope, are searching for some alternatives to the present welfare programs.

Mr. PRYOR. If the gentleman will yield further, let me make this one statement to the gentleman: that I believe all of us are searching for solutions, but I believe we should not be so overly zealous in our search for answers to the problems which face this Nation that we destroy or damage individual initiative. It is in this area that I have certain fears with regard to the proposal made by the gentleman. Therefore I am interested, and I am interested in studying it, and to see what the gentleman has to offer, and to hear the debate in the ensuing months, because I believe this will become one of the great debates of our time in the next few months—the issue of the guaranteed income.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman. I feel that this legislation does provide the incentive to work with which the gentleman is concerned to a much greater extent than the present welfare system.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. Would the gentleman just clarify this for my own mind: The plan the gentleman submits would guarantee a certain amount of income in lieu of any payments from any welfare program in existence at this time. What kind of a floor does the gentleman intend to establish in the bill, or is that left for determination at a later date?

Mr. RYAN. No. Under H.R. 17331, as I pointed out, a family of four without any outside income would be eligible for \$2,000 annually. A family of six would be eligible for \$3,000 annually; but there would be a maximum payment of \$284 per month which comes to a little less than \$3,500 a year, I believe.

Mr. TIERNAN. The gentleman states that there are 38 States that do not provide benefits equalling \$2,000 annually for a family of four in this country.

Mr. RYAN. That is correct as related to the average benefit under the aid to families with dependent children program in those States.

Mr. TIERNAN. And then that there are only 12 States that provide benefits of more than \$2,000 a year for a family of four at this time on welfare?

Mr. RYAN. That is right, average benefits.

Mr. TIERNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for the discussion we have had here. I see that the time of the gentleman is expiring.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his contributions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANDALL). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

TITLE I—FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, education for the disadvantaged has a major commitment from Congress. It is expressed in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

In the present school year we are spending approximately \$1,180,000,000 to help educate 6,669,796 children from low-income families. This, to me, signifies a major response by Congress to a crying national need. And, as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, I am proud to have been part of its germination.

But now, after 2 years of title I programs in operation, the evaluation reports are in. And the results seem confusing.

We have heard from the Center for Urban Education in New York. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Project TEMPO at General Electric. We have read the title I reports from State departments of education.

Overall, they challenge the high hopes expressed by Congress for immediate success.

They tell us that children of poverty are not reading much better than before. We had hoped they would.

They say you cannot tell whether teacher aids, smaller classes, breakfast, counseling programs, and special field trips help them learn better.

Some educators were certain that they would.

Yet, in every school district we have exceptions. Pockets of excellence where title I funds do get through. And make a difference in the children. And the children learn better. They feel better about being in school. They get a small taste of success that makes them want more. And gives them the courage to fight their way through some of the elements—at home and in the neighborhood—that stand in their way.

California's title I program gets results.

So does the McDonagh School in Chicago.

The Ardmore School in Prince Georges County.

And P.S. 146—one of the "more effective schools"—in New York.

Why do these schools reach the disadvantaged? And what lessons can they provide for the rest of the Nation? These are the fundamental questions.

An AP reporter recently quoted me

concerning title I and incorporated this question in a feature story about title I carried by newspapers throughout the country:

"The Title I program obviously has not even begun to make any impact on motivating ghetto youngsters," said Rep. Roman Pucinski, (D-Ill.), chairman of the House General Subcommittee on Education. "You go across the length of the country and you find the money being spent on the same tired old ideas. It is a monumental flop and the outbreak of recent riots speaks louder than anything I can say about the total collapse of the program."

This statement, standing alone, only tells part of the story, but there is the other side of the Federal aid program—particularly title I—which needs telling if we are to intelligently appraise the present status of our efforts to help local communities improve their schools.

I would like to place the above quotation in proper context.

The General Subcommittee on Education, under my leadership, has been conducting an informal inquiry into education of the disadvantaged. We have been searching for some insight into this perplexing problem.

In our pursuit of answers, we invited a distinguished list of scholars to meet with us in early morning, informal "coffee chats." The participants were: Prof. James S. Coleman, the Johns Hopkins University; Prof. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Cornell University; Dr. Robert Dentler, director of the Center for Urban Education, New York; Prof. David Fox, City University of New York; Prof. Jeanne Chall, Harvard Graduate School of Education; Dr. David Cohen, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies; Dr. Alice M. Rivlin, Assistant Secretary-designate, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Dr. Mario Fantini, program officer, the Ford Foundation; Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, director emeritus, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford; and Prof. Charles S. Benson, University of California at Berkeley.

I went beyond my conversations with these stimulating thinkers, however. I conducted my own study of title I programs in Chicago. And I have quizzed some onsite evaluators of many programs in other parts of the country.

This inquiry has convinced me of two things:

First, title I continues to merit strong support from Congress. The need to improve education of disadvantaged children remains enormous, and we cannot turn our backs on this human challenge.

Second, after 2 years of operation, title I's grace period has ended. The time for blind experimentation is over. Now we need some positive feedback. We have to choose those programs and methods which will benefit children in all our title I programs. Without the waste and inefficiency in program planning that has existed.

In line with these priorities, therefore, I want to offer the following recommendations for the continued operation of title I:

First. Title I efforts should be concentrated on target populations. At present, they are being spread so thin that their

efforts are virtually washed out. With limited resources, no school system can expect to reach all of its needy children overnight. Therefore, they must set "priority areas" for initial concentration of funds.

Little dribblets of money do little good. Past experience has shown us that. Impact requires massive direction of our investment. The California report shows that when you fund programs this way, you get positive results.

Second. Program design must be tightened up. Some school districts have 10 or 12 separate title I programs. My own city of Chicago has over 50. Clearly, this represents an absurd waste of money in a time of national economy. But it would be grossly inefficient any time. No school system should channel its spending into more than one or, at the most, two different projects for title I children.

Third. Priority in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 should be placed on reading and communications skills.

As Dwight W. Allen, dean of the University of Massachusetts School of Education, has stated:

All the problems of school financing, staffing, housing and organization are secondary to the problems of that boy smoldering in the back of the room who cannot read.

The entire reward system in formal education derives from verbal facility. Therefore, we should be spending Federal money where it will have the greatest benefit.

No one can deny that, given unlimited resources, a school district could profitably utilize additional monies for psychological counseling programs, recreation, cultural enrichment activities, and other worthy enterprises. We are all aware that emotional problems, disruptive home backgrounds, and a variety of other intervening variables affect the child's ability to learn.

But, as long as title I funds remain limited, they must be spent where they will do the most good.

The ability to read gives a child dignity in the classroom. It provides the key to every other skill he acquires while in school. As Bayard Rustin told the U.S. Civil Rights Commission last fall: "We want our children to be able to read, and to do arithmetic."

Therefore, I propose that we place legislative priority on reading and communications skills in title I. With the provision that local districts may only spend their funds on nonlanguage arts activities if they can show that a majority of their title I children are reading at least at grade level or above.

Fifth. Evaluation of title I programs should be comprehensive and systematic. Data should be made available by the local school district on a longitudinal basis, in order to compare results from one year to the next.

An analysis of the costs and effects of compensatory education programs must take into account all major school programs, not just compensatory education programs and certainly not just title I programs. At the operating level of the school and the child, the definition of what is "compensatory" and what is the

"regular" school program become extremely blurred.

The data should include the social class of individual students, of whole classrooms, and of the whole school.

Most school district standardized testing programs are not systematic or consistent. Districts make use of a number of national tests, each of which is based on a different population. At present it is impossible to equate, with any confidence, performance of different students on different tests.

Description of compensatory programs is difficult and very time-consuming for the local school district. However, it is absolutely essential. They must be sufficiently detailed to differentiate per pupil inputs, and to compare individual pupils and classrooms with one another.

Sixth. Title I funds should stimulate some fundamental changes in education. More of the same does almost no good. That is the message of the evaluation reports. After-school programs are largely a waste of time. Most children are too tired to study at the end of the day. Or they have to help at home. Or work.

Title I must effect changes in the regular school day. And it should be accompanied by dramatic commitment from the school systems, themselves, to use their resources for training teachers and principals in working with the disadvantaged.

Seventh. Local school districts should be given complete latitude in developing title I programs with the U.S. Office of Education setting only the broadest of regulations dealing with general policy as intended by Congress. It should be recalled that Congress stated explicitly and unequivocally that there shall be no interference by Federal authorities with local school districts in their development of standards and curricula.

Where do we go from here? Our directives are clear. The educators must seize upon this opportunity for leadership. We have entrusted them with the future of our nation. We will back them as long as they show results. Now it is up to them to fulfill their responsibilities to all of our children.

AMERICAN LEGION HONORS FRANCES LANGFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Florida takes great pride when one of her sons or daughters gains national acclaim for his or her talent.

Frances Langford is such a person. Born in Lakeland, Fla., she became an actress, entertainer, radio and TV personality, columnist, and writer.

But the fame of Frances Langford also came from her generous sharing of her many talents with the fighting men during times of war and with our veterans after the war.

When Bob Hope gave his first show for servicemen in 1941, Frances Langford was part of that show. She became an integral part of the show as it toured from Alaska to Africa, from Panama to the Pacific.

Between 1941 and 1944, she hit every theater of the war, including the Aleutian Islands, England, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Sicily, Iceland, Australia, and Hawaii.

She became the "GI Nightingale." As the jacket on the cover of Hope's book, "I Never Left Home," said:

It is the story of the mad, concerted enthusiasm of thousands of soldiers every time they saw Bob Hope step to the loudspeaker—and announce that Frances Langford was going to sing a song.

General Eisenhower, who had misgivings about women entertainers in battle zones, paid her tribute, as did many of this Nation's leaders. But maybe the highest tribute she received came from thousands of servicemen as they watched her. An excerpt from one letter from a fighting man indicates this best:

The amazing part of it was that Frances Langford was just a woman with a voice, a marvelous, rich, delicate voice. She will never know what that did for us. For a few seconds we were back in our natural surroundings and completely happy. I could not have been closer to Mary (his wife) had she been right there holding my hand.

In 1952 our men in Korea and Japan also were brought closer to home as she again joined Bob Hope and toured our bases there. And since then in 1966 she has visited Vietnam, Thailand, and the Philippines to cheer and give comfort to our men.

Frances Langford is now a resident of Jensen Beach, Fla., and I am proud that I can call her a constituent as well as a friend.

Since moving to Jensen Beach, she and her husband, Ralph Evinrude, have taken an active part in the community. They have helped in civic drives and charity programs, contributing greatly to the growth of Jensen Beach.

The Jensen Beach American Legion Post 126 is paying tribute to Frances Langford for the many contributions she has made over the years to lift the spirits of our servicemen.

I regret that I will be unable to attend this fete for Fran, Monday, May 20. The honor is much deserved, as are the many others she has received. I am sure that the Members of the House will join me in congratulating her on this occasion and send our thanks for her contributions.

RESTORATION OF LAW AND ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, events of recent weeks cause me to have a grave apprehension as to the future well-being of our Nation. The unseemly conduct of many individuals and groups in America will destroy this Nation from within unless brought to a halt immediately.

Rioting, looting, and burning in many of the great cities, including Washington, should not be tolerated further. It is a national disgrace to have seen things happen which we have seen with our own eyes here in the Nation's Capital.

For several years we have observed a continuing increase in the incidence of serious criminal offenses. The record

shows that most of these offenses have been committed by repeaters who have been coddled by the courts of our country.

No one would suggest cruel and inhumane treatment of any individual. I do not recommend that, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when the law-abiding citizens are entitled to the protection of the law.

Law-enforcement agencies have been hamstrung and stifled in their efforts to preserve a safe society. No one who is familiar with the record can controvert the proposition that the namby-pamby attitude of some of our courts, particularly the Federal courts, have contributed heavily to the insufferable increase in criminal conduct.

Today we see throughout our land groups affiliated with private organizations and students on the campuses of tax-supported and privately supported institutions of higher learning participating in lawlessness and revolution which no free society should countenance. Through all of these college revolutions and riots we can see a thread of similarity in the methods employed by insurgents which gives credence to the contention that organized direction is being given by some external force. It is time that this matter be fully explored and that steps be taken to expose those who would destroy higher education in our country through the indefensible tactics that we have witnessed in the past few months.

There are those who tell us that a minority of college students are rebelling against constituted authority because they are oppressed and suppressed and not given the freedoms to which a college or university student is entitled. The record will show that this revolutionary minority and their fellow students have the greatest freedoms ever known to college students in any period in our history.

This misguided minority of college students might get a real lesson from looking at what has happened to university life in many of the Latin American universities where similar riots by a minority of students have brought about a chaotic condition in which the cause of education has been greatly impaired.

Those who engage in mass riots and destruction assert lofty reasons for their misconduct and contend that they are striving for some goals which will in some way change life in America. They say that firm police methods should not be used to deter them in their violence as they destroy the property and lives of their fellow Americans. They and some of their supporters contend that there must be police leniency in the handling of their conduct in the interest of saving lives and maintaining communication between lawful authority and the insurgent groups.

It might be well for those to whom I have referred to take into account that police leniency in time of riot leads to even greater riots and that many more lives may be lost in the end if their misdeeds are permitted to go unpunished. They might also take thought of the proposition that communication between lawful authority and the citizens cannot survive a period of rioting and destruc-

tion. The net result, if their misconduct is permitted to go unpunished, will be a state of anarchy. When anarchy comes, the people of a free society will demand that steps be taken which will destroy the freedom of all of us in the interest of establishing a measure of orderliness in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the arguments of the apologists for crime and misconduct. They say that the causes are poverty, unemployment, and hunger. Those of us who were raised in an economic status which would now be described as poverty have little patience with these contentions. While we do not blind ourselves to the need in our Nation for provision for the unfortunate, we do not accept the charge that economic status justifies the commission of offenses against one's fellow men or his nation.

Each of us can give strong testimony to the thesis that some of the most God-fearing and law-abiding citizens that we have known have been persons of limited economic means. As this nation seeks an answer to alleged imbalance in economic opportunity, we must never make the mistake of casting reflection upon the Christian character and morality of the underprivileged as has been done recently by many in high places.

We hear the accusation from many that those who speak for law and order and a restoration of sanity in our country are racists. Nothing could be further from the truth. Crime, rioting, and disorderly conduct are equally bad regardless of the race of those engaging in it. No particular race has a monopoly upon misconduct or upon good conduct.

A majority of the people in every race in our nation believes in law and order and the preservation of the basic features of our nation which have made it the greatest the world has ever known. I do not accept the contention that the good name of any group of our people should be impugned by attributing to their race the stigma of the conduct of the small percentage of their race who now attack our peaceful existence.

During my service in Congress I have had a broader opportunity to deal with legislation relating to crime than comes to most members of Congress. This has been due to my membership on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the District of Columbia. As the author of the omnibus crime bill, which was signed into law last year, I have been pleased to see that provisions in that legislation have given to the law enforcement officers and the courts statutory provisions which can be used in the trial of the thousands arrested in the Nation's Capital within the past few weeks.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee it has been my opportunity to support the Law Enforcement Officers Assistance Act, the Safe Streets Act, the Bail Reform Act, the Anti-Racketeering Act, and the Work-Release Act, among other measures. These measures are not only of assistance in meeting the threat of crime but also provide consideration for those who are charged with crime and who show an honest desire for reformation.

Our studies show that because of crime the basic quality of life for many Americans has been seriously affected. We are told that 43 percent of the people of our Nation stay off the street at nights because of their fear of crime; 35 percent do not speak to strangers any more because of their fear of crime; 21 percent use cars and cabs at night because of their fear of crime; 20 percent of the American people say that they would like to move to another neighborhood because of their fear of crime. These statistics were developed after a national survey of 10,000 representative American households.

Mr. Speaker, under our constitutional system every citizen is clothed with great protection and is assured many personal liberties not known to the people who live under other systems of government. This is as it should be. The enjoyment of these protections and privileges places upon every American a heavy responsibility to conduct himself in such manner as to preserve these constitutional guarantees.

The recent conduct and demands of some of our citizens that they be given privileges over and beyond those privileges accorded to the citizenship in general will ultimately erode the freedom of all of us. The use of public parks and grounds by one small group in such a way as to deprive all other Americans of the enjoyment of those facilities is not a privilege or right guaranteed by our Constitution.

In discussing this proposition the late Justice Roberts said:

The privilege of a citizen of the United States to use the streets and parks for communication of views on national questions may be regulated in the interest of all; it is not absolute, but relative, and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order.

The recent action of some of our Government officials in disregarding this basic tenet in granting privilege to the one group which it denies to other Americans is totally indefensible.

I am genuinely concerned about the future of our Nation. I am equally concerned that so many of our people, some of whom have the loftiest aims, are completely overlooking the lessons of history as they encourage the destructive course that is being traveled by many Americans today.

We have a lesson in history in the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Edward Gibbon in his famous work quoted Petrarck, the Roman historian, as follows:

Behold the relics of Rome, the image of her pristine greatness! Neither time nor the barbarian can boast the merit of this stupendous destruction: it was perpetrated by her own citizens, by the most illustrious of her sons; you have done with the battering ram which the Punic hero could not accomplish with the sword.

Those of us who love our country and have reveled in her "pristine greatness" should see to it that it does not experience the "stupendous destruction" visited upon the Roman Empire. We must not permit this destruction of America to be "perpetrated by our own citizens" even

though they may be "the most illustrious of her sons."

There are many evidences that "the battering ram" is now being applied in our Nation by those who participate in, and promote, criminal and riotous conduct such as we see about us today. There is reason for apprehension that those who batter our domestic tranquility may accomplish results which our foreign enemies have not been able to accomplish "with the sword."

Mr. Speaker, the obligation and the opportunity which private citizens and public officials in the United States have today exceed that of any other generation. I call upon our colleagues and all Americans of every race, religion, and philosophy to come to the aid of their country by demanding that the patterns and practices now prevalent in our Nation be abandoned to the end that law and order and individual freedom might be reestablished and preserved.

**NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY,
MAY 17**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 154 years ago on tomorrow the Norwegian people rejoiced to hear that their new Constitution had been adopted. As the good news filtered into every village and hamlet that Norway had established a governmental structure which would assure every citizen protection and permit him to live and work with maximum freedom all Norway was jubilant.

The far-seeing statesmen who drafted their Constitution zealously maintained the long-tested Norwegian legal traditions but added to them the finest elements of the French Revolution and the American Declaration of Independence. Since 1814 this Constitution with only a few of its articles amended has provided Norway with the basic law of the country.

It is small wonder that Norwegians celebrate this day with such enthusiasm, and it is fully understandable why our fine citizens of Norwegian birth or ancestry in this country observe the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the land of their forebears.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you of the magnificent contribution which these stalwart sons of the Vikings have made to this country. They have helped to establish our maritime industry and they were in the vanguard of the intrepid pioneers who made the wilderness of our northern tier of States from New York to the Pacific Ocean a massive granary and dairyland. They have helped to give this country a stable and prosperous economy akin to that which prevails in Norway today. They have enriched this country's moral and religious growth with the same honest fundamentals which characterize the lives of the people of that great country.

I salute these fine Americans today, Mr. Speaker, not only for who they are, but for what they have done. I congratulate

late them for continuing to honor a great manifesto and the magnificent democratic system of government which they have derived from it. I know that many of my colleagues join me in wanting to share with all our Norwegian-American citizens the celebration of this historic and beneficial step taken in Eidsvoll on May 17, 1814.

**FOUNDATIONS SHOULD CARRY A
FAIR SHARE OF THE TAX BURDEN**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I have called attention to the widespread concern generated by the huge increase in the number and wealth of tax-exempt foundations. I present here, for the consideration of the Members, three thought-provoking editorials on this subject which appeared in the Durham, N.C., Herald of April 1, 1968; the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer of March 29, 1968; and the York, Pa., Dispatch of March 30, 1968:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald,
Apr. 1, 1968]

THE FOUNDATIONS AND TAXATION

Rep. Wright Patman's, D-Tex., proposal that tax-exempt foundations donate their receipts to the federal government during the Vietnam crisis fails to come to grips with the real issue. That issue is whether so great a portion of the nation's wealth, with all the impact it can have on the economy through sales and purchases of securities and property, is rightly exempt from taxation.

To suggest that the foundations give their income to government during a time of crisis not only is a sentimental evasion of the issue but it would create a situation in which such income would henceforth be contributed to the government.

The tax-exempt foundation stands in succession to the entail of estates in the colonial period and the trust or monopoly at the turn of the 20th century as a privileged institution. The question is, does it merit this special privilege?

While there is the principle involved, the issue has been made acute by the growth, both in number and in volume of wealth, of foundations. Although eleemosynary considerations entered into the establishment of a number of foundations, the motive provided by the opportunity to avoid taxation is not to be discounted and may have been the determining factor.

Undoubtedly some foundations have abused their tax-exempt privileges, and these have given Mr. Patman and others concern. Where there has been abuse, confirmed through judicial proceedings or admitted by foundation officials, the foundation should lose its tax-exempt status, and it should pay income tax on its earnings as any private corporation.

A more complex issue is involved in the question of whether any foundation should enjoy the privilege of having its income and holdings exempt from taxation. Does such privilege involve hazard to the economy through the ability of great foundations to sell and buy securities and property in large amounts and thereby influence prices to the disadvantage of the public? Is the public interest damaged because so great a portion of wealth is untaxed, and in consequence add unfairly to the tax burden of those, indi-

viduals and corporations, subject to the tax? Here are issues for Rep. Patman's subcommittee to explore; here are pertinent questions for which it should seek answers.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer,
Mar. 29, 1968]

THE FOUNDATION STUDY

The investigation of tax-free foundations by Rep. Wright Patman deserves careful attention and scrutiny by the American people.

In this area, the charges made against the LaGrange-based Callaway Foundation have naturally received major attention.

But the broader—and the much more important—aspect of the Patman investigation concerned those foundations which it found to be providing money to unfriendly nations, and to domestic organizations that are militantly antagonistic to the U.S. government, and to the free enterprise system.

Rep. Patman suggested that the tax-free foundations donate their money to the federal government for the duration of the Vietnam War, so the money can be used to reduce the national deficit, and for financing vital programs here at home.

Patman's suggestion probably will not be greeted too warmly by the foundations.

But there is a lot of sense in it.

Some foundations are using their tax-free dollars for what actually amounts to political activity. Yet, a citizen can't deduct the money he contributes to politicians.

Many of the causes and institutions which are either wholly or partially financed by foundations are thinly-veiled political pressure groups, no matter what their stated purpose might be.

Yet, the money that supports them is tax free, meaning that taxes have to be collected on the dollars of average citizens to make up the tax not collected on the foundation's income.

It is not unfair to say that a lot of the strife and turmoil in the nation today has been stirred and kept boiling by the activities of groups and studies financed from foundation grants.

That was the disturbing national finding Patman's committee made. He'd rather see the money given to the U.S. government.

But a more practical solution is for Congress to revise the tax exemption laws, and more carefully define the use of tax-free money, and the kind of organizations to which the money can be given.

[From the York (Pa.) Dispatch,
Mar. 30, 1968]

FOUNDATIONS AND TAXES

As the April income tax deadline draws nigh, it's well to ponder, or envy, the fate of the millionaires who, because of loopholes in the law, pay less to Uncle Sam than the average York county industrial worker who makes \$5,500 a year.

One of the gimmicks is the establishment of tax-free foundations, which ostensibly are to serve charitable or humanitarian purposes, and to which rich individuals make tax-deductible "gifts."

Congressman Wright Patman (Dem., Tex.) has just taken the foundations over the coals once again. As he said and as the record seems to bear out, foundations represent a "pattern of 'living high' while 'doing good.'"

The luxury of such charities as well as the high living of others in welfare work and even in the ministry does not contribute to the image of sacrifice in the service of others. Subterfuge might be the more appropriate word.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when yesterday's legislative work was over, and I had returned to my office after listening to several hours of brilliant debate, I read the May 9, 1968, edition of the Roll Call and when I came to the editorial I called in the members of my staff and read aloud to them the editorial entitled "Mother's Day."

Mr. Speaker, this is beautiful sentiment and it is fine writing. It deserves a place in the literature of the heart that speaks a universal language for all times and for all peoples. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an editorial by Editor Sidney Yudain which as it is a tribute to the memory of his mother is likewise a tribute to the memories of all mothers. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful sentiment and it is fine writing.

The editorial referred to follows:

MOTHER'S DAY

In one respect every person in the world shares equality at his time of birth. He is endowed with life's most priceless gift—a mother.

In the recent convulsion of our mores and standards, it is perhaps neither fashionable nor cool to extol the virtues of one's mother. You risk charges of "Momism" and accusations of being square. Well, perhaps they don't make mothers like they did anymore. Or perhaps there's a new breed of kids.

Well, there were eight kids in a little Connecticut town who grew up in the Depression without benefit of the Dodge Rebellion, acid, surfboards, hotrods, a collection of rock and soul music, or a penchant to own all of the material things of life.

We were lucky to have an open home where our friends and assorted kids from the neighborhood could flop and play. We made our own baseballs out of rags and we used a stick for a bat. But we never had the slightest trouble fielding full ball teams on the vacant lot beside our house.

It was the warmth and understanding of my mother that made our home the headquarters for others' sons. She fed them, she counseled them, and throughout the years, she was their friend.

Too, she was our friend, our confidante, our encouraging voice, our spur to achievement. She was the most placid person I have ever known, maintaining her calm through the battles and squabbles of a large family and all its conglomerate problems.

When the Depression hit us, she assumed control of the family, and we named her "Blum" after the French Premier who had recently assumed responsibility for the wavering French government.

As I think back, I am most impressed with her complete selflessness, her concern only for her family. It was a standing joke at Christmastime or other occasions that any gift of money be accompanied by a warning that the largesse was to go for a hat or a coat for herself, and not to buy an extra chop from the butcher.

She imparted to us a love of beauty—in music, nature, the person. The things most dear to her could not be bought—the sun shining through her windows, the blooming of the apple trees, the first crocus, a ride in the country when the dogwood was in bloom, an inspirational article in the newspaper.

She had a green thumb and was proud of the flowers and trees that surrounded her. But her first love was her brood. We had little preaching from her, but by example we were taught right from wrong, good from

bad, and were instilled with an appetite for knowledge, an appreciation of art and music and literature, an awareness of the world, a desire to be good citizens and a desire to create, build, and accomplish.

Her health was excellent for some 70 years—at least we never heard a complaint and she rarely saw a doctor. Three years ago she suffered a heart attack, and the end was in sight. Throughout the trying period of hospitalization, bed confinement, and the stoppage of activity—the hardest to bear—she maintained her good spirits, and she amazed all with the maintenance of her good humor which sprang from a well within her that long should have been exhausted.

On a bright May day "Blum" surprised my younger sister by asking to be taken for a ride in the country. She marveled at the panorama of dogwood and blooming fruit trees, the flowers and the green grass. Here and there she would ask that the car be stopped so that she might drink in all of the beauty.

Upon her return home, her heart stopped beating.

It was Sunday, May 6, 1968. It was my birthday. And Mother's Day.

MISINTERPRETATION OF COMMITTEE REPORT ON GUERRILLA WARFARE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, my colleague on the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Iowa, made remarks which, if not clarified, might create the mistaken impression that the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice has rejected, refuted, contradicted, or taken issue with, a recommendation of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This is not the case and I am sure the gentleman from Iowa did not mean to imply by his remarks that it is. The committee has made no recommendation which the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. J. Walter Yeagley, has questioned or contradicted, even though some might get that impression from the contents of the letter from Mr. Yeagley to Mr. Culver which was made a part of the RECORD.

The facts in the case are these:

On May 6, the committee released a report entitled "Guerrilla Warfare Advocates in the United States." This 65-page document names and gives background information on organizations and individuals in this country who are promoting guerrilla warfare against the Government. Quoting from their own publications and documents, the report spells out the strategy, tactics, the weapons and devices these elements say they would use against the people and Government of the United States. The report also reveals the role played by some of these elements in the Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago riots.

In addition, it summarizes some basic principles of guerrilla warfare enunciated by various Communist theoreticians and, applying these principles to the United States, draws the conclusion that

while guerrilla warfare organizations might initially create havoc in this country, they would face certain defeat. It spells out some of the steps the Government could take to suppress guerrilla warfare operations carried out within our major cities, where its proponents say they would operate.

This report, as I indicated in my foreword to it, was prepared by a man who, as a former activist in the Chinese Communist-oriented Progressive Labor Party, had firsthand experience with that group's guerrilla warfare doctrines and plans. This led to a continuing interest in the subject on his part and, following his break with communism, much reading, research, and study in the field. The author, I might mention is a professional writer and editor with a graduate degree in political science.

It is clear to anyone who has read this report that it contains extensive factual information, plus various findings and recommendations of the FBI and grand juries and, in addition, what is obviously the author's personal analysis of and belief about certain matters.

The committee, of course, stands 100 percent behind the factual material in the report. It always very carefully checks and rechecks statements of fact contained in any report it publishes, whether the report is prepared by its own staff or, as occasionally happens, by an outside authority.

At the same time, it should be apparent to any normally intelligent reader that the report material which is not factual in nature does not represent a committee position but only the opinions of the author which, the committee believes, as stated in the foreword, "are worthy of consideration."

Now, in the concluding chapter, the author suggests seven steps that "could be taken" by the Government in dealing with guerrilla warfare operations, should they be attempted. There is no basis for anyone's claiming they are unreasonable, undemocratic, reckless, or in any way inconsistent with our Constitution, or the practices of any democratic nation which has faced an insurrection. They are routine, obvious measures.

It is an unfortunate fact that the Washington Post, in reporting on this committee document, took one sentence out of the 33,000-word report—a sentence from one of the seven steps suggested—and not only played it up out of all proportion but also twisted its meaning. In this sentence, the author had pointed out that the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides for detention centers and wrote:

These might well be utilized for the temporary imprisonment of warring guerrillas.

The gentleman from Iowa, in his May 9 remarks, stated that he had contacted the Department of Justice for clarification of the detention camp provisions of the Internal Security Act and had received a reply from Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, in charge of the Internal Security Division, stating:

There is no support therein for the establishment of detention centers for the purpose set forth in the House Committee on Un-American Activities report.

I would like to point out that I was aware of the provisions of this section of the Internal Security Act—as I am sure was the author and other members of the committee—long before Mr. Yeagley's letter was written. As I have pointed out in a letter to one newspaper correcting a misleading account of the committee report, the Internal Security Act provides only for the detention of persons who will probably engage in, or conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage when the President has proclaimed a state of "internal security emergency" because of war, invasion, or insurrection in support of a foreign enemy.

I have also been well aware of the fact mentioned by Mr. Yeagley in his letter to the gentleman from Iowa, that, while a number of detention centers were established years ago in keeping with the provisions of the Internal Security Act, none of these centers was ever activated and all have been used for other purposes for some years.

The important fact, however, is that if certain elements should launch guerrilla warfare against the United States, the Government would have to react: it would undoubtedly capture a considerable number of these guerrilla fighters and it would have to hold them somewhere. Neither I, the other members of the committee, nor the author of the report, know just what the Government would do to meet the latter problem.

Our Federal prisons, of course, are overcrowded. I would say there is no possibility they could be used for what would be, in effect, prisoner-of-war camps. It is my information that existing military stockades are far from adequate for the purpose. The Federal Government, however, does own, or has access to, the previously mentioned detention centers which were established for the purpose of holding large numbers of persons under security conditions. Most are abandoned World War II Army training centers with barracks, mess halls, hospital buildings and similar facilities.

What could be more logical than to suppose, as the author of the committee report did, that the Government might well decide to use these existing facilities for, as he wrote, the "temporary" imprisonment of captured guerrillas?

Importantly, despite the wording of Mr. Yeagley's letter, I want to stress the point that even though the Internal Security Act, as I said, does not provide for the creation of centers to detain captured guerrillas, there is nothing in that act, there is nothing in any other statute, there is nothing in the Constitution, and nothing in logic barring the use of these centers for that purpose.

They would be utilized for that purpose, of course, not under the authority of the Internal Security Act but under the President's authority as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to deal with insurrection and rebellion.

It is most unfortunate that the wording of Mr. Yeagley's letter and the placing of it in the *Record* has created the false impression that such use of the

centers would be illegal or improper. The fact is that the Government, owning these properties, can use them for any one of a variety of purposes and is actually doing so now.

I very much regret that the wording of the May 9 remarks of the gentleman from Iowa could be said to imply that the committee report contains "reckless reprisal statements" which can have no other effect but to help those who are doing everything they can to further inflame emotions in already highly charged ghettos. The report, most emphatically, makes no recommendations or suggestions whatsoever about the handling of ghetto rioters. The sentence at issue deals only with captured guerrillas in a case of actual insurrection against the U.S. Government. It has no other application.

Also regrettable, in reference to the report, is the gentleman's statement:

A disproportionate concentration on presumed conspiratorial danger diverts us from the principal sources of urban unrest and protest, which are essentially social and economic.

Regarding this statement, I would like to call attention to two facts. First, the report is primarily concerned not with riots and not with some vaguely "presumed" conspiracy, but with actual guerrilla warfare plans, instruction, and training. Guerrilla warfare is much different from "urban unrest and protest," as the gentleman from Iowa referred to riots. The roots of the guerrilla warfare some elements are planning against the United States, as the report makes clear, are conspiratorial and clearly alien. No government deals with alien-inspired armed guerrilla uprisings by social and economic reforms.

Second, insofar as the report concerns urban riots, and it does to some extent, it makes due note of their economic and social causes—the denial of basic rights and related matters. It quotes at some length, for example, the findings of the Cleveland grand jury on the evils in the Hough area which contributed to the riots there. Also quoted on the subject of injustice is an excerpt from an excellent study, "Prevention and Control of Mobs and Riots," which was compiled by the FBI in cooperation with law-enforcement agencies in all parts of the country. Moreover, this is done in a manner which indicates clearly that the report supports the correction of such evils.

Is it to be expected that a Federal report on guerrilla warfare should go further and contain a blueprint for complete social and economic reform which will supposedly solve the separate issue of local urban rioting?

I understand the concern of the gentleman from Iowa about the matter but I strongly disagree with his words that it is "most regrettable" that the report "has served to again stimulate baseless and highly misleading rumors about detention camps, as a solution to uprising which it admits are not likely to occur."

The fact is that it is not the report which has stimulated these rumors but slanted and biased accounts of the report published by a newspaper, the *Washington Post*, which has a long public record of bias against the committee, coupled with continuing effort to dis-

credit it by any and all means. Comparison of the *Washington Post* account of the report with those published by many other newspapers makes this abundantly clear.

I must express my regrets, too, that the gentleman from Iowa, if he had reservations, complaints, disagreements, and so forth, concerning the report, did not bring them to the attention of the committee at any time during the months before its publication when he had galleys in his possession and, particularly, that he did not raise them at the meeting when the committee, with his concurrence, approved its release.

Finally, it is regrettable that the gentleman from Iowa, if he had some questions about title II of the Internal Security Act, did not endeavor to obtain clarification from other committee members and staff personnel who were thoroughly familiar with the report and could have informed him of the correct meaning of the reference to it in that document.

The May 9 letter of Mr. Yeagley which was placed in the *Record* of that day by the gentleman from Iowa is poorly worded. I have no desire to be overcritical of Mr. Yeagley who as head of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice, has tried to do a good job in the face of many difficulties.

Having served as the head of the Internal Security Division here in Washington for many years, however, he must be familiar with the extent to which the *Washington Post* has traditionally and consistently published distortions and falsehoods about the Internal Security Act, the Subversive Activities Control Board, security laws, various governmental agencies dealing with security, and particularly the Committee on Un-American Activities. Despite this he based his letter to the gentleman from Iowa largely on what the *Washington Post* reported about the committee document instead of basing it on what the document itself actually states.

The result is that, although the wording of his letter is technically correct, it definitely creates the impression that the committee has made a recommendation it has never made and, further, that it has made an improper recommendation—one that is actually contrary to the provisions of the Internal Security Act. By doing so, it also creates the misleading impression that an official committee position is giving credence to the false rumors now being circulated that the Government has "concentration" camps which will be used for the mass detention of militant Negroes.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A POSITIVE U.S. EXPORT POLICY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on International Trade, I have been very concerned with recent devel-

opments in this overall area. We have been dealing not only with balance-of-payments problems, but various proposals which would unfortunately reverse the progress this Nation has been making in the recent Kennedy round tariff discussions.

I place in the RECORD an address by our colleague, Congressman THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade, given before the Toledo Society of Professional Engineers on May 7, 1968. This speech, I believe, represents an excellent approach toward the development of a positive U.S. export policy:

ADDRESS ON FOREIGN TRADE BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, BEFORE THE TOLEDO SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ON MAY 7, 1968

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the problems arising from our international trade agreements and how these problems relate to the current imbalance of payments.

Being aware of the opposing views of a previous speaker on this topic, let me say that I especially appreciate your open-mindedness in wanting to hear both sides of the case.

I'd like to start with a brief review of current trade policy generally, the Kennedy Round more specifically, and then try to identify resulting difficulties that face us.

As a general proposition, I think it can be said that trade policy at any given time in our history has reflected the state of the national economy during that same period.

Certainly the vitality of the early years of the 20th century helped produce the famous Underwood Tariff of 1913, the most comprehensive ever undertaken to that date, resulting in an average tariff rate of 27%.

The depression which followed World War I, in turn, produced the Fordney-Macomber Tariff of 1922, with an increased average tariff of 38½%, which was in force until 1930.

Then came the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930 in response to the crash and the beginning of the depression. While it was in force between 1930 and 1934 the average tariff was 59%—the highest level in history. This triggered reciprocal tariff, raising all over the world, with the result that world trade went down two-thirds during the 4 years from the 1930 level. U.S. exports alone dropped 70%, while the U.S. share of world trade dropped one-third.

The first phase of the trend toward liberalization of U.S. policy is identified with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. By that Act Congress gave the President authority to reduce then existing tariffs by 50%. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Act was the inclusion of the most-favored-nation clause which limits discrimination in trade by extending to third parties the same terms agreed to by contracting parties. This clause became a fundamental principal of U.S. trade policy, as well as a cornerstone of international trade.

The purpose of the 1934 Act was to make bilateral agreements that would increase U.S. exports and employment, as long as there would be no injury to domestic industry. Actually there was little possibility of injury because of high rates and the item-by-item approach to negotiations which allowed certain commodities to be excluded if a decrease in rates would result in an increase in imports.

The 1934 Act was a permanent one but authority to negotiate specific amounts of reduction required renewal. These extensions were made every 3 years and by 1945, when the President was again given authority to

cut rates by an additional 50%, the U.S. had concluded agreements with 29 countries.

A second phase of the trend toward liberalization of trade policy came in 1947 when the U.S. and 22 other major trading nations negotiated simultaneously for both reduction of tariffs and removal of trade barriers. These multi-lateral negotiations were conducted at Geneva and culminated in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. GATT membership now includes some 70 nations that account for about 80% of total world trade. Agreements under GATT were made again in 1949, 1951, 1958, 1962 (Dillon Round) and 1967 (Kennedy Round). The value of world trade involved in these negotiations (in billions of dollars) grew from \$2.5 billion in 1956 to \$4.9 billion in 1962 to \$40 billion in 1967, while the percent of average tariff reduction grew from 4% in 1956 to 7% in 1962 to 35% in 1967.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962—the next major move in U.S. trade policy—gave authority to the President to reduce tariffs up to 50% of the rates existing as of July 1, 1962; to eliminate tariffs on products in which the U.S. and the EEC together accounted for at least 80% of the world trade; and to eliminate rates that did not exceed 5%. The 1962 Act empowered the President to negotiate across-the-board tariff reductions (rather than item by item) and modified the safeguard provisions of the old trade agreements program.

An important practical objective of the 1962 Act was to assure U.S. access to the EEC because in the absence of broad changes in U.S. commercial policy, it was seen that EEC tariffs would be discriminatory and restrictive to U.S. trade.

The 1962 Trade Expansion Act was geared to stimulating not only U.S. exports but also world trade in general, with mutual benefits expected to accrue to all nations as a result of international specialization and trade and the more efficient use of resources which in turn fosters more rapid economic growth. The Kennedy Administration acknowledged that further tariff reductions could lead to increased imports as well as exports. Hence the President was provided with authority to institute various new types of "trade adjustment assistance" such as readjustment allowances to unemployed workers, vocational training, and loans and tax benefits to employers affected by increased imports.

In brief, then, since 1934 we've seen average U.S. tariff rates decline from 59% to 12% in 1967, while our exports rose from \$2 billion in 1934 to \$30.9 billion in 1967, a period during which imports climbed from \$1.7 billion to \$26.8 billion.

Turning to the Kennedy Round, the most far reaching ever in reduction of barriers to international trade, it was agreed that tariff reductions would go into effect in 4 stages: in January and July of 1968, January of 1970 and January, 1972.

Based on the year 1964 and summarized primarily in terms of the value of trade covered by concessions and by the depth of the duty reductions, total tariff concessions exchanged in the Kennedy Round covered about \$40 billion of trade.

The U.S. granted tariff concessions on about \$8.5 billion of its imports and received concessions on \$8.1 billion of its exports.

As between the industrialized nations (U.S., EEC, UK, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Japan, the countries negotiating on a linear or across-the-board basis) the U.S. received concessions covering trade of \$7.6 billion while granting reductions of \$6.7 billion.

If the past is any guide to the future, new export opportunities will be created for American goods as tariffs are reduced abroad, and as exports increase so will the earnings of American businesses and the number of jobs for American workers. As U.S. tariffs are reduced on materials and components used

by American manufacturers, both the imported items and the competing domestic materials will be cheaper, production costs will be thereby reduced, and as a consequence the competitive position of American manufacturers using these inputs will be improved in both export and domestic markets.

Conversely, if imports were to be sharply reduced, through quotas or other means, the individual American consumer, as well as industry, would have less choice in the variety, quality, style and price of goods available for purchase. Many things bought from abroad cannot be produced in the United States except at prohibitive costs; other imports are competitive with U.S. products and thereby help keep price levels down. There is nothing new or startling about this: trade among nations is, after all, only the extension beyond our borders of the basic elements of the free enterprise system—competition, specialization, the price mechanism, the free market, freedom of choice, and mutually advantageous exchange.

This is by no means to say that there will not be problems if we continue to pursue a liberal trade policy. Broadly speaking, it seems to me that the general or overall problem we face is that we live in a rapidly and vastly changing world where we must expect a growing number of industrial countries with every improving technology that are just as anxious as we are to advance their standards of living by more actively participating in growing market opportunities throughout the world.

The issue, also broadly stated, is whether we are going to continue our present leadership role, accepting as we must the complex problems which must be overcome if liberal trade is to benefit and serve the community of free nations, or whether we are once again to withdraw from participation and retreat into economic isolationism.

There's no argument, as I've indicated, that there are problems to be met if we continue our liberal trade policy.

Among the future developments which may confront us are:

The possible expansion of existing regional trading blocks and the emergence of new ones.

The mounting importance of non-tariff barriers to trade, as tariffs go down.

The building of new productive facilities throughout the world, bringing new buyers and sellers into the world market.

The growth of American investment abroad which is making many of our large corporations truly multi-national in character.

The determination of developing nations to widen their export markets and reduce their dependence on basic commodities, and

The desire of both east and west to expand two way trade across the vanishing Iron Curtain.

Immediate attention is being given to the problem of non-tariff barriers.

While all trade problems require for their solution the close cooperation of industry and government, this is probably even more true of non-tariff barriers than of others because their very existence is often first known to the businessman seeking to sell his product abroad. U.S. negotiators during the Kennedy Round were handicapped by lack of documented specifics with respect to the effect of non-tariff barriers and by lack of explicit authority to deal in a negotiating framework with this difficult area. The United States, too, has its own non-tariff barriers against the exports of other nations and negotiations requires reciprocity and the ability to move toward compromise.

It should be noted that very comprehensive efforts have been made over the past 5 years to obtain documented data with respect to non-tariff barriers, including consultations with some 60 different industries, public hearings held pursuant to provisions of the Trade Expansion Act, discussions with

the International Affairs Committee of the Business Council, a study by the National Industrial Conference Board, introduction of the issue into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and, most recently, formal raising of the problem by the U.S. in GATT where a Working Party is now actively reviewing the ruling which govern these adjustments.

A full evaluation of the impact of the Kennedy Round must also recognize that there will be some adverse effects as well as beneficial to American industry. Although the overwhelming majority of American industries that face competition can adjust in stride, increases in imports resulting from reduced U.S. tariffs can cause dislocations which require adjustment assistance. New and more constructive means for dealing with the problems which imports may create for particular firms or groups of workers, or even entire industries, are being fully explored as we seek to liberalize the present criteria for adjustment assistance.

The guiding principal in this effort is that tighter quotas or higher tariffs are not necessarily the most appropriate or effective form of relief for injury due to import competition. It may be better in the long run to promote the economic flexibility needed to cope with the ever-changing currents of world trade and their varying effects on different segments within a specific industry, rather than to attempt to insulate whole sectors of our economy against these changing currents.

Let me also be clear about another problem of considerable magnitude, namely, inflation. If we are to successfully pursue a policy of liberal trade, ability to compete will depend upon ability to meet price competition. Since inflation is a significant component of cost reflected in price, nothing could be more obvious than the conclusion that unchecked inflation, whether it be cost-push, demand-pull or the classical definition of too many dollars chasing too few goods, can put us in an extremely exposed position.

I think it is probably true that protectionism provides a degree of insulation against competition but quite honestly I don't think this is good for either the American producer or the American consumer.

There are other problems as well. In recent days we have read that the first quarter U.S. trade surplus is at the lowest level since World War II—\$731 million on a seasonally adjusted annual basis as against about \$4 billion in calendar 1967. A number of reasons have been given for this precipitous decline: the New York dock strike, steel inventories, increased imports of small automobiles, the surge in copper imports because of the 3 month tie up in the domestic industry, and the different timing of U.S. and foreign business cycles.

These, too, suggest areas of vulnerability which we must recognize and be responsive to if we really mean to protect our own markets and compete successfully abroad.

In all truth, I think that it can be said that the Federal Government must be more vigorous in all of these areas of actual or potential vulnerability. But whether the finger is pointed at the Administration or the Congress, or both, failure to bridge the current \$20 billion deficit gap through a combination of federal expenditure cuts and a temporary tax increase is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst because it can only result in a permanent inflation, obviously to the detriment to our trade efforts.

We have also failed to provide effective guidelines which could at least help minimize the wage-price spiral which also inhibits our ability to meet foreign competition and, in a somewhat removed but nonetheless important area, we have been slow to provide competitive export credits—the

loans that make it possible for foreigners to purchase U.S. products.

These are some of the difficulties we face and which are inherent in pursuance of a liberal trade policy. They can be met if we have the will and choose to do so. To revert to a protectionist course might obviate some of these problems in the short run but it would also beget others. We can hardly overlook that if new tariffs are imposed, or if quotas are established by the United States at the insistence of one industry, some other American industry or industries must be made to pay the price for that new protection, either by compensatory reductions in tariffs on imports in their field or through consent by the U.S. to increases of foreign tariffs on U.S. exports. In its simplest terms this involves robbing Peter to pay Paul—a regrettable degree of direct participation by government in the allocation of foreign trade between industries. Under the present circumstances, with the President's power to negotiate such compensatory adjustments in tariffs having lapsed, the only remedy available to the foreign governments affected is by way of retaliation—in each case affecting third country trade as well—which inevitably would be followed by a chain reaction of counter-retaliatory moves around the world, affecting all foreign trade. This is precisely what happened when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 triggered a wave of retaliatory trade restrictions—an important factor in deepening the great depression of the 30's.

Nor do I think that protectionism can affect our balance of payments problem except adversely. A leading proponent of this course suggests that an easy cure is available: cut off all foreign trade and grant important licenses only on a high priority basis. This is both simplistic and illogical. It might not kill his golden goose—although I'm not sure of this in the long run—but it would certainly kill others. The fact is that we can't cut ourselves off from our international responsibilities—responsibilities which promote both our short and long range national interest—with a press of the button or a flip of the switch. Were we to follow this advice, our trade balance—which has been a major asset in our balance of payments—would be decimated through retaliation, compounding an already difficult problem even further.

Certainly liberal trade is not THE answer to bring our payments into balance but in my view it forces upon us the range and system of disciplines which are essential if we are to remain competitive and innovative—the two basic requirements for meeting the challenges which face us in our national life both at home and abroad.

A REPLY WILL BE INTERESTING

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Floyd E. Wilson, superintendent of the North County Public Schools in Desloge, Mo., in which he enclosed a copy of a letter he had addressed to the President of the United States, requesting an answer to a question by one of Superintendent Wilson's students, which Mr. Wilson could not answer; which I cannot answer, and which I believe only the President can answer.

The letter to the President follows:

MAY 14, 1968.

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

SIR: As a leader of youth in the capacity of Superintendent of Schools, I am confronted with a question to which I do not know the answer.

In the recent months, there has been two deaths of leaders who are known throughout the country. When Dr. Martin Luther King was so unjustly assassinated, you as President of the United States by having this power invested to you by the virtue of your office, ordered the flag to be flown at half-mast.

Just recently, Mrs. Lurleen Wallace, Governor of Alabama, died, and the flag was not ordered to be flown half-mast for her.

I am not against recognition of people who are dedicated to be leaders of what is right, but I have always been under the impression that our flag is flown at half-mast only for heroes or government officials.

I realize that you have the most responsible position in the world, and I admire you for your ability in this capacity. I am sure that you receive all kinds of letters, and receive more criticism than praise.

The only reason I write this letter is so that I can answer the questions of the young citizens of America.

Respectfully yours,
FLOYD E. WILSON,
Superintendent.

IN MEMORY OF SPEAKER MARTIN

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the late Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., America lost one of its most distinguished citizens and a great patriot. As a member of the minority when he served as Speaker of the House of Representatives, I think I came to appreciate more fully the sterling qualities of this individual who enjoyed the esteem, respect, and friendship of all those with whom he had served. While the two districts which we represent in Congress had very little, if anything, in common, I was impressed as a new Member that here was a man, a leader in this House, who while he might not have a comprehensive understanding of the problems of the area I was attempting to serve, was sympathetic to my problems and would take the time to listen and to advise me as to how these problems might be alleviated. Over the years we became, what I like to believe, close friends, and I remember at least three or four occasions when Mrs. Jones and I would be "eating out," we ran onto Speaker Martin, dining alone, and we would enjoy informal visits with him. Perhaps it was these occasions which caused me to regard him as a lonely man. He was indeed, a gracious gentleman, one who served his district, his State, and his Nation well, and whose memory will linger on in the minds of those who were privileged to know and work with him.

**TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF PAST
COMMANDER IN CHIEF ARCHIE
HOUSE**

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, belatedly, and with deep sadness, I have learned of the death of Archie J. House, past national commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans. He was a great and good American who set for future generations a pattern of service and patriotism.

The last time I saw and talked with Archie was at the White House just 2 weeks before the black and tragic day of President Kennedy's assassination. I had gone with Archie and his wife Blanche to the White House to pay respects to the Chief Executive of our Nation, representing as we did the veterans of the war of 1898 meeting with the honored veteran of World War II, the President of our beloved country, and President Kennedy personally had escorted us around the garden and amidst the flowers, and on bidding us farewell had said: "BARRATT knew my grandfather," the last words I was to hear from President Kennedy, whose grandfather I had indeed known and long had counted among the heroes of my boyhood. In the period of the Spanish-American War, when the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan was brigaded and served in Cuba with the Ninth Massachusetts Infantry, the Kennedy grandfather was mayor of Boston. No man ever had a bigger and a kinder heart, and he was in a large sense a national idol.

Archie House was born in January of 1882 and I in April of the same year. We were sophomores in the high school at Benton Harbor, Mich., when the *Matine* was sunk in Havana Bay and war with Spain followed. We enlisted together in Company I, 33d Michigan Infantry, trained together at Island Lake in Michigan, later at Camp Alger at Falls Church, Va., and then together were off to Cuba and the siege of Santiago.

The last I had heard from Archie, and that was not long ago, he and his wife were living in Florida, he seemed in good health and certainly as always in good and cheerful spirits. I learned of his passing from the news bulletin issued by the Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans. It was a blow that brought home the realization that the trail of the youth of the last years of the 19th century is rapidly approaching the end. I am told that less than 9,000 remain.

To the wife and loved ones of my high school buddy, later my comrade in march and battle in a foreign land, and later my commander in chief, goes my deepest sympathy.

**CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN IS
PRAISED FOR REHABILITATION
HOUSING PROGRAM**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recognition has again come to Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, one of our esteemed colleagues and a senior member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, for her sponsorship of what now is called the 221(h) section of the National Housing Act. This law provides funds to buy and rehabilitate old housing for resale to low-income people at reasonable interest rates.

The Washington Post has written up the first project under the Sullivan rehabilitation housing program. This project in St. Louis has succeeded beyond all expectations as the newspaper article points out.

Most significant is the fact that this housing program successfully involves everyone within the community and allows all to participate in rebuilding what previously had been a slum. The importance of this program is perhaps best summed up by Father Kohler, who has involved himself in this program, when he was quoted as saying:

If we get enough homes built, we'll make it go—homeowners aren't home burners.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this article to our colleagues and I hope that this program will continue to receive the full support of HUD for it has already become in just the 1 year it has been in existence one of the most successful housing programs we have.

The article follows:

HOUSING PLAN INSPIRES HOPE

(By Eve Edstrom)

In the living room on the second level of his sturdy row house, Theodore Forte leaned back on the sofa and talked about building a barbecue pit, setting up summer furniture, and landscaping the patio.

The conversation, like the floor plan of Forte's home, was not a world apart from swank Georgetown. Yet Forte lives in one of St. Louis' worst slums.

He is a truck driver for that city's rubbish department and the father of seven children—but he is able to save dollars every week and buy his own home because of "Mrs. Sullivan's law."

I'VE GOT A FUTURE NOW

That law is Section 221(h) of the National Housing Act and what it means to Forte is this:

"I'm living for something now—my own front yard, my own back yard, my own basement. It's a pleasure every night I get home. You can't beat it. You see, I've got a future now and so do my children."

That same kind of future is in sight for 1340 low-income families in 62 cities, including Washington. In these cities, nonprofit organizations are borrowing Federal funds at 3 per cent interest, as authorized under 221(h), to buy and rehabilitate old housing for resale to the poor at the same low-interest rates.

While this program is just getting under way in most cities, its prototype began in St. Louis in 1963 when two priests began a "find and fix-up" housing effort for one large family whose income had priced them out of public housing.

EIGHTY FAMILIES REHOUSED

That effort provided the basis for 221(h), which was pushed through Congress by Rep.

Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.) ranking member of the Banking and Currency's Housing Subcommittee.

The first Federal loan under the legislation went to the St. Louis project which, in the last four years, has rehoused about 80 families in rehabilitated dwellings that are about 70 years old.

Other cities, such as Washington where one project involving nine properties is under way and other nonprofit organizations have been established to do similar work, can profit from the St. Louis experience.

It shows that neighborhood corporations can do an effective housing rehabilitation job. But it also shows that a number of self-help measures ranging from job-finding programs to credit unions, must be folded into the program if the rehoused families are to become stable home owners.

The St. Louis results have been dramatic. There have been no defaults in payments. Some family heads have almost doubled their income. Others, like the Forte family, have the same income but are saving money because they no longer pay fantastic heat and gas bills for drafty, ill-equipped dwellings.

IMMIGRANTS MOVED OUT

The St. Louis project area, on the Near North Side, consists of nine blocks where formerly Irish and Polish immigrants lived in the solidly-built brick rowhouses. As the immigrants moved out, slum landlords took over and let the houses deteriorate. Several of the houses are now vacant and boarded up, and others have been demolished, giving the area a war-torn appearance.

Across the avenue and towering over the project site is one of the Nation's largest public housing developments (Pruitt-Igoe), which has 2900 units and is described as a high-rise "jungle" by those who have lived in it. Its shattered windows and grounds littered with debris and clusters of unkempt toughs make it one of St. Louis' sorriest sights.

It was in Pruitt-Igoe that Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Straughter and their seven children lived.

"At first I thought it was heaven—six rooms all to ourselves when we only had two rooms before," Mrs. Straughter said.

DECIDE TO LEAVE

But she soon found that the family was living in a "madhouse," with thousands of children so sandwiched together that there were constant fights. And each time the Straughter family tried to get ahead through pay raises or additional income from a daughter who went to work, their rent went up. The Straughters decided to quit the neighborhood.

That's when the Rev. John A. Shocklee, pastor of St. Bridget of Erin Church, and his former assistant, the Rev. Joseph M. Kohler, stepped in.

"We wanted to keep the Straughters in the area," Father Kohler said. "You know how everyone talks about indigenous leaders these days. I can't spell indigenous, but I know real leaders and we couldn't afford to lose the Straughters."

Until that time, Father Kohler had been principally concerned with finding better paying jobs for area residents. Through VIP—Voluntary Improvement Program—scores of residents have been able to obtain high school equivalency ratings that paid off in qualifying them for jobs at higher wages. Now Father Kohler, who "never had bought anything in my life," decided to buy houses.

LIST OF HOUSES OBTAINED

He and Father Shocklee obtained a list of available houses for sale, mustered up funds through voluntary contributions and bought their first house.

"When Father Kohler asked me how I would like to have a place of my own, I didn't

know what to say," Mrs. Straughter said. "I still don't. I love it so."

The interior of the house was brought up to city standards by adding a furnace, electric wiring and bathrooms. The yard was fenced in and Mrs. Straughter now has the garden she always wanted.

From this informal effort, the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corporation (BCIC) was formed in November, 1964. It has mobilized wide-ranging voluntary support, not only from St. Bridget's Church but from such organizations as the American Jewish Congress and the League of Women Voters.

FINANCING PROVIDED

Most importantly, in terms of the housing venture, BCIC found a strong friend in M. A. Burdzy, president of the Pulaski Savings and Loan Association, Pulaski, with BCIC assisting in collecting mortgage payments, worked out a financing device which, in effect, provided poor families with 100 per cent financing repayable over 15 years.

Dwelling units were acquired for between \$2000 and \$3000. Rehabilitation costs—replacing roofs, installing new kitchens, furnaces, heating systems, bathrooms and inside stairs—averaged about \$4000 to \$5000 a unit.

This type of rehabilitation has had an important byproduct—providing jobs for the area's Negroes working under the supervision of an excellent craftsman, Richard Woods, who is on the staff of BCIC.

"I've lived in this neighborhood for 40 years," Woods said. "It was a beautiful neighborhood. It's going to be beautiful again."

But the piecemeal operation of BCIC has had its drawbacks. As fast as a few houses have been rehabilitated, more decayed. Now, with both Federal antipoverty and housing money, BCIC has set up a sister corporation with a master plan to complete rehabilitating 300 houses in the nine-block area.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZER

Mrs. Straughter is now a fulltime community organizer, who screens the families who will buy the houses.

"I still have to earn my title when we really become a community," she said. "Right now, I'm just a people's worker."

Among her "people" are the Fortes. They are paying \$71.92 for their three-level home, with its huge basement, living room, dining room, kitchen, three large bedrooms and 1½ baths.

"You don't know the thrill it is to know that this is all yours," said Mrs. Forte.

Forte added: "I now live for my home and my family. They're happy and that makes me the happiest."

And that's why Father Kohler said "if we get enough homes built, we'll make it go—home owners aren't home burners."

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL CLEARS CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contains a succinct summary of the major provisions of the truth-in-lending bill which the House and Senate conferees finished yesterday.

I am sure all Members will be interested in looking at this summary in anticipation of the conference report being brought to the floor in the very near future.

This time is being taken so that I can

personally compliment the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, for her superb performance in conducting the House hearings on this legislation, her participation in the House floor debate, and the leadership she evidenced in the conference.

Every consumer owes Mrs. SULLIVAN, whom I consider to be the outstanding consumer champion in Congress, a great debt of gratitude.

My words of praise for Mrs. SULLIVAN in no way imply any criticism of the other conferees on the truth-in-lending conference who, in my opinion, all carried out their responsibility in the true tradition of conferees on a very complicated piece of legislation.

I want to emphasize that we also owe a debt to two distinguished Members of the other body, Senator SPARKMAN of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Senator PROXMIER of Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation in the Senate. I am most grateful to both Senator SPARKMAN and Senator PROXMIER for their able and informed contributions to the progress of this vital legislation.

Let no one be misled, however, into believing that this legislation has concluded congressional responsibility in this most vital area. This truth-in-lending legislation is nothing more than a mere beginning. I would personally feel that the American consumers have been let down if legislation is not considered in the very near future going beyond that which we now have before us.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by also paying homage to that great American, Senator Paul Douglas, for it is to this great American that we owe the original debt for his conception of the legislation and his tenacity in attempting to secure its enactment.

The article follows:

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL CLEARED—CONFEREES ADOPT DISCLOSURE RULES ON CREDIT COSTS

(By Richard L. Lyons)

House-Senate conferees agreed yesterday on a "truth-in-lending" bill modified somewhat from the tough House version but still one of the strongest consumer protection bills ever written.

It now goes back to each house for a final vote and expected approval, the climax of an eight-year fight to tell consumers the full cost of credit when they buy on time.

The bill requires full disclosure of credit costs and interest rates in credit advertising, department store revolving credit and other installment purchases and loans.

It imposes restrictions on garnishment of wages to satisfy debts, writes a new Federal anti-loan shark law and protects poor homeowners from unknowingly signing second mortgages to finance home repairs.

The second mortgage protection would be of special importance here in Washington. Recent surveys have shown many cases of poor homemakers learning too late that the loan paper they signed for repairs was in fact a second mortgage, by which they incurred long-term debt and possible loss of their homes.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.) who had pushed through the House a bill requiring full disclosure on consumer credit transactions totalling about \$100 billion a year,

called the final product a "good bill," but added she was sorry she had to give up some good provisions.

Senate conferees, bargaining for the much weaker Senate bill, said the House hadn't given up five per cent of the difference between them.

President Johnson called the conference agreement "a great victory for the American consumer. I applaud the action of the conferees and I urge the House and Senate promptly to make this long-overdue measure a reality for the American people."

Following is a brief summary of major provisions in the compromise bill:

Garnishment. The bill would exempt from garnishment the first \$49 or 75 percent of an employee's weekly take-home pay, whichever is greater. This would take effect July 1, 1970; the rest of the bill, July 1, 1969.

Credit Advertising. Published or broadcast advertising which includes any figures must give total credit costs and period of repayment. The bill would bar offerings of "\$1 down and \$1 a week", but vague language such as "easy credit" need not be spelled out. The Senate had not considered this, but accepted the House provision.

Revolving Credit. The bill requires department stores charging interest on unpaid charge accounts to state interest charges at both monthly and annual rates. They may also state the "effective rate" charged if they can show that because of grace periods allowed or repayment in less than a year the average customer pays less than the "nominal annual rate."

\$10 Exemption. The House had eliminated a Senate provision exempting from disclosure charges on installment buying (not revolving credit) where finance costs were \$10 or less. This was modified to permit exempting costs up to \$7.50 in some cases.

Loan Sharks. The conferees rewrote a House provision to come up with a stronger Federal law to crack down on loan sharks. The final version defined loan sharks as lenders charging more than 45 per cent annual interest or using threat of violence or other illegal means to collect. For the first time, Federal law enforcement officials could investigate and police loan sharks.

Second Mortgages. The bill would still require lenders to inform homeowners that papers they were given to sign were second mortgages. But instead of requiring notice three days in advance, the bill would give the homeowner three days after signing to withdraw.

Mortgages. Dropped was a requirement that first mortgages state the total, interest charges during the life of the mortgage.

Advisory Commission. The conferees added a provision creating a national advisory commission to make a two-year study in the field of consumer credit costs.

Other Credit. The bill also requires full disclosure of actual credit costs for all other purchases or loans—such as bank loans and auto purchases in addition to revolving credit purchases—but these provisions were not in dispute at the conference.

CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON REPORTS TO THE 35TH DISTRICT ON THE RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, belated as the occasion is, to

give the people of the 35th District of New York a summary of the accomplishments of the first session of this 90th Congress. Each year I have made such a report immediately after the end of the session. But when the session ended last December I was in Asia on an inspection trip as a member of the National Defense Posture Subcommittee and thus was unable to prepare and circulate my report at the usual time. Since then the demands of the present session have further delayed this document.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

The first session was not the most productive one I have seen, but it did generate a number of significant pieces of legislation. For example:

A measure boosting social security benefits by 12½ percent, and increasing the amount recipients may earn on the outside without losing their benefits, is something I have long urged.

Included in this new law were some very strict limits placed on the costs of State-supported medicaid plans, such as the one now operating in New York. This represented victory in my long fight to cut the heavy costs of medicaid, and in the long run will save the American taxpayers as much as \$1.5 billion a year.

Pay of postal and other Federal employees was raised in two stages, bringing their earnings more into line with comparable private jobs. The same bill also raised rates for all three classes of mail.

We extended the draft for another 4 years. College deferments were retained but deferments for graduate students were ended.

Adam Clayton Powell was denied a House seat early in the session, in part because he had defied the New York courts and could not enter his own district without being arrested.

In the wake of the Powell and Dodd cases the House created a special committee to establish ethical standards of congressional conduct.

Additional funds were voted to continue the war in Vietnam and furnish economic help to the civilian government of South Vietnam.

Faced with an increasingly large budget deficit, Congress insisted on sharp spending cuts, and ended the year by reducing the President's budget more than \$6 billion.

A bill was passed and sent to the Senate to punish those inciting to riots and other violence.

Another measure was sent to the Senate to help local police departments deal more effectively with crime and rioting.

A bill was also sent to the Senate to make it a crime to deface or burn the American flag.

A move was begun to transform the old Union Station in Washington into a National Visitors Center. If successful this should put an end to the drive to spend \$34 million to extend the west front of the Capitol, something, as you know, I have long opposed.

A new, tougher Federal meat inspection law was enacted.

A bill to give the Nation's reserve forces more permanent status was also passed.

The government of the District of

Columbia was reorganized to make it more representative and effective.

Legislation was passed to provide \$40 million for the rat control. I supported the bill. An earlier measure, however, which would have created a new Government bureau for this purpose, was defeated since it would have meant an unwarranted expansion of the bureaucracy.

STRATTON LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

I regard enactment of the amendments putting strict cost limits on the medicaid program as my major legislative accomplishment. I introduced such legislation nearly 2 years ago and pushed hard with the Ways and Means Committee for its adoption.

Of course the major share of my time and attention was devoted to the work of my own Armed Services Committee. The Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare, which I chair, continued its inquiry into the adequacy of our defenses against the growing Soviet submarine threat. In addition I made two trips to Vietnam and other parts of Asia as a member of two other subcommittees, subsequently reported on my conclusions from these visits, and spoke dozens of times before all kinds of groups and organizations about Vietnam, illustrating these talks with colored slides I took with my own camera.

I have also been active in other legislative areas, helping to move various matters through legislative and administrative channels.

For example, my 10-year fight to put several of our major holidays on Mondays moved much closer to victory as formal hearings were held in both the House and in the Senate. My legislation was later reported by the Rogers subcommittee to the full House Judiciary Committee, and further action is expected.

Congress still refuses to approve the costly \$34 million proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol, so we are winning that fight.

I also won my fight to prevent the Defense Department from moving the east coast branch of our Defense Language Institute to western Texas. Secretary McNamara caved in completely on that one.

My bill to stop foreign dairy imports was not enacted, but the President did impose similar restrictions by Executive order. The Department of Agriculture also approved increases in the price paid to dairy farmers for fluid milk.

The drive I began 2 years ago to force General De Gaulle to pay up his World War I debts by boycotting French wines and substituting New York Finger Lakes wines has continued to pick up support in Congress and across the country.

Congress refused to appropriate further funds to carry out the controversial highway beautification program. I had opposed the original legislation because of the damage it could do to upstate New York's tourist industry, and had sought to amend the basic law.

At my insistence funds were included in the military construction program to rehabilitate Army Reserve and National Guard training facilities at Camp Drum, an installation long neglected for southern training sites.

Late last year I protested an Army re-

quirement that personnel serving in Korea make "voluntary" contributions out of their own pockets to hire Korean civilians to perform KP duties. In response to my demand the Defense Department, early this year, announced plans to begin a phaseout of all KP operations and hire civilians on a regular basis, as I had originally recommended.

I have continued to push for improved airline service and safety. Two years ago I called attention to the practice on some airlines of refusing to serve meals to military standbys. As a result of that protest airlines now serve meals regularly to all military standbys.

Last summer I called attention to the hazards disclosed by the midair collision in North Carolina that claimed the lives of a new Secretary of Navy-designate, his wife, and young son. As a result of public interest stimulated by these comments Congress appropriated special funds to improve safety procedures at several airports including those not adequately equipped to handle modern jet airliners.

In February 1967 I was named chairman of a Special Subcommittee to Investigate the Tragic Fire at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas, which claimed the lives of two young airmen, one from Auburn, in an experimental oxygen atmosphere test chamber. The circumstances of this fire were very similar to the Apollo fire which claimed the lives of three astronauts only 2 weeks earlier. Our subcommittee's findings were made public and led to important safety changes in both military experiments and space activities designed to prevent similar tragedies in the future.

LOCAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the year actions by Congress or other agencies of the Federal Government have resulted in benefits to communities, groups, industries, and individuals in our congressional district. Let me mention some of the highlights.

In response to pleas by myself and others, the Department of Agriculture put grape juice on the school lunch program for the first time, thus helping grape growers and grape-juice processors in Yates, Ontario, and Seneca Counties.

Several Members of the House and Senate, myself included, met with the President in November and persuaded him to continue special tariff relief to the Wilton and velvet carpet industry, located in Amsterdam and Auburn, for at least another 2 years.

Early in the session I took the lead in forming a new informal northeast dairy bloc of Congressmen to see that the interests of dairy farmers in our Northeastern States were fully protected by mobilizing the support of Congressmen from the whole area, without regard for party, behind measures of benefit to dairy farmers. Our interest was one factor in persuading the Department to grant several price increases to dairymen in our area.

Programs were approved and funds released for urban renewal projects in Norwich, Amsterdam, Auburn, Penn Yan, and Oneonta.

Funds were provided to complete the expansion and modernization of the Cortland County Airport. Federal funds

were also appropriated to continue the construction of new facilities at the Federal fish hatchery and laboratory in Cortland.

As for Federal aid to education, two items are worth special mention. One was Federal approval of a new comprehensive high school and community living and learning center for Amsterdam. Additional loan funds were also made available to Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, whose first class will enter in September. Incidentally, I introduced legislation last summer, scheduled shortly for formal hearings, to grant \$5 million to Eisenhower College as a living memorial to the former President.

Federal help for water and sewer projects still led in terms of local interest. During the session aid for planning or building projects was approved for the following communities: water projects in Auburn, Oxford, and the Town of Seneca; sewer projects in Victor, Bainbridge, Greene, Weedsport, Port Byron, Cooperstown, Moravia, and Dundee.

The new Oneonta post office was formally dedicated. Earlier plans for a new post office in Sherburne were withdrawn at the request of the successful bidder, and steps were taken to build on a site more acceptable to the community.

Low-rent housing was approved for Geneva.

On-the-job training programs were funded for Amsterdam and Auburn. Under the economic opportunity program a sheltered workshop program got support in Cortland County, and an ambitious on-the-job training program was approved for the Fulmont Development Corp. in Fonda.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Because the last session ran almost until Christmas it was impossible for me to hold my usual open-air office hours at area post offices. I look forward, however, to an earlier adjournment this year, and hope to be able to carry out these office hours in warmer and more agreeable weather.

Until our subcommittee trip to Vietnam last November my attendance record for the session stood at better than 90 percent. But because of rollcall votes I missed during the trip—mostly on issues the House had already voted on—my percentage slipped to just below 80 percent.

I continued to maintain my record for voting independence during the session. My tabulated score was the highest of any New York member of my party. I was also listed as the most conservative member of my party from our State.

On a personal note, I was honored last summer by being named an honorary citizen of Seneca Falls, and in October was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Hartwick College.

During the session we issued our newsletter regularly, as well as a weekly report for weekly newspapers, a weekly radio report, periodic television reports, and an annual questionnaire which evoked a very substantial response, for which I am most grateful. We also maintained our summer intern program in my Washington office, giving several college students from the district an oppor-

tunity to learn more about the operations of Congress.

Let me conclude by saying again how much I appreciate the honor of continuing to serve as your Congressman here in Washington. Please call on me whenever I can be helpful, either in my Washington office, 202 225-5076; my Amsterdam office, 518 843-3400; or my Auburn office, 315 252-8575.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for May 20–May 27, on account of official committee business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. HARRISON to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARTH and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech by I. W. Abel.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter in five instances.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. REINECKE in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. WHALLEY.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. WYLIE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mrs. MINK in two instances.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in six instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. POOL.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. HULL.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of California.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes, p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

No. 1849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending March 31, 1968, pursuant to Subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order No. 10958 of August 14, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

No. 1850. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report entitled "Postal Systems of the United States Armed Forces—Vietnam and the Far East" (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on manpower management in the Federal Government (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 15395. A bill to provide salary step advancements and adjustments for employees moving to and from different pay systems, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 15131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1394). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17354. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 17324. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to advertising in a convention program of a national political convention; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 17326. A bill to designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 17327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding credits and payments in the case of certain uses of gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17328. A bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer, during the taxable period, disposes of a truck and acquires another truck; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 17329. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 17330. A bill to guarantee productive employment opportunities for those who are unemployed or underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 17331. A bill to provide for a comprehensive income maintenance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 17332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding credits and payments in the case of certain uses of gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17333. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 17334. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 17335. A bill to designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 17336. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to exempt reservists who are local law enforcement officers from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 17337. A bill to provide a comprehensive national manpower policy, to improve the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, to authorize a community service employment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 17338. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to honey producers for losses sustained by reason of the application of Government-approved insecticides on adjoining croplands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ELLBERG, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HICKS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. RIGGLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOW, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. ST. ONGE):

H.R. 17339. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SISK, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. POLANCO-ABREU, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 17340. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 17341. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of professional baseball; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLBERG, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 17342. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct the foundation and substructure of a U.S. court house and Federal building at a certain site in Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 1275. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17343. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giamio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 17344. A bill for the relief of Nedeljko Korunic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 17345. A bill for the relief of Catherine Maria Szonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 17346. A bill for the relief of Carolina Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 17347. A bill for the relief of J. Burdette Shaft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 17348. A bill for the relief of Angelo Conteduca and his wife Marianna Conteduca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17349. A bill for the relief of Corazon Paca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 17350. A bill for the relief of Filiberto Piclucco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 17351. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Theodore J. Violassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 17352. A bill for the relief of Wincenty Bioniarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 17353. A bill for the relief of Elon Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

317. Mr. HOSMER presented a petition of certain residents of the 32d Congressional District of California, who request enactment by Congress of legislation to have this administration stop, promptly and completely, giving aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Thursday, May 16, 1968

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Dean W. Miller, minister, Palm Desert Community Presbyterian Church, Palm Desert, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who rulest the world from end to end, and whose will is the good of all Thy sons and daughters under the sun, look in mercy upon us as we