

Increasing recognition of outboard motor operation as a significant nationwide source of pollution and improved technology to correct the problem make such standards both urgent and feasible.

Studies investigating the effects and the amount of fuel exhausted by two-cycle outboard marine engines began as early as 1961, revealing that outboard motor emissions damage water quality by tainting fish flesh and by producing unpleasant odor and taste. The latest confirmation is a 1970-71 study made for the Environmental Protection Agency which demonstrates that fuel emission from outboard motors is becoming a serious pollution problem in our lakes and river systems.

The quantities of wastes involved in outboard motor operation are shocking. The exhaust to the water has been estimated to range from less than 10 percent to more than 50 percent of the fuel originally put into a two-cycle outboard engine. Within the 1 billion gallons of outboard motor fuel sold annually, it has been estimated that 100 to 160 million gallons of fuel is wasted. By comparison, the Torrey Canyon disaster resulted in an oil spill of only 15 to 30 million gallons. Furthermore, the waste of this unused outboard fuel costs boat owners between \$50 to \$100 million a year in out-of-pocket expense.

The source of the problem is relatively simple and should have been corrected long ago. Because of the design, the engine parts of the two-cycle motor are lubricated by mixing oil with gasoline. During the intake of this fuel mixture into the firing chamber, some of the fuel vapor condenses and accumulates in the crankcase. The unused fuel is evacuated from the crankcase by valves which open up and vent the fuel into the exhaust housing and then into the water. According to a study made by Stillwell & Gladding, Inc. in 1969, the two-cycle engine's open crankcase or "crankcase scavenging" design is "highly inefficient."

Significant steps have been taken recently in the improvement of the two-cycle outboard engine by the designing of a drain free engine which would recycle the unused fuel vented from the crankcase back into the engine as fresh fuel, and a recycling device that can be attached onto two-cycle engines.

The recycling of fuel technique reportedly is already being manufactured in all motor sizes and will be used industrywide in the 1972 models. However, in 1970, there were approximately 7,215,000 outboard motors already in use in this country, and over 98 percent of these are two-cycle motors. These older outboard motors will continue to leave massive fuel residues in our waters regardless of the fuel recycling innovation of the new two-cycle outboard motors.

To cope with existing outboard motor pollution, it is clear that fuel emission standards set under this bill must cover existing as well as future outboard motors, requiring use of the best available technology to reduce or eliminate the pollution in each case.

The bill that I am introducing will accomplish these important objectives through the following: First, direct the

Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to study the available technology that could abate fuel emission from two-cycle engines and establish standards for outboard motors accordingly; second, make it unlawful for anyone to operate a two-cycle outboard motor on the navigable waters of the United States after June 30, 1972, without adhering to these standards; third, establish a penalty of not more than \$500 for any violation of these standards, and fourth, allow the Secretary of the department in with the Coast Guard is operating to enforce the provisions of this bill by using law enforcement officers, Federal agencies, or the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks there be inserted in the RECORD an article from the Jack Anderson column in the Washington Post dated May 15, 1971, which reports the disturbing findings of the 1970-71 EPA study on the amount of fuel deposited into our waters by outboard motors. The article is entitled, "Motorboats: Super Polluters of Lakes."

Also, I ask that the text of the bill be printed following the article.

There being no objection, the article and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTORBOATS: SUPER-POLLUTERS OF LAKES
(By Jack Anderson)

With the warming of the weather, the nation's seven million outboard motors have started to pump a seasonal stream of gunk into America's once-sparkling waters.

This is the scientific, if upsetting, conclusion of an unpublished Environmental Protection Agency study.

The study found that a single outboard motor coughs, splutters and spits as much organic carbon pollution into the water in 24 hours as the sewerage from a neighborhood of 400 persons.

Up to 30 per cent of the fuel used in outboards, according to the study, actually is spewed into the water. Multiplying this by the total consumption of outboard motors in this country gives the staggering dimensions of the pollution problem—more than 100 million gallons of oil and gas poured into our streams and lakes and along our coast lines.

Many bodies of water simply don't contain enough bacteria to consume the gush of oil and gas. The residue fouls the shorelines, kills fish, pollutes drinking water and greases the skins of swimmers.

The study has been conducted quietly—if that is the word for an outboard motor test—by Dr. Williams Shuster, head of the Bio-Environmental Engineering Division of famed Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

He ran his tests with two engines, one 33 horsepower, the other 5 horsepower. His research team used an 18-foot-long, four-foot-deep swimming pool and took samples of the water for measurements.

As a double check, they also put containers on the fuel vents of the engines to collect the waste.

The lowest amounts of dumpage came from the high horse-power motor when it was tuned and speeding. Then only 4 per cent of the fuel leaked into the water. But at low speed, the motor threw off 27 per cent of its fuel. This increased to 30 per cent when the motor was untuned.

Footnote: The federal government has now given the Boating Industry Association a \$100,000 contract to study the effect of outboard motors on the nation's water. The association includes the manufacturers whose

motors are causing the pollution. Thus, the contract is a little like asking a tubercular cook whether he might infect his customers. Eight years ago, incidentally, the outboard motor makers were offered designs which would have largely prevented pollution.

S. 2096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Outboard Motor Pollution Control Act of 1971".

Sec. 2. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating sections 21 through 27 as sections 22 through 28 respectively, and by inserting after section 20 a new section as follows:

"REGULATION OF OUTBOARD MOTORS

"Sec. 21. (a) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall promulgate, not later than June 30, 1972, regulations requiring that two-cycle outboard motors used on vessels or any other water craft on the navigable waters of the United States be equipped or modified in such a manner as will use the latest available technology to prevent such motors from polluting such waters.

"(b) (1) After the effective date of such regulations it shall be unlawful to operate a two-cycle outboard motor on the navigable waters of the United States in violation of such regulations.

"(2) Any person who violates the provisions of this subsection shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than \$500 for each violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may assess any such penalty.

"(c) The provisions of this section and regulations established thereunder shall be enforced by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and he may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, law enforcement officers or other personnel and facilities of the Administrator, other Federal agencies, or the States in carrying out such provisions.

"(d) Anyone authorized by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to enforce the provisions of this section, may except as to public vessels or watercraft, (1) board and inspect any vessel or other watercraft upon the navigable waters of the United States, and (2) execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction."

By Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CHILES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. SAXBE):

S. 2097. A bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to concentrate the resources of the Nation in a Crusade Against Drug Abuse. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I appear in the Chamber today. I am, of course, highly pleased to announce a bold, new White House initiative to deal with the agonizing problem of drug abuse in this country. But to even allude to this initiative one must face up to the oppressive facts

June 18, 1971

that establish the depth and dimensions of this disease that is infecting our society, and especially our youth.

President Nixon, in his message yesterday to Congress, echoed that thought. "We must now candidly recognize," he said—

That the deliberate procedures embodied in present efforts to control drug abuse are not sufficient in themselves. The problem has assumed the dimensions of a national emergency.

Noting that "drug addiction destroys lives, destroys families, and destroys communities," the President went on to say:

Despite the magnitude of the problem, despite our very limited success in meeting it, and despite the common recognition of both circumstances, we nevertheless have thus far failed to develop a concerted effort to find a better solution to this increasingly grave threat. At present, there are nine Federal agencies involved in one fashion or another with the problem of drug addiction. There are anti-drug abuse efforts in Federal programs ranging from vocational rehabilitation to highway safety. In this manner our efforts have been fragmented through competing priorities, lack of communication, multiple authority, and limited and dispersed resources. The magnitude and the severity of the present threat will no longer permit this piecemeal and bureaucratically-dispersed effort at drug control. If we cannot destroy the drug menace in America, then it will surely in time destroy us. I am not prepared to accept this alternative.

Therefore, I am transmitting legislation to the Congress to consolidate at the highest level a full-scale attack on the problem of drug abuse in America.

Calling for a statutory Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention in the White House, the President has asked for \$155 million in new funds for combating drug abuse, bringing to \$371 million the total amount to be spent for this purpose. Of the new funds, \$105 million is to be used solely for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. Other requests include: \$14 million to enable the Veterans Administration to expand its five drug addiction clinics to 30; \$10 million for education and training in use of dangerous drugs; \$2 million for research on drug detection techniques; \$7.5 million for intensified investigation of large-scale traffickers and \$18-million for customs inspections and pursuit of smugglers; \$1 million to help other nations train enforcement officers; and \$2 million for research on herbicides to destroy narcotics-producing plants.

The President said he would ask Congress to permit drug control assistance to Communist countries that are now ineligible for aid.

EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

The scope of the addiction problem is chilling. The financial costs alone exceed \$2 billion each year, but are inestimable in terms of the human costs—the personal suffering and mental anguish—that the American society is forced to bear:

HEROIN

Heroin addiction can be found in cities, in suburban and rural areas. In recent testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics,

Dr. Bertram S. Brown, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, said:

Affluent suburbs often thought to be free of heroin associated with ghettos are suddenly aware of heroin use among their youth.

Since possession and traffic in heroin is illegal, it is difficult to know precisely the number of heroin addicts in the country. NIMH estimates the total at 250,000. The House Select Committee on Crime puts the figure at 200,000.

About half of the addicts in the country reside in New York State. In New York City, narcotics addiction is the greatest single cause of death of adolescents and young adults between the ages of 15 and 35. In the past 8 years, New York City has lost more lives to drugs than the entire State of New York has lost to the war in Vietnam.

Heroin addicts need from \$20 to \$150 per day to support their habit. If New York City's approximately 100,000 addicts spend an average of \$35 per day on heroin, the total exceeds \$3.5 million per day or \$1.3 billion per year. Most turn to crime to get the money to pay for the heroin, since they ordinarily are unable to earn enough to pay for it. One survey in New York City showed that only 2 percent supported their habit through gainful employment; 98 percent were involved in criminal activity. If addicts steal goods, they must steal five times the cost of their habit, since stolen merchandise brings only 20 percent of its value when fenced. On a yearly basis, an addict must steal \$90,000 worth of merchandise.

According to a recent, authoritative estimate from the provost marshal's office in Saigon, there are between 30,000 and 40,000 American servicemen in Vietnam who are heroin users—close to 15 percent of the troops stationed there. One study showed that the average age of the addicts included in the survey was only 20.5 years and the length of time addicted 5 months. With plenty of cheap heroin available in Vietnam, the servicemen have no trouble supporting their habit. But when they return to this country, their habit becomes more expensive—and most will have to steal to pay for it. They are sentencing themselves to lives of crime.

Mr. President, at this point I would like to recall my own personal experience in Vietnam when in Danang I met with the son of our distinguished colleague from Virginia (Mr. Byrd). Harry Byrd, III, was a marine stationed up in the Danang area. When I asked about his work he indicated he had supervisory responsibilities in a brig. I asked him what the most frequent charge brought against GI's in Vietnam was at that time. This was of course several years ago. He indicated that even at that early time most occupants of the brig were there for drug usage and drug abuse. He indicated that because of the boredom of GI's and the fact that many were protesting against the war and resented being there and fighting a war in which they did not believe, drug addiction, and

particularly, at that time, marijuana smoking was possible because the enemy itself saw to it that it was widely and freely distributed. Trucks would come through villages and when they would see a group of GI's, dump off large quantities of marijuana. And no one knows how many of the harder drugs might have been made similarly accessible.

This problem that I heard about firsthand several years ago in Vietnam has grown until it has now reached the crisis stage.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am confident the legislation will receive prompt hearings by the Committee on Government Operations.

The problem of drug abuse in this country is expanding and now wastes the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans every year, many of them potentially our most promising young people. The recent disclosures regarding addiction in our Armed Forces in South Vietnam only highlight the pervasive impact drugs have in our society.

The need for a concerted attack on this problem is obvious. Until now, however, the Federal Government's drug abuse prevention and control programs have been fragmented and uncoordinated. Responsibility was unfocused. As late as last year coordination was being handled by an ad hoc committee chaired by a special assistant in the White House with numerous other responsibilities.

Under the President's bill, 10 programs from more than five departments and agencies will be supervised by a Presidential appointee working full time on this matter in the White House. I hope the creation of a new White House office will lead to greater coordination and better results.

An additional \$155 million is to be provided along with the powers needed to oversee Federal drug abuse efforts effectively. The Director of the new White House office will have the authority to prescribe policies, prepare budgets, and set priorities.

I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation for the purposes of introduction and am confident that it will receive prompt and thorough hearings by the Government Operations Committee. Details of this legislation aside, no one can dispute the great need that led to its formulation and introduction.

We must be careful not to deceive ourselves, however. Enforcement needs to be improved. Education and rehabilitation are critical. But ultimately we must address ourselves to the ills of our society if we are to remove the underlying causes of much of the drug addiction in this country.

Why do so many feel the necessity of the drug habit? We need to know, so we can eliminate the causes that lead to drug involvement.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to thank my distinguished colleague, who is chairman of the Government Op-

erations Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization. I would like to express my deep appreciation for his having become the principal cosponsor of this legislation. In fact, I am delighted at the interest and support each of the other cosponsors of this bill has expressed. Also, I should like at the same time to express my appreciation to Senator JAVITS of New York, another cosponsor of the legislation and who, together with Senator RIBICOFF, will be handling some of the major, substantive matters in this area in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This matter, we would trust, would be referred to the Government Operations Committee, because its essential purpose is to set up a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, which falls within the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee. By having overlapping jurisdiction in the Government Operations Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with ranking members in the persons of Senator RIBICOFF and Senator JAVITS who serve on both committees assume very active leadership roles in both. I think we have a coordinated effort which will insure early hearings and prompt action by the Senate in this most urgent area.

I again want to express my deep appreciation to our esteemed colleague.

AMPHETAMINES

In 1969, over 8 billion amphetamine pills were produced and consumed in the United States—enough for 40 doses of amphetamines for every man, woman, and child in the United States. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, the total legitimate medical need can be measured in the thousands. NIMH puts the number of persons using oral amphetamines without a medical prescription at about 5 million. Intravenous use of amphetamines or methamphetamine is limited to about 100,000 users. These "speed freaks" face an emergency when their drugs are withdrawn: an abrupt "crash."

BARBITURATES

In 1969 over 4 billion barbiturate capsules were produced and consumed in this country—again, far more than would be needed for legitimate medical reasons. NIMH estimates that 2 million people take this drug regularly without medical need. Barbiturates often are used in suicide attempts; accidental overdoses in combination with alcohol constitute another hazard. Barbiturates diminish the physical and mental responses to such an extent that users are endangering the general public when performing such tasks as driving a car.

HALLUCINOGENS

Use of hallucinogens, such as LSD, which can cause birth defects, appears to be leveling off. Repetitive use of LTD now is found among a relatively small number of individuals, although experimentation by young drug abusers unfortunately continues to flourish.

MARIHUANA

According to NIMH, marihuana usage is increasing rapidly. An estimated 10 to 12 million Americans have used the drug at least once. The recent report to

Congress on "Marihuana and Health" from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determined that by the end of 1970, one college student in seven was using marihuana weekly or even more often. In a substantial number of colleges and high schools, a majority of students used marihuana.

Marihuana is at the center of great national debate. For example, this week witnesses testifying in San Francisco before the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse contradicted each other on such questions as whether marihuana usage leads to experimentation with harder drugs; whether marihuana produces a toxic reaction in the central nervous system of adolescents; and whether marihuana should be legalized.

We appear to know that marihuana is not physically addictive—though it may be psychologically habituating. We also know that it leads to an alteration of time and space perception, a sense of euphoria, a loss of inhibition, exaggerated laughter and attention loss. And we know that it has relatively minor physiological effects. But, beyond this, we know little in spite of the HEW report and the spate of opinions that bombard us regularly. We await next year's report of the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse before forming a firm judgment on many of the issues concerning marihuana.

A NEW OFFENSIVE

To counter the vicious cycle of addiction, the President has proposed a "new all-out offensive," dealing with the sources of supply at home and abroad and proposing the establishment of a central authority within the Executive Office of the President to have overall responsibility for all major Federal programs of drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training, and research programs. The authority will be designated at the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention. It will be headed by a Director accountable to the President.

Because of the emergency nature of this problem, the President has established this Office by Executive order, effective yesterday, pending passage by the Congress of specific enabling legislation which I am introducing today.

I am deeply pleased to see that the President has announced the appointment of Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, director of the drug abuse control program of the State of Illinois, to head this new office in the temporary capacity of special consultant to the President for narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Dr. Jaffe, 37, has been a leader in developing innovative techniques for the treatment of heroin addiction, including comprehensive approaches involving methadone use. An article appearing in this morning's edition of the New York Times entitled "Drug Abuse Fighter" describes in some detail the admirable efforts of Dr. Jaffe in this area.

Apart from establishing the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention, the President's message provides for a comprehensive antidrug offensive, aimed at sources of supply and demand with equal force.

To the extent that rehabilitation is required for Vietnam veterans, the President:

Ordered immediate establishment of testing procedures and initial rehabilitation efforts to be taken in Vietnam.

Ordered the Department of Defense to provide rehabilitation services and the rehabilitation of all returning discharged veterans who desire this help.

Announced the request of legislation to permit the military services to retain for treatment narcotic addicts due for discharge.

Described the authority of the Director of the Special Action Office to refer patients to private and Veterans' Administration hospitals as circumstances require.

Described authority to be sought by the Special Action Office to make VA facilities available for drug rehabilitation to all former servicemen regardless of the nature of their discharge.

Asked Congress to increase the present VA budget by \$14 million to permit immediate initiation of the program.

The President also announced a request to Congress to amend the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to broaden the authority for use of methadone maintenance programs under rigid standards.

He also instructed Dr. Jaffe to review immediately all Federal laws pertaining to rehabilitation and announces he will submit any legislation needed to expedite the Federal rehabilitative role and correct overlapping authorities.

EDUCATION

An additional \$10 million to increase and improve education and training in the field of dangerous drugs.

ENFORCEMENT

To expedite the prosecution of narcotics cases, legislation will be sought permitting the Government to utilize information obtained by foreign police and also will request legislation to permit a chemist to submit written findings of his analysis in drug cases in order to speed the process of criminal justice.

Dangerous drugs and narcotics enforcement are to be stepped up with requests to Congress for; \$2 million for research and development of equipment and detection techniques; authorization and funding of 325 added positions in the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs; supplemental appropriations of \$25.6 million for the Treasury Department—about \$7.5 million for intensified investigation of large-scale traffickers; approximately \$18 million for Bureau of Customs investigation and inspection efforts and for the pursuit and apprehension of smugglers.

NARCOTIC-PRODUCING PLANTS

The President announced a request for \$2 million for the Department of Agriculture for research and development of herbicides to destroy growths of natural narcotics-producing plants without adverse ecological effect.

INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS

The President initiated a worldwide escalation of existing efforts along with new steps to secure international cooperation to control narcotics traffic.

Measures include; a request to the Director General of the World Health Organization to appoint a study panel on synthetics to replace opiates; a request for \$1 million for assistance to developed nations in training enforcement officers; a request to Congress to amend and approve foreign assistance acts permitting assistance to Communist countries presently ineligible for aid in ending drug trafficking; a request to the Senate to promptly ratify the Convention on Psychotropic Substances recently signed by the United States and 22 other nations; a request to Congress to make additional contributions, as needed, to the United Nations Special Fund on the world drug problem; the urging of multilateral support for amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotics enabling the International Narcotics Control Board to acquire narcotics information, conduct inquiries on drug activities, and requiring signatories to embargo the export and/or import of drugs to or from a particular country failing to meet its obligations under the Convention.

Finally, the President directed that research efforts in the United States be intensified to develop a feasible substitute for codeine.

NEED FOR TIMELY ACTION

In introducing this legislation today, I am joined in a totally bipartisan effort with some of my most esteemed colleagues, among them Senators McCLELLAN, RIBICOFF, JAVITS, SCOTT, ALLEN, GURNEY, SARBEE, BYRD of West Virginia, BEALL, BROCK, CHILES, JACKSON, MATHIAS, MUSKIE, and ROTH. I am certain that many other Senators will want to join in this critical effort.

I would also like to point out how grateful I am that the problem of drug abuse has surfaced as a concern of all Americans. No small thanks is due to the tireless efforts of the junior Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) and the distinguished members of his Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics who have devoted countless hours to this matter.

I commend the President for his foresight and initiative in addressing this problem. I look forward to quick action in the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, in reporting out a bill that incorporates whatever refinements or additions are deemed appropriate. As the President stated:

Time is critical. Every day we lose compounds the tragedy which drugs inflict on individual Americans. The final issue is not whether we will conquer drug abuse, but how soon. Part of this answer lies with the Congress now and the speed with which it moves to support the struggle against drug abuse.

As a final thought, we now are all too aware of the pervasive extent of heroin traffic among our GI's stationed in Vietnam. It is fatuous to speak of the drug problem without alluding to the hellish contribution of that war to the problem. But let us turn now from a war that we do not want, to a segment of society that we do so earnestly want. That we want to help.

We must redirect our attention and our energies and our moneys, let us lose our most cherished asset—lest we lose

our youth not only to the hateful clash of war, but also to the pitiful whimper of despair.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention be printed in the RECORD, to be followed by a section-by-section analysis of its provisions. I also ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article to which I earlier referred, describing the work of Dr. Jaffe, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and material were ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

S. 2097

A bill to establish a special action office for drug abuse prevention to concentrate the resources of the Nation in a crusade against drug abuse.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds—

(1) that drug abuse is rapidly increasing in the United States and now afflicts urban, suburban, and rural areas of this Nation;

(2) that drug abuse contributes to crime, particularly to crimes of violence;

(3) that the adverse impact of drug abuse inflicts increasing pain and hardship on individuals, families, and communities;

(4) that for these reasons the increasing rate of drug abuse constitutes a threat to national health and welfare and an emergency requiring immediate and effective Federal Government response.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to focus the comprehensive resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on drug addiction and drug abuse with the immediate objective of promptly and significantly reducing the incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse in the Nation within the shortest possible period of time.

(b) To accomplish these objectives (1) all Federal drug abuse prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, training, education, and research activities will be placed under the direction and policy-setting of a new Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, established in the Executive Office of the President; and (2) major drug abuse programs will be centrally developed, funded, managed, and evaluated to achieve maximum effectiveness.

SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President, an office to be known as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the Office).

(b) There shall be at the head of the Office a Director of the Office (hereinafter referred to as the Director). He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the rate now or hereafter provided for Level III of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5314).

(c) There shall be in the Office a Deputy Director of the Office who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the rate now or hereafter provided for Level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315). The Deputy Director shall perform such functions as the Director from time to time assigns or delegates, and shall act as Director during the

absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

(d) There shall be in the Office not to exceed three Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the Director and shall be compensated at the rate now or hereafter provided for Level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316). Each Assistant Director shall perform such functions as the Director from time to time assigns or delegates.

CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall provide overall planning and policy, and shall establish objectives and priorities, for all Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment programs and activities (exclusive of law enforcement activities and legal proceedings).

(b) In addition, the Director shall provide overall planning, policy, direction, management, and funding for all Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment programs and activities (exclusive of law enforcement activities and legal proceedings) conducted pursuant to the authorities described in subsection (c) (1) of this section and programs and activities designated by the President pursuant to subsection (c) (2) of this section.

(c) As used in subsection (b) of this section and all subsequent provisions of this Act, the term "Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment programs and activities" means—

(1) All such programs and activities (exclusive of law enforcement activities and legal proceedings) conducted pursuant to the following-described provisions of law:

(A) The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966;

(B) Part D and Part E (to the extent that such Parts pertain to drug abuse) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act;

(C) Title I of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970;

(D) Section 502(a) (1) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, to the extent that it pertains to public education not involving law enforcement;

(E) The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970;

(F) Section 222(a) (9) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and all other provisions of that Act to the extent that they pertain to drug abuse;

(G) Section 306(a) (2) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to the extent that it pertains to drug abuse;

(H) The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, to the extent that it pertains to drug abuse;

(I) The Public Health Service Act, to the extent it pertains to drug abuse; and

(J) Title 38 of the United States Code, to the extent it pertains to drug abuse; and

(2) subject to the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of this section, such other Federal drug abuse related programs and activities (exclusive of law enforcement activities and legal proceedings) as the President may from time to time designate, including those which constitute a part of some larger program or activity.

(d) Whenever a designation is proposed pursuant to subsection (c) (2) of this section, a notice thereof shall be transmitted to the Congress. Such designation shall become effective on the thirtieth day (exclusive of periods of adjournment or recess of either the House or the Senate in excess of three days) following such transmittal, but only to the extent that, between the date of transmittal of the proposed designation and such effective date—

(1) there has not been enacted into law a statute which otherwise deals with the program involved;

(2) neither House of the Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves the designation involved.

(c) Any such designation by the President may, in accordance with the designation notice transmitted to the Congress, be made operative on a date later than the date on which that designation otherwise would have taken effect.

AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 6. (a) In carrying out his functions with respect to the programs and activities covered under section 5(b) of this Act, the Director shall—

(1) prescribe policies, requirements, criteria and standards, regulations, and procedures for the administration and management of such programs and activities;

(2) prepare budget requests for such programs and activities;

(3) determine priorities for the use of funds for such programs and activities;

(4) make funds available for program implementation to Federal departments and agencies and establish an implementation plan for each program setting forth policies, procedures, performance requirements, manpower levels, key personnel qualifications, time schedules, and other requirements;

(5) maintain overall supervision of such programs and activities and evaluate the performance and results achieved by the Federal departments and agencies, and recommend organizational, managerial, personnel, and program changes whenever he deems such changes to be advisable;

(6) take such steps as may be necessary to evaluate and assure the most effective utilization of all drug abuse programs and activities conducted by Federal departments and agencies, and by public or private agencies and organizations engaged in such activities under Federal grants or other assistance; and

(7) strengthen coordination among Federal departments and agencies engaged in non-law enforcement efforts involving drug abuse prevention and control, and assure that those nonlaw enforcement efforts are coordinated with related law enforcement efforts being conducted by other Federal departments and agencies.

(b) (1) The Director may, with the approval of the President (A) exercise any powers or perform any functions conferred by any of the statutory provisions enumerated in section 5(c) (1), or any statutory provisions relating to programs and activities designated by the President pursuant to section 5(c) (2), or (B) provide for their exercise or performance by an officer of any Federal department or agency other than the department or agency on whom such powers or functions are conferred by such provisions.

(2) To the extent that the Director or his designee exercises any powers or performs any function pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Director or his designee, as the case may be, may exercise in relation to those powers and functions any related authority or part thereof available by law, including appropriation acts, to the official or agency from which such power or functions were derived.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by the Director, no Federal officer, department or agency shall be deemed to be relieved of any responsibility that such officer, department, or agency may have had on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment.

(d) The Director may require departments and agencies engaged in any activity involving Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment to provide him with such information and reports, and to conduct on a reimbursable basis such studies and surveys,

as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act.

(e) Nothing in the foregoing provisions of this Act shall be construed as authorizing or permitting the Director to waive or disregard any requirement, including standards, criteria, or cost-sharing formulae, prescribed by law with respect to Federal drug abuse programs or activities.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to any public or non-profit private agency, organization, or institution and to enter into contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, or with any individual—

(1) to develop and demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation;

(2) to evaluate those new approaches, techniques, and methods;

(3) to foster the establishment of new or expanded drug abuse programs and activities;

(4) to acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate, or maintain facilities, and to acquire and improve real property, necessary to the establishment or maintenance of drug abuse programs and activities; and

(5) to otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director may require the recipients of a grant or contract under this section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the program and activity for which such grant or contract was made.

(c) Payments under this section pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made over-payments or under-payments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Director may determine.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal department or agency (including the Veterans Administration) may enter into grant or contractual arrangements with the Director and pursuant to such a grant or contractual arrangement, may exercise any authority or use any personnel or facilities otherwise available to such department or agency for the performance by it of related functions.

PERSONNEL—SPECIAL PERSONNEL—EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

SEC. 8 (a) The Director may, subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him and to prescribe their functions.

(b) The Director may, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, select, appoint, and employ not to exceed five officers and to fix their compensation at rates not to exceed the rate now or hereafter prescribed for GS-18 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

(c) The Director may obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of Title 5 of the United States Code, at rates not to exceed the rate now or hereafter prescribed for GS-18 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) The President may authorize any person who, immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act, held a position in the executive branch of the Government to act as the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention until the Office of Director is for the first time filled pursuant to the provisions of this Act or

by recess appointment, as the case may be.

(b) The President may similarly authorize any such person to act as Deputy Director.

(c) The President may authorize any person who serves in an acting capacity under the foregoing provisions of this section to receive the compensation attached to the office in respect of which he so serves. Such compensation, if authorized, shall be in lieu of, but not in addition to, other compensation from the United States to which such person may be entitled.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 10. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized to provide for the transfer to the Office of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available or hereafter made available for Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, treatment programs and activities, as he may deem to be appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Any of those sums may be appropriated without regard to fiscal year limitations.

JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where funds are made available by more than one Federal agency to be used by an agency, organization, institution, or individual to carry out a Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, or treatment program or activity, any one of the Federal agencies providing funds may be designated by the Director to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined in such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

VOLUNTARY SERVICE

SEC. 13. The Director is authorized to accept and employ in furtherance of the purpose of the Act or any Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, or treatment program or activity, voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 (b) of the Revised Statute (31 U.S.C. 665 (b)).

EFFECTIVE AND TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 14 (a) The provisions of this Act shall take effect thirty days after the Director or Acting Director first takes office or on such earlier date as the President may prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, except that any of the officers provided for in section 4 of this Act may be nominated and appointed and any of the interim officers provided for by section 9 may be authorized to serve, at any time after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) This Act shall terminate on June 30, 1974, unless extended by the President, in which case it shall expire on June 30, 1976, or such earlier date after June 30, 1974, as the President may prescribe and publish in the Federal Register.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

A bill to establish a Special Action Office for drug abuse prevention

FINDINGS

Sec. 2. Sets forth the reasons for concern about the problems of drug abuse and its threat to National health and safety.

PURPOSE

Sec. 3. Cites the need for creation of a new project office to plan, fund, manage programs and activities of drug abuse prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, training, education and research.

SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Sec. 4. (a) Establishes the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

Sec. 4. (b) Designates a Director to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Sec. 4. (c) Designates a Deputy Director, also appointed by the President who will be the "alter ego" of the Director.

Sec. 4. (d) Three Assistant Directors are authorized to be appointed by the Director to senior positions in the management of the office.

CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT

Sec. 5. (a) Establishes the overall authority of the Director for overall planning, policy-setting, objectives and priorities for all Federal domestic programs of drug abuse excluding law enforcement activities. Note the international aspects of drug abuse are also excluded.

Sec. 5. (b) Specifies that in addition to the overall planning and policy role described in 5(a), the Director will also assume direct management authority over certain major drug abuse programs undertaken under the authorities listed in Sec. 5(c)(1). This includes programs now in operation in departments and agencies, plus new programs, which may be initiated under these authorities to meet future program needs.

Sec. 5. (b) (2) Establishes general authority to assume management of any other drug abuse programs the President may designate.

Sec. 5. (d) Where a new program not covered by the authorities of Sec. 5(c)(1) is proposed, a notice will be transmitted to the Congress. The designation will become effective after 30 days if neither House of the Congress enacts legislation disapproving the designation.

Sec. 5. (e) Specifies that the actual start of operations of a newly designated program may be delayed beyond the date on which it might otherwise have taken. This assures that transfers of operations can be made when the action office is ready to assume responsibility.

AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

Sec. 6. (a) Details the specific authorities to be exercised by the Director for those programs and activities over which he assumes management authority under the provisions listed in Sec. 5(b) of this Act. By means of an Implementation Plan, the Action Office and each implementing agency will agree on the terms and conditions of operation. The Director can then evaluate the performance of each program to determine whether the implementing agency is successfully meeting the necessary performance criteria. This critical provision is the most important means available to the Director to assure compliance with program objectives.

Sec. 6. (b) Specifies that the Director is authorized to exercise any of the authorities specified in Sec. 5(c)(1) directly or to assign them to any Federal agency. Thus, a program which is not being properly carried out in one agency may be reassigned to another agency for implementation.

Sec. 6. (c) Points out that the existence of the special action office does not relieve other agencies of the need to carry out drug abuse programs which meet their broad responsibilities.

Sec. 6. (d) Allows the Director to obtain necessary reports, surveys, studies or other information from agencies which have such data of value to the Special Action Office.

Sec. 6. (e) Retains such things as standards,

criteria, cost-sharing formulae or other regulations which otherwise govern the conduct of drug abuse activities.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Sec. 7. (a) Authorizes the Director to give grants and make contracts for drug abuse activities. This authority is in addition to authority to carry out programs by agreement with other agencies as provided in Sec. 5 and 6. It includes authority to let grants to states and local governments and provide the Director with alternative ways of carrying out programs where urgency, cost, special skills or other factors dictate.

Sec. 7. (b) Provides that the Director may require sharing of costs of drug abuse programs.

Sec. 7. (c) Allows for advance payments or installments as matters of administrative convenience in expediting grant or contract business.

Sec. 7. (d) Provides that the Director enter into grant or contract arrangements for necessary drug abuse program activity even where other laws or regulations might otherwise rule out these arrangements. This provision allows other agencies to accept these arrangements under specifications established by the Special Action Office and to use personnel and facilities otherwise available to carry out these arrangements.

PERSONNEL-SPECIAL PERSONNEL-EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

Sec. 8. (a) Allows the Director to employ a staff of civil service personnel under regular civil service laws and regulations.

Sec. 8. (b) Permits the hiring of five key executive people and fixing of their compensation at rates not to exceed that of a GS-18. This permits special flexibility in hiring a small number of special technical or management people.

Sec. 8. (c) Allows the use of consultants at rates not to exceed that for GS-18's.

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 9. (a) (b) Provides for designation of Federal officials as acting Director and deputy director until these offices are filled for the first time.

Sec. 9. (c) Provides full compensation for acting officials.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Sec. 10. Provides for orderly transfer of funds to the Special Action Office on assumption of program and budget responsibility.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 11. Provides for authorization of appropriations and for the appropriation of "no year" funds as an important element of budget flexibility for the office.

JOINT FUNDING

Sec. 12. Permits joint funding by more than one agency of drug abuse programs and activities, including a portion of non-Federal funds, and permits waiver of inconsistent technical regulations and requirements.

VOLUNTARY SERVICE

Sec. 13. Allows the Director to accept the services of volunteers.

EFFECTIVE AND TERMINATION DATE

Sec. 14. (a) Provides for the office to start operations 30 days after the Director takes office. This precludes the office being forced to operate without a head, and allows the Director some time to make appropriate preparations.

Sec. 14. (b) Provides that the office will be temporary, operating for a period of three years unless the President chooses to extend its life for an additional two years at his discretion.

Herbert Jaffe was asked today just after President Nixon named him to head a new White House office on drug abuse control. "With the same unrealistic optimism with which I dealt with Illinois bureaucracy," the doctor replied. When he arrived in Illinois in 1966 from the Bronx, there wasn't a single state-supported bed for the treatment of drug addicts in Illinois. The first year he got 300 beds. Now there are 1,800.

Thirty-seven years old and even younger in appearance, Dr. Jaffe is an unpretentious, humorous man who affects outrageous ties, including the psychedelic one he wore to the White House today. He takes on big jobs in a cool, offhand way.

His wife, the former Faith Kessel of Philadelphia, likes to tell how he got into medicine. In high school in Philadelphia, he recalls, he was surrounded by so many bright and ambitious boys that he decided that, given the heavy competition, he would become a car mechanic.

"But his family decided otherwise," she said. "They persuaded him to apply for admission at Temple University, and he says he agreed because the application was only one page long and the college was only two stops away on the streetcar."

Four years later he graduated first in a class of a thousand, although he had to finance his medical studies with two jobs, as a short order cook in a diner and playing the string bass in a band.

Throughout his earlier school years he had worked during his spare time in the grocery on the Lower East Side of New York run by his father, an immigrant from Lithuania.

From college days until the present, Jerome Jaffe has been working overtime. He has no hobbies, takes no exercise, brings work home with him at night, never smokes, and takes a drink only out of social courtesy.

Dr. Jaffe spent five years at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, first as postdoctoral fellow, later as resident in psychiatry, assistant professor of pharmacology and instructor in the department of psychiatry. Then he was invited to become assistant professor in the department of psychiatry of the University of Chicago.

"I was looking forward to some quiet laboratory work and animal research," he recalls. But the lab was not ready yet, and he filled in the time by drawing up a program for drug abuse control in the State of Illinois. To his surprise Gov. Otto Kerner asked him to put the program into effect.

Today he takes no individual patients, but "I began directly taking care of people, and I didn't forget," he observes. "Every day, I talk to people who have been through our program—drivers, stockmen, all kinds, many of whom want to get relatives into treatment."

"Above all," his wife says, "he is a humane man. He keeps up with friends who date back to high school."

In Chicago the Jaffes live in a big, comfortable, old Tudor house on the South Side because it is only five minutes from the University of Chicago and he has never lived farther than that from his place of work.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 2098. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMPUTATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS BASED UPON COMBINED EARNINGS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill on behalf of the junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and to have a statement by the distinguished

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1971]
 DRUG ABUSE FIGHTER: JEROME HERBERT JAFFE
 WASHINGTON.—"How do you expect to deal with Washington bureaucracy?" Dr. Jerome

The objective of the new policy is to induce foreign concerns to take the Antidumping Act into account before they engage in sales to the United States.

The 25 Percent Rule

The Antidumping Act provides that in normal situations fair value shall be determined by comparing the ex factory home market price of the merchandise under investigation with the ex factory price at which the merchandise is sold in the United States. If the price in the United States is less than the home market price, then there are "sales at less than fair value" within the meaning of the statute.

The Act also states that in situations where the quantity of merchandise sold in the home market is so small in relation to the quantity sold for exportation to countries other than the United States as to form an inadequate basis for comparison, then third country price should be used as the basis for comparison.

The Antidumping Regulations provide that generally for purposes of determining what constitutes an "inadequate basis of comparison" for fair value purposes, home market sales will be considered to be inadequate if less than 25 percent of the non-U.S. sales of the merchandise are sold in the home market.

The selection of home market or third country price for fair value comparison can easily be crucial to the results of antidumping investigations, for frequently home market price tends to be higher than third country price. This is particularly true where merchandise is sold in a protected home market and, when sold in third countries, is exposed to the vagaries of world competition.

It has been Treasury's experience that cases arise where sales in the home market are adequate as a basis for fair value comparison, even though less than 25 percent of the non-U.S. sales are sold in the home market. From a technical standpoint, the existing regulations provide for this situation, since the 25 percent rule is introduced by the adverb "Generally." Examination of the precedents, however, revealed that the Treasury has not, in recent years at least, made an exception in applying the 25 percent rule.

This left the Treasury with two alternatives. It could have ignored the previous interpretations of the Antidumping Regulations which had, in effect, applied the regulations as if the word "Generally" were not there, or it could propose a change in the Antidumping Regulations to eliminate the 25 percent rule. We chose the latter course. The proposal was published in the Federal Register of April 27, and is currently open for comment by interested persons. Any comments received will be carefully considered before we take final action on this proposal.

A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

In my judgment, we have only come to the end of the beginning of the rejuvenation process. But, I believe we have made a solid start.

Let me take a final brief moment to touch upon what I see happening in the future. We have taken steps to initiate a fresh examination of the Treasury's antidumping procedures and regulations to see what more can be done. The regulations were substantially revised in mid-1968 after a broad review, with the dual objectives of conforming to the Treasury's procedures to the requirements of the International Anti-Dumping Code, and also of having the regulations implemented in clear and precise language the objectives of the Antidumping Act. With almost three additional years of experience under the regulations, as then revised, it is now appropriate to stop and take a new look to see whether additional changes may be appropriate. A Notice of Proposed Rule Making to this effect was published in the Federal Register of April 13, 1971.

Sixty days are being allowed for the submission of comments. I would assume that many persons present here today—if you are not already aware of the Treasury's invitation to submit comments—may wish to do so.

Let me emphasize that the Treasury Department continues, as always, to adhere to its policy of equitable administration of the Antidumping Act. With the increased personnel assigned to this field and modernized procedures and policies, we shall speed up antidumping investigations, thereby making administration of the law more effective—all this without sacrificing equity.

Let me also emphasize that the Treasury Department and the Administration are strongly opposed to having the Antidumping Act transformed into an instrument of protectionism. On the other hand, we are equally strongly opposed to allowing foreign firms to injure U.S. industry by unfair price discrimination. It is with the latter objective in mind that the Treasury Department introduced the changes in the administration of the Antidumping law, which I have discussed with you today. To the extent that we succeed in our objective, the Treasury's rejuvenation of the Antidumping Act will become an increasingly important influence in favor of a freer international trade policy.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat a statement made by Secretary Connally on May 17 before the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Senate Committee on Finance:

"The efforts to foster increased competitiveness in our economy must be actively pursued in the context of fair and liberal trading arrangements."

RAMPARTS MAGAZINE MISREPRESENTS ROLE OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY IN FIGHTING AGAINST IMPORTATION OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently Ramparts magazine published an article which, like so many other articles which appear in new left publications, attempted to discredit established agencies of the Government, including the Central Intelligence Agency. Unfortunately, the Stanford Daily, the newspaper published by students at Stanford University, saw fit to lend credibility to this article by reprinting it.

A tearsheet from the Stanford Daily was sent to me by a constituent and I submitted it to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs with a request for comment. Under date of May 27 I received a reply from Mr. John E. Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. His letter should be brought to the attention of all responsible Members of Congress and the press since it certainly contradicts the implications contained in the Ramparts magazine article. Mr. Ingersoll's response follows:

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: This is in response to your letter of May 21, 1971, which enclosed a tearsheet from the "Standard Daily" (a publication of Stanford Univer-

sity) of the article entitled, "The New Opium War," as reprinted from "Ramparts Magazine."

Charges made in the article appear to be a part of a continuing effort to discredit agencies of the U.S. Government, such as the U.S. Military, the FBI, the CIA, and the Department of State, all of which are, in point of fact, working actively with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) in our worldwide effort to curtail international drug traffic.

Actually, CIA has for sometime been this Bureau's strongest partner in identifying foreign sources and routes of illegal trade in narcotics. Their help has included both direct support in intelligence collection, as well as in intelligence analysis and production. Liaison between our two agencies is close and constant in matters of mutual interest. Much of the progress we are now making in identifying overseas narcotics traffic can, in fact, be attributed to CIA cooperation.

In Burma, Laos, and Thailand, opium is produced by tribal peoples, some of whom lead a marginal existence beyond the political reach of their national governments. Since the 1950's, this Southeast Asian area has become a massive producer of illicit opium and is the source of 500 to 700 metric tons annually, which is about half of the world's illegal supply. Up to now, however, less than ten percent of the heroin entering the United States comes from Far Eastern production.

The dimensions of the drug problem and the absence of any strong political base for control purposes has been a dilemma for United Nations opium control bodies operating in Southeast Asia for many years. Drug traffic, use, and addiction appears to have become accepted as a fact of life in this area and, on the whole, public attitudes are not conducive to change.

The U.S. Government has been concerned that Southeast Asia could become the major source of illicit narcotics for U.S. addicts after the Turkish production is brought under control. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, with the help of CIA, DoD, and the Department of State, has been working to define and characterize the problem so that suitable programs to suppress the illicit traffic and eliminate illegal opium production, such as the proposed United Nations pilot project in Thailand, can be implemented.

It is probable that opium production in Southeast Asia will be brought under effective control only with further political development in these countries. Nevertheless, in consideration of U.S. Military personnel in the area, as well as the possibility that opium from this area may become a source for domestic consumption, concerned U.S. Agencies, including CIA, Bureau of Customs, DoD, and State, are cooperating with BNDD to work out programs to meet the immediate problem as well as provide longer term solutions.

Since the subject matter of your letter concerns CIA, I have taken the liberty of furnishing a copy along with my reply to Director Richard Helms.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. INGERSOLL,
Director.

As an enclosure to his letter, Mr. Ingersoll included a paper entitled "Recent Trends in the Illicit Narcotics Market in Southeast Asia." This should also be of interest to every person who is concerned about this problem and I therefore include the text herewith:

RECENT TRENDS IN THE ILLICIT NARCOTICS MARKET IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

1. The reported increasing incidence of heroin addiction among U.S. servicemen in Vietnam and recent intelligence indicating that heroin traffic between Southeast Asia

June 2, 1971

and the United States may also be increasing suggest that Southeast Asia is growing in importance as a producer of heroin. While this phenomenon in part reflects improvement in information available in recent months to the U.S. Government, there are also good indications that production of illicit narcotics in Southeast Asia has indeed risen in 1971.

BACKGROUND

2. The Burma, Laos, Thailand border area, known also as the "Golden Triangle," is considered one of the world's largest opium producing regions. This region normally accounts for about 700 tons of opium annually or about one-half of the world's total illicit output. A substantial proportion is consumed within the region. Burma, by far the largest producer of opium in this region, accounts for about 400 tons annually.

BURMA

3. Production in Burma is concentrated in the Eastern and Northern parts of Shan State and in the Southwestern part of Kachin State. Poppy fields cover the rugged slopes in Eastern Shan State around Keng Tung and in Northern Shan State from Lashio east and north to the China border. The latter territory, comprised of the former Wa and Kokang feudal states, is now a center of insurgency directed against the Burmese government, with much of the area under insurgent control.

4. The growing season varies with the altitude, but the planting season generally falls during the months of August and September, with the harvest some seven months later during February and March. At harvest time the women of the hill tribes slit the poppies and collect the raw opium by hand. The opium plants themselves are ground into a compound for smoking. In Northeast Burma, the raw opium is packed by the growers and traded to itinerant Chinese merchants who transport it to major collection points, particularly around Lashio and Keng Tung. Agents of the major entrepreneurs circulate through the hill country shortly after harvest time arranging for payment and pickup. Payment is often in the form of weapons and ammunition, although gold and silver rupees are also used.

5. The opium harvested in Shan, Wa, and Kokang areas is picked up by caravans that are put together by the major insurgent leaders in these areas. The caravans, which can include up to 600 horses and donkeys and 300 to 400 men, take the opium on the southeasterly journey to the processing plants that lie along the Mekong River in the Tachilek (Burma)-Mae Sai (Thailand)-Ben Houei Sai (Laos) area. Caravans carrying in excess of 16 metric tons have been reported.

THAILAND

6. Opium-growing areas in northern Thailand are located in the upland tracts occupied by various tribal groups. The provinces of Ching Mai, Chiang Rai, and Nan, which have the largest concentration of Meos, produce most Thai opium. Illicit opium production in Thailand is estimated at 200 tons.

LAOS

7. Another, less productive, opium growing area is along the 2,500 to 4,500 foot high mountainsides of Northwest Laos. The opium cultivated by the Meo in this area is of a relatively lower grade and thus less suitable for refinement into morphine base or heroin. In these areas where the tribesmen have been encouraged to grow corn, the poppies are planted among the corn. When the corn is cut, the poppies continue to grow until they too can be harvested.

8. Major producing areas include Phong Saly Province in the North, Houa Phan (Samneua) Province in the Northeast, and the Plaine de Jarres area of Xiang Khoang Province in the East-central part of the

country. However, large areas of production in Phong Saly, Houa Phan, and Xiang Khoang have fallen under the control of the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese.

9. The trade in Northwest Laos is less well structured and organized for significant commercial exploitation. There are no advance purchasing agents or pick-up caravans. The harvested opium and the poppy plants which are ground up for smoking are transported to nearby village markets by the growers themselves. In highland market places the raw opium and its by-product are used openly as currency. Ethnic Chinese merchants are the traditional purchasers of the opium products throughout Laos. The products they collect are transported to population centers and also to processing plants along the Mekong River by travelers, particularly government soldiers, who have the most mobility and access to air travel in the area, and refugees. Opium produced in the Communist-controlled areas also find its way into the regular marketing channels.

DISTRIBUTION AND REFINERIES

10. The KMT irregular "armies" and the Burmese Self Defense Forces (KKY) are the most important trafficking syndicates in Northern Southeast Asia. The KMT irregulars—formerly the remnants of the Chinese Nationalist forces which retreated across the Chinese border in 1949—now composed largely of recruits from the local population, have a combined strength of between 4,000 and 6,000 well-armed men. The largest force, with an estimated strength of 1,400 to 1,900, is the Fifth Army. The second largest with a troop strength of between 1,200 and 1,700 is the Third Army. The headquarters of both armies are located in a remote part of Northern Thailand between Fang and Mae Sai. It is estimated that these two KMT irregular forces control more than 80 percent of the opium traffic from the Shan State.

11. The KKY have been major competitors of the KMT irregulars in the opium trade. The KKY are comprised of former Shan State insurgents and bandits who have allied themselves with the Burmese government against both the KMT and Chinese Communist-backed insurgents. In return the government of Burma allowed them to pursue their opium trafficking activities.

12. The Shan States Army, an insurgent group, is also heavily involved in the opium business. It maintains several camps in Northern Thailand where opium is marketed for weapons and military supplies.

13. About 140 tons of raw opium is normally transported annually out of Northeast Burma to foreign markets. Most of this opium is stored or processed in the Mekong River tri-border area before transiting Thailand and Laos. Tachilek, Burma is probably the most important transshipment point in the border area. In 1970, out of a total of 123 tons reportedly shipped out of Northeast Burma, 45 tons was received in the Tachilek area. In the first two months of 1971, 58 out of a total of 87 tons had Tachilek as its destination. Other important transshipment points appear to be located in the vicinity of Ban Houei Sai, Laos, and Mae Salong, Thailand.

14. There appear to be at least 21 opium refineries of various sizes and capacities located in the tri-border area, of which about 7 are believed to be able to process to the heroin stage. The most important are located in the areas around Tachilek, Burma, Ban Houei Sai and Nam Keung, Laos, and Mae Salong, Thailand. The best known, if not largest of these refineries is the one at Ban Houei Tap, Laos, near Ban Houei Sai which is believed capable of processing some 100 kilos of raw opium per day. The 14 refineries in the Tachilek area apparently process the largest volume of raw opium in the region. In 1970, about 90 tons was converted by the Tachilek refineries into refined opium, morphine base, and heroin.

15. The typical refinery is on a small tributary of the Mekong River in an isolated area with a military defense perimeter guarding all ground approaches. Most of these refineries operate under the protection of the various military organizations in the region, or are owned or managed by the leaders of these military groups. The KKY units protect and operate most of the refineries in Burma. Leaders of these groups also hold an ownership interest in many of these facilities. In Thailand, the refineries appear to be operated by units of the KMT irregulars, whereas in Laos, most of the refineries operate under the protection of elements of the Royal Laotian Armed Forces (FAR). While the management and ownership of the Laotian refineries appear to be primarily in the hands of a consortium of Chinese, some reports suggest that a senior FAR officer may hold an ownership interest in a few of these facilities.

16. Most of the narcotics buyers in the tri-border area are ethnic Chinese. While many of these buyers pool their purchases, no large syndicate appears to be involved. The opium, morphine base, and heroin purchased in this area eventually finds its way into Bangkok, Vientiane, and Luang Prabang, where additional processing may take place before delivery to Saigon, Hong Kong, and other international markets.

17. Much of the opium and its derivatives transiting Thailand from Burma moves out of such Northern Thai towns as Chiang Rai, Chiang Mai, Lampang, or Tak by various modes of ground and water transport. These narcotics, along with those produced in Thailand, are smuggled into Bangkok for further refinement into morphine or heroin. A considerable quantity of the raw opium and morphine base is sent by fishing trawler from Bangkok to Hong Kong during a period from about 1 January to 1 May. During this period, approximately one fishing trawler a day—carrying one to three tons of opium and/or quantities of morphine base—leaves Bangkok for Hong Kong. The boats proceed to the vicinity of the Chinese Communist-controlled Lema Islands—15 miles south of Hong Kong—where the goods are loaded into Hong Kong junks.

18. Opium and its derivatives which move through Laos are transferred from the Mekong River refineries by river craft and FAR vehicles to Ban Houei Sai, further downstream on the Mekong in Laos, from where it is transported on Royal Laotian Air Force (RLAF) aircraft to Luang Prabang or Vientiane. From Vientiane narcotics are usually sent via RLAF aircraft, as well as Air Laos, to other cities in Laos such as Savannakhet or Pakse or to international markets. A considerable portion of the Laotian produced narcotics is smuggled into Saigon on military and commercial air flights, particularly on Royal Air Laos and Air Vietnam. Although collusion between crew members and air line agents on one hand and individual narcotics smugglers on the other has been reported, poor handling of commercial cargo and the laxity of Lao customs control in Vientiane and other surreptitious loading of narcotics aboard commercial flights.

RECENT CHANGES IN THE AREA

19. There are tentative indications that larger quantities of raw opium may now be moving into the tri-border area for refining and that larger quantities of this raw opium are now being refined into morphine base and heroin in this area. As suggested in paragraph 13 above, data on the first two months of 1971 indicate that the Tachilek transshipment and refining area may be receiving and processing sizably larger amounts of raw opium than was the case in 1970. As for changes in the type of refined narcotics produced, the processing plants at Mae Haw in Thailand and Houei Tap in Laos now appear

to be converting most of their opium into No. 4 or 96 percent pure white heroin. Previously, these refineries tended to produce refined opium, morphine base and No. 3 smoking heroin. An increased demand for No. 4 heroin also appears to be reflected in the steady rise in its price. For example, the mid-April 1971 price in the Tachilek area for a kilo of No. 4 heroin was reported to be U.S. \$1,780 as compared to U.S. \$1,240 in September 1970. Some of this increase may also reflect a tight supply situation in the area because of a shortage of chemicals used in the processing of heroin. Rising prices for opium and its derivatives can also be seen in other areas of Southeast Asia.

20. The establishment of new refineries since 1969 in the tri-border area, many with a capability for producing 96 percent pure heroin, appears to be due to the sudden increase in demand by a large and relatively affluent market in South Vietnam. A recent report pertaining to the production of morphine base in the Northern Shan States would indicate a possible trend toward vertical integrations—producing areas establishing their own refineries—in the production of narcotics. Such a development would significantly facilitate transportation and distribution of refined narcotics to the market places.

HOW FAIR THE FARE?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, representatives of U.S. transatlantic airlines are going to Montreal later this month to negotiate air fares—actually the word should be to “fix” air fares, for the competing carriers meet in private to decide the rates they all will charge.

The prices are fixed by the International Air Transport Association. Frances Cerra, Newsday's consumer writer, has aptly described IATA as “a cartel which operates without the participation of consumers and above the laws of the United States and any international organization.”

The position of the American carriers is thrashed out by the airlines and the Civil Aeronautics Board in secret sessions. The people who must pay the fares will be given no opportunity to participate or express their views; after all, they have little choice: only one or two transatlantic airlines land in the United States that are not IATA members.

The Aviation Consumer Action Project has written to CAB Chairman Secor D. Browne protesting the lack of public participation in these proceedings. That letter said, in part:

Such practices on the part of a federal regulatory agency are hostile to elementary notions of due process and deprive citizens of basic participatory rights assured in the First Amendment.

I would like at this time to join them in urging an end to these secret meetings with the airlines in the course of fare negotiations.

So that all my colleagues may be aware of this situation, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the Aviation Consumer Action Project's letter to CAB Chairman Browne, and Miss Cerra's very

fine article on the setting of international air fares:

AVIATION CONSUMER ACTION PROJECT,

Washington, D.C., May 25, 1971.

HON. SECOR D. BROWNE,
Chairman,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BROWNE: The traffic conference of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) is scheduled to meet at Montreal on June 28, 1971, to negotiate transatlantic air fares. The Presidents of the transatlantic IATA carriers will meet in New York on May 27, 1971, to discuss the Montreal fares conference. And the Board, in accordance with its customary practice, will probably meet with the representatives of the U.S. carriers and discuss with them the various views and positions which they will adopt in the IATA negotiations at Montreal. All these meetings will, as usual, be held in secret. Members of the public and farepayers will not be given an opportunity to present their views and opinions in any of those meetings.

The Aviation Consumer Action Project (ACAP), is writing to express its deep resentment and disapproval of the restrictive price-fixing practices of IATA, and the Board's complicity in those practices.

ACAP is a non-profit consumer organization which has been founded for the purpose of providing an independent voice for the advocacy of consumer and environmental interests in matters and proceedings before the Board and other regulatory agencies.

Whatever may be the underlying reasons for the Board's approval of U.S. carriers' participation in IATA meetings, ACAP is of the opinion that there cannot be any justification for the Board's secret meeting with airline executives on the eve of the IATA conference. The issues raised by such a meeting are rendered all the more serious when the Board, on the exclusive basis of the airlines' *in camera* presentations, formulates policies and opinions with respect to the appropriate and permissible fare levels for various international routes and traffic regions. Such policies and opinions are communicated to the carriers by the Board in the form of “directives.” For all practical purposes these directives are informal decisions of the Board which tentatively set forth the fares that the Board considers reasonable and legal.

The Federal Aviation Act and the regulatory scheme outlined therein do not permit the Board to make *ex parte* decisions after hearing the airlines in closed sessions. Such practices on the part of a federal regulatory agency are hostile to elementary notions of due process and deprive citizens of basic participatory rights assured in the First Amendment. They are wholly inconsistent with the procedural principles embodied in the Administrative Procedure Act.

ACAP urges the Board not to engage in secret or private audiences with the airlines concerning fares or other matters to be negotiated in the IATA conference, except in open proceedings of record, in which all interested and affected parties would have the right to attend and lawfully participate. We urge the Board to abstain from convening any secret meeting with the airlines whether prior to or in the course of IATA fares negotiations.

Sincerely,

K. G. J. PILLAI,
REUBEN B. ROBERTSON III.

INTERNATIONAL FARES: ARE THEY SET FAIRLY?

(By Frances Cerra)

Unless you really dig bazonki music or care about the color scheme of a plane's interior, it doesn't pay to shop around for the cheapest flight to Athens. Whatever air-

line you choose, the flight will cost you \$555 round trip for a 17- to 28-day stay.

The same is true for Rome or Cairo or any other international destination except Luxembourg. (Icelandic, a maverick airline, flies there.) The prices are fixed by the International Air Transport Association, a cartel which operates without the participation of consumers and above the laws of the U.S. and any international organization. This year the price of international travel increased from eight to 12 per cent as a result of IATA agreements. Next month, the process of fixing the 1972 prices will begin, but a new element may be added: A new consumer group backed by Ralph Nader promises to challenge the IATA system in the courts.

Since its formation in 1929, IATA has been involved in the complicated maneuvers of international politics. Many governments in the world subsidize their own airlines and therefore want to be protected from true competition on air fares. These governments therefore adopt the IATA agreements as law and threaten to prosecute any foreign airline which tries to charge lower fares. Great Britain, which subsidizes BOAC, actually made such a threat against the U.S. airlines in 1963 when the Civil Aeronautics Board opposed a five per cent increase in air fares. Faced with this threat and an international incident, the CAB backed down.

Foreign governments also enforce the IATA agreements by another simple measure: They refuse to allow an airline that is not a member of the cartel to land in their countries. That is why Icelandic Airlines, the only non-member of IATA, can land only in Luxembourg. No other European country will give it landing rights.

A spokesman for Pan American, whose president, Najeeb E. Halaby, is on the executive committee of IATA, said that he would not call IATA agreements “price fixing,” but “an area of cooperation.”

“If there were not an area of cooperation,” he said, “many airlines would not be able to exist. The U.S. airlines in particular would have a hard time because they are not subsidized by the government. IATA makes for fair play, and without it there would be chaos.”

Herb Aswall, the acting chief of the IATA rates and fares section of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which sets domestic air fare rates, echoed Pan American's concern. “With 20 carriers flying the Atlantic alone,” he said, “to not have IATA would result in chaos because we would have to deal with each individual foreign government to establish fares. And because the CAB has no authority to regulate international fares, we might have to accept an uneconomic fares, which would drive an American carrier out of business.”

Dr. K. G. J. Pillai, author of a book on IATA called “Air Net,” and head of the new Aviation Consumer Action Project, calls such arguments illogical. “The private airlines are now at a disadvantage in IATA because they are negotiating as private concerns with government-owned airlines. That is exactly why we say IATA should not exist. If there were competition in air fares I personally don't think it would be very destructive because the efficient airlines would survive. But the alternative is for the U.S. government to directly represent the private airlines in these conferences.”

Pillai said that such negotiations would not be unusual for the government which now makes tariff and excise duty agreements on thousands of products like oil and textiles, and even airmail rates. “I can't understand why air fares should be different,” he said. Pillai said that if the government was involved in fixing the international air fares, the consumer would have a better chance of influencing the negotiations. Right now, he charges, the consumer has no chance of influencing IATA.

June 2, 1971

Pillai is particularly critical of the role of the CAB in the present system. The CAB has to give the American carriers permission to attend IATA meetings. Aswall, of the CAB, said that this process involves the submission by the airlines to the CAB of their thoughts on how next year's air fares should be set. The CAB, according to Aswall, then makes a public statement of what it believes the proper international air fares should be. The airlines are then supposed to be guided by this statement when they attend the IATA conferences.

Pillai said this process is "illegal." "There are secret meetings between the CAB and the senior vice presidents of the airlines," he charges, "which are completely illegal because the CAB does not have authority to hear the arguments of airlines *ex parte*, that is, without hearing the other side of the case." These meetings, he said, will begin next month, and Pillai plans to write to the CAB asking that these conferences not be held.

Later in the year, he said, the group will challenge the IATA air fares in court. The actual meetings of IATA are held in secret and no one but the airline executives are privy to how the fares are figured. Pillai argues that the CAB could break the cartel by simply not allowing the American carriers to attend the meetings. He says that foreign governments would not really carry out their threats of suits or of preventing an American plane from landing because they depend on American tourists for money. More than half of all international tourists are American.

Pillai believes that under the present system "many millions of dollars have been extracted from consumers in unnecessarily high air fares because of the reluctance of the government to get involved." Pillai said his group was started by Nader but is supported exclusively by contributions from consumers who want to help change the IATA system. The address of the Aviation Consumers Action Project, a nonprofit organization, is P.O. Box 19029, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ELDER CITIZENS DESERVE OUR GRATITUDE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the elder citizens of our land have worked and sacrificed to build America. They deserve to be thanked, not ignored. The extra years of life made possible by science must be made secure, productive, and independent. We cannot allow the older citizens of our society to live out their days in poverty, loneliness, and despair.

The Bureau of the Budget in its appropriations request for the Administration on Aging in fiscal year 1972 cut \$7 million from the amount of appropriations voted in fiscal year 1971. This would have forced serious cutbacks in the community programs and other projects. It is estimated that, if these cuts had been maintained, more than 125 senior centers in different sections of the country would have had to be closed. When all the facts came to light, President Nixon and Secretary Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare make a determination to ask for the restoration of the appropriation request to the fiscal year 1971 level and, indeed, to

increase the request by an additional \$3 million. The following table shows the result of the administration's action:

	Original fiscal year 1972 budget	Revised fiscal year 1972 budget	Net increase
Community programs...	\$5,350	\$9,000	\$3,650
Planning and operation...	4,000	4,000	-----
Model projects.....	4,000	5,200	1,200
Foster grandparents.....	7,500	10,500	3,000
RSVP.....	5,000	5,000	-----
Research and demonstration.....	1,800	2,800	1,000
Training.....	1,850	3,000	1,150
Total.....	29,500	39,500	10,000

It has also come to my attention that during the past year there has been great concern among the senior citizen membership groups and the national organizations engaged in programs affecting the elderly about the gradual downgrading of the Administration on Aging which began with the action of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur Cohen, who placed it under the jurisdiction of the offices of Social and Rehabilitation Service in HEW. The result has awakened a deep seated fear among interested parties that the Administration on Aging will be unable to fulfill the responsibilities assigned to it by the Older American Act of 1965.

It was in response to this concern that Secretary Richardson on May 6 announced that he had invited Dr. Arthur Flemming, newly appointed chairman of the White House Conference on Aging, to appoint a task force to reexamine the future role and structure of the Administration on Aging.

For the information of the Members of the House, I include at this time Secretary Richardson's statement announcing this special task force:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY RICHARDSON

I have asked Dr. Arthur Flemming, Chairman of the 1971 White House Conference on the Aging, to establish a special task force to review the organization and status of the Administration on Aging.

The task force will be composed of qualified and prominent private citizens and they will give Chairman Flemming and me their recommendations as to the role, function and location of the Administration on Aging within the Executive Branch as a whole.

Dr. Flemming and I want the task force to examine the different alternatives with respect to the future of the Administration on Aging, giving special consideration to recommendations which will issue from the various State White House Conferences on Aging, and giving particular weight to those recommendations which emerge from the White House Conference on Aging next November.

The Administration on Aging is a prominent part, but only one part, of this Administration's comprehensive program to assist older Americans; many Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government have essential roles.

Dr. Flemming and I look forward to a thorough examination and to receiving ideas which are directly representative of the views of senior citizens themselves and their membership organizations.

The members of the task force will be announced by Chairman Flemming within a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, these actions will help strengthen old-age programs at the grass

roots level and improve communications between older Americans and their Government.

It was a pleasure for me to vote for the 10-percent increase in social security as well as the 10-percent increase for railroad retirees. I also support proposed legislation which includes an additional 5-percent increase in social security and ties social security increases to the cost-of-living index.

The halting of inflationary pressures is perhaps the most important need of our retired citizens, and social security must be made a more equitable and effective instrument of income security through this automatic cost-of-living adjustment.

To give needed assistance to those older Americans who work, I have introduced legislation which would exempt those persons over 65 from social security tax—who are either forced to continue working to supplement social security benefits—or who do not wish to retire.

Assuring the dignity of old age is not the granting of some special privilege. It is sharing America's trillion-dollar economy with the men and women who helped create it.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY CELEBRATED

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in marking Italian National Day—because of the bonds and strong alliance between Italy and the United States—because of the incalculable contributions by Italy to Western civilization and not least of all because of my affection for the homeland of my father.

In this occasion I pay tribute to the Italian nation and her people and I express my congratulations and fond sentiments to the Republic of Italy through a trusted friend of the United States and eloquent Ambassador of Italy, His Excellency Egidio Ortona.

Italians are perhaps most noted for their artistic and esthetic sensitivity. The genius of da Vinci, Raphael, Michelangelo, Bellini, Duccio is immortal. The creative and innovative capacity of the Italian people seems limitless. But their contributions extend far beyond the purely artistic. Men like da Vinci made two fold contributions in the arts and in the sciences. Other accomplished Italians like Livy and Cicero wrote significant historical and philosophical works; the importance of Roman law cannot be overestimated. Indeed, Italians have made their mark in every field of endeavor. Proof of Italy's rich culture is the number of tourists who flock to her shores to share her history and enjoy the warm receptive nature of her people.

Again, I extend my warmest wishes to the Italian people on Italian National Day and express my confidence in the continued friendship of our two peoples.